

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

“LIKE, RIGHT NOW WE DON’T REALLY HAVE A VOICE”:
STORIES OF SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS WORKING WITH ELLS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of
MASTER OF EDUCATION

By
SARAH E. DEWITT
Norman, Oklahoma
2020

“LIKE, RIGHT NOW WE DON’T REALLY HAVE A VOICE”:
STORIES OF SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS WORKING WITH ELLS

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Kristy A. Brugar, Chair

Dr. Neil O. Houser

Dr. Rebecca S. Borden

DEDICATION

For my fifth graders at Rockwood

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There's a wonderful moment at the start of Neil Young's set with The Band during *The Last Waltz*. Neil said, "I'd just like to say before I start that it's one of the pleasures of my life to be able to be on this stage with these people tonight." I think of my committee when I hear that line. It has been one of the greatest privileges of my life to learn from Dr. Brugar, Dr. Houser, and Dr. Borden. Maybe it's appropriate that Neil Young goes on to perform "Helpless" since I, too, felt unmoored at times throughout this thesis, but because of my committee's support, I reached the end of this most rewarding program.

I must extend my sincerest heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Kristy A. Brugar. I am profoundly grateful for her scholarship and expertise, her time, her generosity of spirit, and her encouragement. She is that truly rare but special leader: the one who lifts you up with her as she climbs. She has modeled how to be a better teacher and researcher while also inspiring me to be a better person. I am so thankful for her.

Thank you to Dr. Neil O. Houser for teaching me, as Baldwin says, "to ask questions of the universe, and then learn to live with those questions." I am deeply grateful for, and changed by, the opportunities to learn from him and his courses.

Thank you to Dr. Rebecca S. Borden for her tireless scholarship and advocacy for language learners. I found a true home in her classroom, a place that unapologetically centered our students in affirming ways. I can chart this project's origin to her course.

Thank you to my parents for being my earliest and most enthusiastic supporters. They nurtured a love of learning in my sisters and in me, and they have spent a lifetime fighting for public education. Thank you to my husband, David, for encouraging me to begin this journey and for loving and supporting our family and me so well. Thank you to my babies, January Joy and Wesley David, for their unconditional love and for being the world's sweetest little angels.

Thank you to Sam Sy for being a constant source of humor, accountability, and support throughout this study. Sam is a fierce advocate for teachers and for public education. I am grateful for her friendship.

Finally, I would like to thank the teachers who participated in this study. I am inspired by their tireless dedication to their communities and to their students. Their stories call us to imagine and to work for a more just world. May we answer their call.

Although I dedicated great care and effort to making this study as sound as possible, I fully acknowledge that this draft is but the beginning of my learning journey on this topic. As such, there will be mistake in what follows, and I take responsibility for them and pledge to learn from them.

Abstract

Students for whom English is a second or additional language are a significant and growing population within public schools. Notions of inclusion and citizenship are uniquely and distinctly a part of social studies. In combination, these factors present an opportunity for social studies teachers to meaningfully engage with their students, many of whom are English language learners (ELLs), in ways that expand 1) our understandings of what constitutes valuable knowledge and 2) the boundaries of citizenship education. Through a qualitative narrative inquiry, the researcher explored three secondary social studies teachers whose work predominately involved ELLs. Through interviews, guided by think aloud protocols, and through the collection of classroom artifacts, the researcher explored how secondary social studies teachers working with increasing numbers of ELLs “took up the charge” of educating for and about citizenship. Informed by the theory of transnational funds of knowledge, the researcher found that two of the teachers recognized, valued, and incorporated students’ languages, countries of origins, and knowledge bases in ways that extended or transformed traditional approaches to ELLs and to citizenship education. Their efforts and successes may provide opportunities for other teachers in similar contexts to reflect on their own practices. Future researchers may be interested in factors that may support or constrain teachers in the development of a transnational funds of knowledge stance.

Keywords: ELLs, English language learners, social studies, citizenship, civics education

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
Research Puzzle	1
Need for the Study	2
Research Purpose	3
<i>Literature Review</i>	4
English Language Learners: Key Terms and Background	5
<i>Definition</i>	5
<i>Diversity</i>	6
<i>School Policies Related to English Language Learners</i>	8
<i>Placement</i>	10
Essential Components for ELL Instruction in Social Studies	12
<i>Unique Challenges in Social Studies for ELLs</i>	13
<i>Opportunities for Social Studies Teachers to Bridge Language and Content Instruction</i>	14
<i>Global and Transnational Citizenship Education</i>	21
<i>Citizenship Education for the Few</i>	23
<i>Theories of Resistance</i>	25
<i>Gap</i>	28
<i>Methods</i>	28
Theoretical Framework: Funds of Knowledge	28
<i>Transnational Funds of Knowledge</i>	30
Research Design	30
<i>Epistemological Stance: Constructionism</i>	32
Participants	33
Data Collection	36
<i>Interviews</i>	36
<i>Think Aloud</i>	37
<i>Classroom Artifacts</i>	38
Data Analysis	39
Trustworthiness	39
Ethical Considerations	40
<i>Findings</i>	41
Elijah	41
Eduardo	51
Allie	59
<i>Discussion</i>	68
The Final Act	68
<i>Individual teachers' practices in their classrooms with their students</i>	68
<i>Innovative and Resourceful, but at What Cost?</i>	74

<i>Limitations</i>	77
<i>Implications and Conclusion</i>	78
<i>References</i>	81
<i>Interview Protocol, Appendix A</i>	89

Introduction

Research Puzzle

Public schools are experiencing a significant increase in the enrollment of English language learners (ELLs) (Wright, 2015, p. 7). The most recently available data for Oklahoma, from the 2012-13 school year, reflects 43,500 ELLs enrolled in its public schools (Colorín, 2019). The density of ELLs enrolled in Oklahoma public schools, as of 2009-10, is between 5% and 9% (NCELA, 2011; Wright, 2015). Nationally, the growth rate of ELLs surpasses the growth rate of the total student population: “Between 1994 and 2010, the pre-k-12 student growth was less than 5% whereas the ELL growth rate exceeded 63%” (NCELA, 2011; Wright, 2015, p. 7). Demographic estimates indicate that ELLs will continue to be a sizeable and growing portion of the student population.

At the bare minimum, English language learners in public schools are entitled to English proficiency and to content knowledge, yet schools and teachers are struggling to fulfill these obligations (Wright, 2015). In secondary classrooms, ELLs are expected to demonstrate high levels of content knowledge. This expectation for content knowledge, and the ability for students to both receive and articulate that content knowledge in English, applies across all disciplines. In combination, these factors may diminish opportunities for ELLs to fully engage with the curriculum in ways that are appropriate and meaningful. Because notions of inclusion and citizenship are uniquely and distinctively part of social studies, and because these concepts may lend themselves to a curriculum in which socio-cultural diversity may be, or should be, more readily integrated, the fact that ELLs are still sidelined in social studies is particularly troubling. Research indicates that ELLs often are systematically excluded from high quality, rigorous social studies course offerings (Journell, 2011). Compounding this, social studies teachers feel ill-

prepared to meet the needs and skills of their ELLs (O'Brien, 2011). This growing and significant increase of ELLs in public schools will require teachers who are confident and competent in their ability to engage and support all learners, including ELLs. A bright spot for ELLs in secondary social studies has emerged. There are, of course, highly skilled social studies teachers who have seized the opportunity to meaningfully educate for and about citizenship in their classrooms with their ELL students, and these teachers do so in ways that affirm and sustain the rich socio-cultural and linguistic diversity of their students by drawing upon students' transnational funds of knowledge (Dabach & Fones, 2016; González et al., 2005; Jaffee, 2016; Moll et al., 1992).

Need for the Study

ELLs are not a monolith. In addition to the obvious variety in languages spoken and language skills, there are also differences among ELLs in literacy levels in home and second/additional languages, in experiences with formal schooling, and in socioeconomic status, to name a few (Wright, 2015). Moreover, ELLs hold a variety of connections to immigration, but the majority of ELLs in U.S. schools are U.S. citizens under the legal definition of the term: 76% of elementary ELLs and 56% of secondary ELLs are U.S. citizens (Wright, 2015, p. 7). In this regard, ELLs reflect both traditional notions of citizenship (e.g. legal status, the right to exercise one's vote), but they also present in ways that challenge tradition (e.g. multilingual, accents, recent immigrant histories). This last point reinforces the unique role the social studies can play in expanding and reshaping citizenship education in order to include and reflect all students, ELLs included.

Learning a second or additional language is a complex process, and learning secondary social studies content is equally complex. It is no surprise, then, that when ELLs are placed in

classrooms with teachers who report being unprepared for the work of educating ELLs, language learning and content knowledge may not be well integrated (Cruz & Thornton, 2013; O'Brien, 2011). In particular, many researchers cite social studies' complexity of texts, its needed disciplinary literacy, students' prior knowledge, and dominant language and culture as factors that complicate the teaching of social studies with ELLs (Cruz & Thornton, 2013; Wright, 2015; Zhang, 2017). Because this may lead to a chilling effect on enrollment for ELLs in rigorous social studies coursework, researchers and educators must work to understand how to align language learning and content learning so that all students have equitable access to high quality social studies education (Callahan & Obenchain, 2016). This study seeks to explore how some teachers are finding success in providing high quality social studies instruction that appropriately integrates the needs and myriad skills of ELLs.

Citizenship education in secondary social studies may be a useful lens to explore this concept because citizenship is one of the central tenets of social studies curriculum (NCSS, 2013). Social studies researchers and practitioners are broadening citizenship education in exciting and transformative ways (e.g. Bondy, 2016; Dabach & Fones, 2016; Jaffee, 2016). By exploring the three teachers featured in this study, we can learn from them and contemplate both their successes and their hardships with integrating their ELLs into all aspects of their classrooms. This study may provide other social studies teachers who work with similar student populations opportunities to reflect on their own practices.

Research Purpose

I am pursuing a study that utilizes individual interviews, a think aloud method, and classroom artifacts to explore how high school social studies teachers are carving out space in their citizenship education curricula to more fully integrate ELLs. This study seeks to explore the

following research question: How do secondary social studies teachers who are working with an increasing number of ELLs “take up the charge of educating for and about citizenship”? In order to further explore this larger question, sub-questions include the following: 1) How do secondary social studies teachers define citizenship?, 2) How are secondary social teachers experiencing an increasing population of ELLs in their classrooms?, 3) How do secondary social studies teachers self-describe enactments of citizenship in their daily lives and in their classrooms?, 4) How do secondary social studies teachers understand the selected 2019 Oklahoma Academic Standards?, 5) How are secondary social studies teachers making connections between the selected 2019 Oklahoma Academic Standards and citizenship education?, and lastly, 6) How are secondary social studies teachers connecting the selected 2019 Oklahoma Academic Standards to their work with ELLs?

Literature Review

In narrative inquiry, a formal literature review, as featured in this study, is uncommon (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). More often, the literature review is woven throughout the study to “create a seamless link between the theory and practice embodied in the inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 41). However, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) acknowledge that many novice researchers, like graduate students, must confront tension at the formalistic boundary of graduate school expectations and narrative inquiry. This tension is reflected in the literature review that follows, and while this section is uncharacteristic of narrative inquiry, its inclusion reflects a thorough investigation into the ideas and approaches of more accomplished scholars. In this regard, synthesizing and sharing scholars’ views and works can enhance our understanding of and appreciation for the teachers’ stories that follow.

To set the stage, so to speak, for the stories shared by teachers in this study, familiarity with some of the leading scholarly conversations around ELLs, around social studies instruction with respect to ELLs, and around citizenship education in social studies is pertinent. In this review, I first define the origins of the term ELL and explain my rationale for employing it in this study. Then, I offer a fuller picture of ELLs' background as well as their experiences with language placements in public schools. Next, I address the relationship between social studies and ELLs, including challenges and opportunities for meaningful social studies instruction with ELLs. Lastly, I present different approaches to conceptualizing social studies and citizenship education, including implications of these approaches with respect to ELLs. In combination, this coverage will crystallize the conundrum: the social studies is built on the premise that citizenship education is central to its mission yet many students in today's social studies classrooms confound traditional conceptions of citizenship. How select teachers navigate these questions and whether, and to what extent, they make room for their ELLs in the social studies curriculum will be the focus of this study.

English Language Learners: Key Terms and Background

Definition

While scholars agree that there are students in our schools for whom English is a new language, they do not consistently agree on how to label these students. Limited English proficient (LEP) is the legal term often found in federal and state legislation and used by the U.S. Department of Education for these students and emphasizes a deficit. In contrast, Wright (2015) defines "An English language learner (ELL) [as] a student who is in the process of attaining proficiency in English as a new, additional language" (p. 1). Further, ELL, the term first introduced by LaCelle-Peterson and Rivera,

underscores the fact that, in addition to meeting all the academic challenges that face their monolingual peers, these students are mastering another language – something too few monolingual English-speakers are currently asked to do in U.S. schools. The term follows conventional educational usage in that it focuses on what students are accomplishing, rather than on any temporary “limitation” they face prior to having done so, just as we refer to advanced teacher candidates as “student teachers” rather than “limited teaching proficient individuals” [...] (1994, p. 55 as cited in Wright, 2015).

Clearly, the term ELL acknowledges a positive, active learning process for students. Some scholars, however, take issue with the centrality that ELL places on English. In so doing, the term ignores students’ home languages by only acknowledging that students are learning English (Wright, 2015). García (2009) advocates for the use of emergent bilingual because it emphasizes that students are, and should be, acquiring proficiency in English and in their home languages. Arguably, a term like emergent bilingual may better and more accurately forefront students’ linguistic assets, yet English language learner currently is most widely used in school settings and by the teachers in this study, and as such, is used here (Cruz & Thornton, 2013; Dabach, 2014; Wright, 2015). However, the use of a single term, like ELL, to describe students learning English disguises and reduces their impressive diversity.

Diversity

ELLs, like all students, are individual students with individual stories and backgrounds. While ELLs often are considered only for their language competencies, there is great diversity in the languages they know and the degree to which they know them. While Spanish is the most common home language for ELLs nationwide, over 50 languages rank in the “top five home languages for students” state by state (Wright, 2015). Moreover, a language itself holds tremendous variety, and it can vary regionally and nationally (Wright, 2015). This means that Spanish spoken in Spain varies from Spanish in El Salvador, for example. Additionally, Wright (2015) notes that students may vary widely in their oral proficiency and literacy skills in their

home languages (p. 11). This means that the languages that ELLs speak and their proficiencies in those languages varies dramatically from one student to another.

Socioeconomic status is another important consideration. According to the Urban Institute, more than 60% of ELLs come from low-income families, compounded by the fact that about 50% of ELLs have parents without high school diplomas (Capps et al., 2006; Wright, 2015). The implications of this are important as they relate to opportunities to learn in school settings. “ELLs in particular tend to be very segregated [... and] nationally, 70% of elementary school-aged ELLs attended only 10% of the country’s public elementary schools” (Wright, 2015, p. 14). At the secondary level, “poor and minority children [...] are more likely to be taught by teachers who lack expertise in the subject they teach” (Wright, 2015, p. 14). Funding is also impacted: “Nationally we spend approximately \$900 less per year on each student in the school districts with the most poor students [...]” (Wright, 2015, p. 14). This is why a funds of knowledge approach to teaching may prove vital and effective, yet this approach alone is insufficient to combat ever-increasing injustices inherent to our society and our schools. A critical economic lens and a more global approach to citizenship also will be needed.

ELLs also vary in other meaningful ways, including their countries of origin. The majority of ELLs are U.S.-born citizens, but obviously, there are foreign-born ELLs, as well. Foreign-born ELLs may be newly arrived to the United States within the past 2 years, and thus, be classified as newcomer ELLs. Even within this newcomer status, there is variety: students may be newly arrived as a result of war or conflict in their home countries, and thus, be considered refugee ELLs. Foreign-born newcomer ELLs also have differing experiences with formal schooling. Some may be considered highly schooled newcomers (HSN) because they had high-quality education opportunities prior to arriving in the U.S. Alternatively, some may be

considered students with interrupted formal education (SIFE) if they had little or no access to education as a result of conflict, most often the case for refugee ELLs (Wright, 2015). ELLs also may resist or reject their association with these labels because they do not wish to be positioned as the Other or, by extension, as foreign (Dabach, 2014; Talmy, 2004). The foreign-born designation, in particular, is problematic: “with the exception of [I]ndigenous people, everyone is of immigrant origins [...] whether migration was forced [as in slavery] or marked by various degrees of choice” (Dabach, 2014, p. 51). In fact, Cherokee is one of most common languages spoken by ELLs in Oklahoma (Colorín, 2019). This reveals the problematic nature of a system that reduces students to labels like foreign-born or native, yet it is the prevailing system imposed on ELLs.

These aforementioned considerations scarcely scratch the surface of diversity for ELLs. What are their favorite musicians, movies, books? Do they like working in groups or individually? Do they prefer science or social studies? Who are their friends? What are their dreams for their futures? The term ELL, and related labels, indicates that the student is learning English. That is all it reveals. Teachers who work with ELLs must learn about their students as the individuals they are, and yet, teachers must also contend with the very real implications of content learning with students with varying degrees of English fluency.

School Policies Related to English Language Learners

There are several significant federal court cases and legislation that relate to the creation of ELL programs nationwide. In particular, *the Civil Rights Act of 1964*, *Lau v. Nichols (1974)*, and *Plyler v. Doe (1982)* are important to understand when considering both the responsibilities of educators and public schools with respect to ELLs and the rights of ELLs as learners in schools. *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*, a landmark piece of federal legislation, contains an

important provision that relates to many ELLs. In *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*, it states, “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” This was put to the test ten years later when a class-action lawsuit was brought by Chinese-American students against the San Francisco school system.

The Supreme Court of the United States found, in *Lau v. Nichols (1974)*, that the “failure of the San Francisco school system to provide English language instruction to approximately 1,800 students of Chinese ancestry who do not speak English, or to provide them with other adequate instructional procedures, denies them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the public education program and thus violates [section] 601 of *the Civil Rights Act of 1964* [...]” (USDOE, 2020). *Lau v. Nichols (1974)* also expanded the guideline to cover students who needed additional language supports, creating, essentially, a justification for ELL programs.

In 1975, the Texas legislature permitted its school districts to deny enrollment to “foreign-born” children who could not prove that they were legal residents or citizens of the U.S. (AIC, 2016). Mexican students who could not prove their legal status argued that the mere requirement to do so violated their fourteenth amendment rights and brought the case that would become known as *Plyler v. Doe (1982)* (AIC, 2016). The U.S. Supreme Court, through *Plyler v. Doe (1982)*, found that the Texas legislation did, in fact, violate the Equal Protection Clause of the fourteenth amendment and “affirmed that citizenship or immigration status of students, parents, or guardians cannot be used to bar students from public schools” (USDOE, 2020). Ultimately, this ruling means that any state that establishes a public school system must provide free and equal education to *all* children. The majority of ELLs nationwide are U.S. citizens, but

the precedent set by *Plyler v. Doe* (1982) is certainly significant for students who may have difficulty verifying citizenship status or for those students who are not U.S. citizens. While researchers acknowledge the complexities of teaching high quality social studies that meets the needs of ELLs, the simple reality is that teachers have a legal responsibility to do so. Teachers in my study are working with students and families with a wide range of citizenship statuses.

Placement

Within the context of this study, the two relevant placements for English language learners include mainstream and sheltered classrooms. ELLs placed in mainstream instructional settings are “in content-area classrooms where the curriculum is delivered in English; typically, curricula and instruction are not modified in these classrooms for non-native English speakers” (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 11). An increasing number of ELLs are placed in mainstream settings, “despite evidence that a minimum of five years of *bilingual* instruction is needed to benefit from English only courses” (Borden, 2014, p. 229). ELLs are placed in mainstream classes for a number of reasons, “including assumptions by non-educators about what ELLs need, the scarcity of ESOL-trained teachers relative to demand, the growth of ELL populations, the dispersal of ELLs into more districts across the country, and restrictions in a growing number of states regarding the time ELLs can stay in ESOL programs” (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 11). As more and more ELLs are placed in mainstream classrooms, ELL specialists predict that ELLs will spend increasing instructional time with “(1) teachers inadequately trained to work with ELLs; (2) teachers who do not see meeting the needs of their ELLs as a priority; and (3) curricula and classroom practices that are not designed to target ELLs’ needs” (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 11). An alternative to mainstream instruction is sheltered instruction.

A sheltered classroom offers “grade-level content instruction that is provided in English but in a manner that makes it comprehensible to ELLs while promoting their English language development” (Wright, 2015, p. 92). Wright (2015) notes that the term *sheltered* refers to easing language demands without “watering down content” (p. 92). That means that a sheltered instruction classroom would have the “same curriculum objectives as [a] mainstream classroom in addition to specific language and learning strategy objectives” (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 23).

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is a model created by Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2014) to provide clear guidance to teachers tasked with sheltered instruction. SIOP includes eight essential components for sheltered instruction: preparation (clear language and content objectives), building background (activating and building on prior knowledge), comprehensive input (adjusting speech to appropriate language levels), strategies (scaffolding), interaction (primary language support and effective student grouping), practice and application (cooperative learning to apply content knowledge through listening, speaking, reading, and writing), lesson delivery (meeting language and content objectives), and review and assessment (providing feedback and assessment) (Wright, 2015, pp. 92-93). The SIOP model is growing in popularity with school districts, and more teachers are receiving professional development on it; however, in addition to SIOP training, researchers have found that professional development around second language acquisition and second language learning as well as understanding for sociocultural factors related to their ELLs is necessary for truly effective sheltered instruction (Wright, 2015, p. 93).

Similar to the labeling of ELLs, an undercurrent of the placement sorting system is the Othering of ELLs, both culturally and linguistically (Borden, 2014; Talmy, 2004). ELLs are

positioned exclusively relative to the monolingual cultural dominance of English and, thus, ELLs are identified as linguistically marked (Talmy, 2004). Talmy (2004) describes this as a process where some social categories, like language, obtain normative status, thus marking any category that differs as Other (Talmy, 2004, p. 152). The normative status of English in the U.S. schooling system, then, is conferred a normal or natural appearance; it passes without recognition because of its dominance. As a result, the normative status of English marks other languages as recognizably different. “One such ‘highly recognizable’ or ‘marked’ identity [is ELL]” (Talmy, 2004, p. 152). The placement system of ELLs into either mainstream or sheltered classes carries varying degrees of reductionism, deficit-orientation, and assimilationist attitudes. Additionally, in both contexts, teacher preparation is essential for work with ELLs, but this preparation is not occurring at the rate and to the extent needed.

Essential Components for ELL Instruction in Social Studies

Teachers reported deficiencies in instructional support related to ELLs provided at both the pre-service and in-service levels (He, Journell, & Faircloth, 2018; O’Brien, 2011). He, Journell, and Faircloth (2018) found that only six states require pre-service teachers take coursework on ELLs for all content areas. O’Brien (2011) also discovered that teachers with the largest ELL student populations reported the least district support. Related to in-service teachers, Mullins et al. (2020) reached a similar conclusion: “social studies teachers receive very little PD focused on supporting the learning of *all* students, specifically [students with disabilities and ELLs]” (p. 12). Cruz and Thornton (2009) echo these findings and assert that most social studies teachers have been ill-prepared to teach students who are not proficient in English. Even while the “body of potentially relevant research on teaching ELLs has grown in recent years, its application to social studies instruction has not kept pace” (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 271).

Mullins et al. (2020) reported that their “findings in this study should start a conversation about what PD is needed to support social studies teachers in fulfilling their duty of educating *all* students for the responsibility of citizenship” (p. 12). De Jong and Harper assert that

the failure to include bilingual or [ESL] courses as an integral part of the teacher preparation stems, at least in part, from the assumption that teaching ELLs is a matter of pedagogical adaptations that can easily be incorporated into a mainstream teacher’s existing repertoire of instructional strategies for a diverse classroom”; therefore, teaching ELLs requires no special expertise but is rather “a matter of applying ‘just good teaching’ practices” (2005, p. 102).

As the next section indicates, being a good teacher is requisite, but not sufficient, for teaching ELLs.

In fact, O’Brien (2009) found that teacher disposition matters as much, if not more, than the professional development that teachers receive related to ELLs. Cruz and Thornton (2013) emphasize that “teachers of ELLs [...] must especially endeavor to explore their own practices, core values, and underlying beliefs to better serve their students” (p. 55). Reflecting on their own practice must dictate that they reflect deeply on themselves (Palmer, 2007). Both the practice of critical self-reflection and the opportunity to develop and nurture asset-based dispositions toward ELLs are not easily packaged professional development sessions, yet both are essential in this work.

Unique Challenges in Social Studies for ELLs

Social studies can present unique challenges to ELLs. For example, social studies texts contain complexities that may be less common in other content areas. These text complexities include passive voice, the use of time markers (e.g. “after the war” or “the Middle Ages”) instead of discourse markers (e.g. “in addition” or “first”), and lengthy noun groups (“the first idea Jefferson argued”) (Zhang, 2017, p. 204). That is to say, social studies requires its own disciplinary literacy (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). This is important to bring to teachers’

attention since social studies instruction often relies heavily on reading comprehension (Zhang, 2017). Additionally, ELLs may lack familiarity with social studies terms, historical processes, and vocabulary (Cruz & Thornton, 2013). For example, *American Revolution* is a concise term, yet it carries complex social and historical baggage; in its conciseness, the term enables teachers to succinctly describe rich phenomena (Wright, 2015). Abstract terms like *freedom* or *justice* are additional examples. Utilization of these semantically-loaded terms is common to the social studies. Sometimes, these concepts may be difficult for teachers to break down in comprehensible ways for ELLs, yet these ideas constitute an important and sizeable portion of the curriculum (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 55; Wright, 2015). Many teachers may turn to pseudo-translation software like Google Translate or to the additional language resources provided by their textbooks and curriculum guides to increase comprehensibility for students. However, this fails to account for students who may not be proficient in reading in their home languages or for the possibility for mistranslation (Wright, 2015).

Opportunities for Social Studies Teachers to Bridge Language and Content Instruction

First and foremost, Cruz and Thornton (2013) emphasize the importance of building a classroom community reflective of the teacher and students who occupy that space. Operating within that community, teachers must then draw on three core knowledge bases to achieve effective content instruction for ELLs: knowledge of the content; knowledge of language(s), including English, and knowledge of how tasks are to be achieved (Short, 1997 as cited in Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 55). In order to activate and build upon ELLs' prior knowledge, or their knowledge of the content, teachers must determine what students already know. Dong (2017) recommends a general survey at the beginning of the school year to gauge ELLs' previous social studies learning experiences as well as at the start of each unit so teachers can create entry points

into the curriculum as well as departure points for possible student investigation (p. 146). This approach underscores that ELLs “are not empty vessels when they come to the social studies classroom; rather, they bring a collection of prior knowledge and skills [...]” (Dong, 2017, p. 145). Moreover, activating students’ prior knowledge and situating it as valid and valuable can create space both for students’ voices in and for students’ engagement with a curriculum that has “often [been] based on the dominant culture, taking a Eurocentric perspective” (Dong, 2017, p. 144). In so doing, building on the students’ knowledge of the content also can build and enhance the classroom community.

Next, social studies teachers must draw upon the language bases of their students. He et al. (2018) assert that “teachers need to assist EL[L]s’ English language proficiency development but also foster their academic content mastery” (p. 13). Some scholars contend that teachers should also support ELLs’ home language proficiency, as well, since there is evidence that bilingualism ultimately allows students to develop greater metalinguistic awareness (García et al., 2008). Cummins (2001) noted that this awareness is where “two languages bolster each other and thus the student in his or her acquisition of knowledge” (as cited in García et al., 2008, p. 27; Wright, 2015, p. 58). This means that, when a teacher supports a student’s home language, the teacher is also strengthening the student’s English skills; this interplay of language building, in turn, will allow the student to engage more with the content.

The SIOP model forefronts this need by requiring that teachers create both language and content objectives. Most ELLs are not placed with bilingual teachers and many are not placed in sheltered classrooms where SIOP is utilized, however. This should not stop teachers from embracing home languages as assets. As García et al. (2008) note, “what is evident from the research is that the use of the child’s first language is most important for their long-term

academic achievement in English as well as cognitive growth” (p. 31). Franquíz and Salinas (2013) argue that English language proficiency is not a prerequisite for subject matter learning in social studies. One way that monolingual English-speaking social studies teachers can best support their ELLs and draw on their ELLs’ home language is through primary language support (PLS).

Primary language support involves the use of students’ home languages to support sheltered instruction, though it can be employed in all classrooms, and its purpose “is to make instruction in English as comprehensible as possible for ELLs so they can learn the content and acquire more English” (Wright, 2015, p. 297). PLS can be effective in classrooms where students speak many languages and the teacher speaks only English. Valdéz (2014) notes that it is important for teachers to realize, however, “that because bilingual individuals develop and use language for different purposes, they do not develop identical strengths in each language” (as cited in Wright, 2015, p. 39). That is to say, bilingual speakers are not speakers with identical, perfect fluency in both languages; they use language in complex and context-embedded ways, yet they should still be considered bilinguals. García (2009) refers to this as dynamic bilingualism. Students must be provided ample opportunity to read, write, listen, and speak in every lesson in order to grow in their English proficiency, and this language building can reflect PLS, as well, and should be grounded in social studies content. (Billings & Walqui, 2019). With this understanding, teachers must bring students’ home languages into their classrooms.

The third knowledge base that teachers can draw upon is ELLs’ knowledge of how tasks are to be completed. This requires that teachers provide explicit instructions and appropriate scaffolding. Cruz and Thornton (2013) advocate for the use of images to represent key terms in order to increase comprehension, noting also that visual resources, such as photographs or maps,

can engage students in ways traditional texts may not. Moreover, graphic organizers, realia, note-taking practices, prereading discussions, total physical response, and vocabulary overviews also can be helpful for communicating how to tackle learning goals (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 66).

Zhang (2017) warns, however, that making predictions, think alouds, and graphic organizers are “heavily cognitively focused, which assume that students can get meaning from print and can accordingly respond to the reading. Although they are approved to be effective reading strategies, they may not provide sufficient scaffolding for ELLs” (p. 205). That is to say, on their own, these tools may be insufficient for ELLs. Instead, Zhang (2017) advocates that social studies teachers must deliberately teach in a more language-focused approach so students learn to pay attention to the disciplinary literacy of social studies. Zhang (2017) offers noun deconstruction, sentence matching, and text reconstruction as appropriate linguistic scaffolding for content mastery. This level of language emphasis may be unfamiliar or uncomfortable for many social studies teachers, but Zhang (2017) argues that this focus on language ultimately enables teachers and students to focus on content.

He et al. (2018) also argue for more explicit attention to language in social studies, stating, “to prepare social studies for ELs, it is important that [teachers] practice identifying academic language and setting specific language objectives in their lessons” (p. 16). As mentioned, the SIOP model can be helpful in this task due to the centrality it places on identifying both language and academic objectives. However, some scholars take issue with the concept of academic language itself. Cummins (1981) theorized that ELLs acquire two kinds of English language skills: basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). BICS “is very much context-embedded in that it is always used in situations that have real-world connections for the ELL” like shopping or playing with friends,

and BICS may be acquired in one to three years (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 27; García et al., 2008). CALP, alternatively, “is abstract, decontextualized, and scholarly in nature” making it more difficult for ELLs to acquire this academic language, and CALP can take between five to seven years for fluency (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 27; García et al., 2008). CALP represents the notion of academic language. Yet, the dichotomy introduced by Cummins (1981) is called into question by scholars. Some argue that the two categories are oversimplified. Váldez (2000) asserts that “efforts to teach academic language to ELLs are counterproductive since it comprises multiple dynamic and ever-evolving literacies” (as cited in Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 27). Advocates for a multiple literacies approach encourage teachers to “accept multiple ways of communicating [that do not] marginalize students when they use a variety of English” (Cruz & Thornton, 2013, p. 27). This includes non-standard forms of English and language that could be categorized as informal or social, akin to Cummins’ (1981) concept of BICS. Another related consideration is the swiftness with which ELLs often learn everyday language. This can deceive teachers into believing that their students possess adequate language development in the subject-specific language required for learning in social studies well before this may be the case.

While much of this is nuanced and continues to be negotiated by scholars, what is straightforward is that teachers must understand and appreciate language acquisition and development in order to provide high quality social studies content instruction for ELLs (Cruz & Thornton, 2013).

Ideas of Citizenship in Social Studies

A central aim of social studies education is to cultivate engaged and informed citizens prepared to be stewards of democracy (NCSS, 2013). What is less clear is how educators include and consider their ELLs as they plan and enact their civics curricula.

Citizenship Typologies

In order to bring clarity and some degree of unity to the definition of social studies, Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) focused on the questions that teachers must ask as they develop lessons. Barr et al. (1977) used purpose, methods, and content, all aspects of instructional design, to analyze decades of position papers from scholarly and teacher organizations in addition to relevant research. Barr et al. (1977) determined three distinct traditions. These traditions “were not complementary areas representing different aspects of the total field [... They] were actually antagonistic, competitive philosophical systems – each striving to emerge as *the one true* social studies,” yet, ultimately, the researchers found that these traditions shared some commonalities that allowed for a coherent definition (p. 59). The three traditions include Citizenship Transmission, Social Studies Taught as Social Science, and Social Studies Taught as Reflective Inquiry. According to Barr et al. (1977), Citizenship Transmission is “the desire to transmit to the young a conception both of an ideal society and of ideal citizenship” and is the tradition to which most social studies teachers belong (p. 61). The second tradition, of Social Science, aims to teach students the “actual techniques by which scholars gain new knowledge” by exploring content through problems and assumptions in order to cultivate citizens who “have learned how to look at the world through the eyes of social scientists” (Barr et al., 1977, p. 63). The third and final tradition, Reflective Inquiry, concerns itself with “identification of problems and the systematic search for answers,” and notably, these problems must be grounded both in society and in students’ lives. Reflective Inquiry’s purpose is to nurture citizens who make decisions in a socio-political context based on more than personal habit or impulse (Barr et al., 1977, pp. 64-65). Ultimately, Barr et al. (1977) found that these traditions, while conflicting, held “general agreement that the primary, overriding purpose of the social studies is citizenship education” (pp.

67-68). Barr et al. (1977) ultimately arrived at this definition: “the social studies is an integration of experience and knowledge concerning human relations for the purpose of citizenship education” (p. 69). Their scholarship provided the groundwork for continuing to question how we think about and understand citizenship education.

Building upon Barr, Barth, and Shermis’ (1977) finding that citizenship was a primary concern for the social studies, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) developed a foundational study to understand how teachers understand and teach citizenship. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) asserted that there is a “spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship *is* and what good citizens *do*” in a democracy (p. 1). Their study produced findings which emphasized three types of citizenship: personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). To succinctly capture the core assumptions of each of these visions, the researchers provided how the given citizen-type would act with respect to a food drive: the personally responsible citizen would donate food, the participatory citizen would organize the food drive, and the justice-oriented citizen would explore why people were hungry and work to address that underlying issue (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 2).

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) outlined that most school-based citizenship education programs emphasized personally responsible citizenship and/or participatory citizenship but always without politics. To explore if a citizenship education program which emphasized one type of citizen could ultimately cultivate citizenship outcomes across the spectrum, Westheimer & Kahne (2004) conducted a focused investigation. They explored whether educators who pursued participatory citizenship could also achieve justice-oriented outcomes and vice versa. Ultimately, the authors found that this dual-outcome was not guaranteed, and “If both goals are

priorities, those designing and implementing curriculum must give both explicit attention” (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 6).

Global and Transnational Citizenship Education

While researchers like Hanvey (1976), Gaudelli (2003), and Pike (2008) present seminal understandings of global education, Harshman (2016) noted that recently “however, work in global education has turned toward global citizenship education and more critical reading of the tenets of global education [... and] this shift has provided an important and necessary move away from [...] Hanvey’s work, which presumes most people have access to and benefit from global systems” (p. 160). While there is not one comprehensive definition for global citizenship education (GCE), Pashby and de Oliveira Andreotti (2015) provided a compelling framework for understanding it. They asserted that GCE is often understood and practiced, if at all, in one of two ways: soft GCE or critical GCE. While soft GCE “is based on a liberal individualistic and meritocratic understanding that aims at universality and cohesion” (Pashby & de Oliveira Andreotti, 2015, p. 14), critical GCE promotes citizenship action ““as a choice of the individual after a careful analysis of the context of intervention, of different views, of power relations, and of short and long term implications of goals and strategies”” (Andreotti, 2006, p. 46 as cited in Pashby & de Oliveira Andreotti, 2015, p. 15). GCE, of either variety, does not have a strong foothold in social studies education for a number of reasons: confusion on what it means and its importance, lack of inclusion in standards, time limitations, and more (Gaudelli, 2003). Rapoport (2010) also discovered that teachers believe that GCE, in some ways, conflicts with their responsibility to teach and practice patriotic citizenship. While critical GCE may be a highly appropriate approach to incorporating the multi-national identities of many ELLs, it is not utilized by many social studies educators at present (Rapoport, 2010, 2015). Harshman (2016)

argued that the NCSS (2013) C3 framework provides a powerful way to bring global citizenship education into social studies classrooms.

Additionally, some scholars have extended global citizenship education to think beyond a global/national or a global/local dichotomy, and instead, to contemplate a transcendence of borders known as transnationalism (Bondy, 2016; Dabach & Fones, 2016). Bondy (2016) argued that migration patterns, racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, and gender, among others, have altered the way in which scholars and educators should draw meaning from citizenship education in the United States. In particular, Bondy's (2016) study focused on Latinas and advocated for a transnational feminist theoretical lens because she argued that identities span and transverse borders; this reality requires a more complex way of understanding citizenship. In addition, Bondy's (2016) insistence on both a transnational and feminist lens for understanding citizenship is due to the "concern with [...] the making and unmaking of the nation and bodies that fit and do not fit the national character" (p. 215). Bondy (2016) concluded that Latinas underwent two types of citizenship: "being-made" and "self-making". Stereotypical images of Latinas, such as high rates of teenage pregnancy, and language ideologies, like teachers' lowered expectations for students with accents, contributed to a "being-made" process of citizenship. Students who embraced education, who deployed cultural practices (e.g. wearing a Dominican flag), and who created new definitions of citizenship by straddling multiple nation-states contributed to "self-making" citizenship (Bondy, 2016). In combination, these processes and conceptions expand our understanding of what citizenship education looks like for students.

Banks (2008), in discussing citizenship education in global times, argues that this century's citizens "need the knowledge, attitudes, and skills required to function in their cultural communities and beyond their cultural borders" (p. 61). Banks (2008) emphasizes that citizens

should not only create and contribute to a national civic culture, but they must also acquire skills that allow them to engage effectively in the broader global civic environment. Importantly, in each of these overlapping spheres of civic community, Banks (2008) asserts that “students should not have to deny and reject important aspects of their cultures and languages in order to participate fully” in civic life (p. 67).

Dabach and Fones (2016) also advocate for a reimagining of citizenship that breaks free of traditional boundaries. Dabach and Fones (2016) recommend a transnational funds of knowledge approach to citizenship education that “frames immigrant transnational youth’s knowledge as vital” (p. 21). Dabach and Fones (2016) also call for increasing all students’ knowledge about the global, interconnectedness of the world. Both Bondy (2016) and Dabach and Fones (2016) concluded that citizenship discourses must expand and shift to include experiences and contributions of students outside the dominant culture and the traditional conceptions of citizenship. Again, while not all Latinas and/or immigrants are ELLs, this work holds important significance for citizenship education of ELLs because of the complexity of their identities, heritages, and languages.

Citizenship Education for the Few

Callahan and Obenchain (2016), like Westheimer and Kahne (2004), also determined that civic engagement was not guaranteed unless explicitly taught and that the school in their study followed the participatory model. Callahan and Obenchain (2016) found that, although teachers and parents held high academic expectations for their first- and second- generation immigrant and ELL students, these high academic expectations did not necessarily translate into realized civic potential because these students lacked access to high quality social studies courses; the courses existed, but the students were not enrolled. Callahan and Obenchain (2016) noted that

“Immigrant youth take significantly fewer social studies credits and earn significantly lower social studies grades than non-immigrants” (p. 56) and stressed the implications of this, stating that “The relationship between education and political engagement is tempered by inequities in academic preparation along racial, ethnic, linguistic, and generational lines” (Callahan & Obenchain, 2016, p. 37). This puts students, but particularly immigrant students which often includes ELLs, at risk for unrealized civic potential. Researchers also have found that requisite civic knowledge was linked to civic participation in adulthood, so access to rich, high-quality social studies curricula and instruction would be essential for life-long civic engagement (Journell, 2011). Yet, like Callahan and Obenchain (2016), Journell (2011) found that minority students were often not enrolled in these high-level social studies courses full of rich experiences for civic identity formation. This means that not only does citizenship education need to be reimagined to fully incorporate the assets and values of ELLs but that increasing access to high quality social studies must be a priority.

Of equal importance, as highlighted by Callahan and Obenchain (2016), was that even when immigrant and/or ELL students had access to advanced social studies coursework, the teachers in these ranks “centered on the knowledge and skills necessary to produce informed and engaged individuals who could function within existing institutional structures” which is quite different than “ensuring that youth understand the dominant culture in order to critique it” (p. 56). Westheimer & Kahne (2004) highlighted that those of us interested in citizenship education must ask, “what kind of values [do we want to develop in citizens?] What political and ideological interests are embedded” in our visions of citizenship? (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 6). These questions are important to consider in relation to ELLs. There are many approaches

to citizenship education that challenge the assimilationist underpinnings of the dominant culture. A few pertinent ones are introduced next.

Theories of Resistance

Although not specific to social studies or notions of citizenship around ELLs, culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) can be informative to both. Ladson-Billings (1994) developed the theory of CRP to address and contest the way in which dominant pedagogies approached minority students as deficient. Instead of asking “what was wrong with African American learners, [Ladson-Billings] dared to ask what was right with these students and what happened in the classrooms of teachers who had success with them” (Ladson-Billings, 2014). Ladson-Billings (2014) identified three prominent domains of these teachers’ pedagogies: academic success, cultural competence, and sociopolitical consciousness. Academic success referred to intellectual and academic growth experienced by the students. Cultural competence meant that students explored their own cultures fully and the cultures of others. Sociopolitical consciousness referred to real-world applications for in-school learning (Ladson-Billings, 2014). By reframing how educators should view students, Ladson-Billings (1994) centered the students that systems, like schools, otherwise had marginalized. These ideas connect to a reimagination of citizenship education because they remind us that traditional approaches have, by design, excluded large swaths of students. Even so, Ladson-Billings (2014) acknowledged that her theory may need to be updated. Jaffee (2016) and Paris (2012) offer examples of what that change may look like.

Jaffee (2016) conducted a multi-site, collective case study in four newcomer high schools. Initially, Jaffee (2016) intended to utilize CRP as the guiding theory framing her work, but she realized that CRP did not adequately capture or explain her findings. Jaffee (2016) explored how secondary teachers conceptualized and implemented social studies education for

newcomer Latino/a youth, and she found that five pedagogies were central to their effective work. These pedagogies included pedagogies of community, of success, of cross-cultural connections, of building disciplinary language in social studies, and of community-based citizenship. In combination, these pedagogies led Jaffee (2016) to develop a novel theory: culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education (CLRCE). Jaffee (2016) asserted that CRP was a central component to CLRCE, but she also incorporated linguistically relevant theory and active and engaged citizenship. Jaffee (2016), like other scholars (Merryfield, 1998; González et al., 2005) also found that the teachers most engaged in this type of citizenship education had experiences with international travel and/or intimate connections to immigration.

Interestingly, Paris (2012) framed his response to CRP in a way that forced readers to reconsider if CRP and, by extension perhaps, Jaffee's (2016) CLRCE, fully captured the goals of social studies educators around issues of citizenship and identity. In reflecting upon CRP, Paris (2012) stated, "I have begun to question if these terms [e.g. relevant, responsive] go far enough in their orientation to the languages and literacies and other cultural practices of students and communities to ensure the valuing and maintenance of our increasingly multiethnic and multilingual society" (p. 94). Paris (2012) asserted that being responsive or relevant to a culture or a language did not mandate that those cultural traditions or languages were maintained and sustained. Instead, Paris (2012) advocated a new theory, culturally sustaining pedagogy, "to perpetuate and foster - to sustain - linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling" (p. 95). Paris (2012) rejected that students must lose their heritage and community ways with language in order to find success in schools (p. 96). Like Jaffee (2016), Paris (2012) used Ladson-Billings' (1994) CRP to begin his work and to address gaps in the theory. Culturally sustaining pedagogy, while it may not appear related to citizenship

education on the surface, can be particularly informative because it can aid teachers in thinking about and understanding citizenship education in new ways. For example, if social studies educators encouraged and supported their students to participate in democracy in traditional ways, like through voting, many students (e.g. newcomers) may be excluded from that definition of citizenship as a result of their citizenship status (Dabach, 2014). Moreover, voting does not necessitate that one is voting for transformative candidates and policies that support and affirm the values and needs of immigrant and/or ELL communities. If a social studies educator is serious about sustaining the language, literacy, heritage, and culture of her students, then citizenship education cannot continue in its current form with overemphasis on personally responsible and participatory citizenship alone (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Neither of these typologies require work to sustain students' cultures and languages.

Salinas et al. (2017) conducted a literature review that emphasized pedagogical practices in social studies that attended to the political content, cultural dynamics, and social needs of teachers and ELLs. Salinas et al. (2017) rejected the notion that an additive curriculum was an adequate response for the ways in which ELLs had been marginalized in social studies. The researchers found that, while many ELLs lacked prior knowledge on the American context, they had rich cultural and historical experiences and knowledge of their own (Salinas et al., 2017). As a result, educators must understand their students' contexts and interpret their students through an asset-based approach. The researchers ultimately concluded that "It is essential that we [...] value the voices and experiences of students who are largely marginalized in traditional civic life and promote their academic, linguistic, and social success" (Salinas et al., 2017, p. 456-457). The continuing refrain across theories of citizenship education is that students who have been marginalized by interlocking systems of oppression must be centered if civics is to be

appropriate and sustaining in the 21st century; as a population marginalized by the system of schooling, ELLs must be considered in a new reimagining of citizenship education.

Gap

Overall, the literature reveals a recurrent theme: high quality social studies education is essential for comprehensive, sustaining citizenship education for all students, ELLs included, but that this is often inaccessible to students on the periphery of our monocultural, monolingual society. Scholars have spent ample time contemplating what social studies, and approaches to citizenship in particular, should look like with respect to ELLs, but there are few studies that explore teachers in these very contexts. Dabach (2014) notes that “[T]eachers may be breaking new ground in formulating a civics education that transcends the traditional boundaries of citizenship. Research is needed that examines how teachers and youth navigate this terrain, in these times, and to what effects” (p. 50). Moreover, Fránquiz and Salinas (2013) decree that “portraits of successful teachers of linguistically and culturally diverse students are needed now more than ever” (p. 339). My study profiles three high school teachers who are working with large populations of ELLs and are navigating these issues.

Methods

Theoretical Framework: Funds of Knowledge

Funds of knowledge, as a theory, values the totality of experiences that children bring with them to school. Broadly, these experiences are “the cultural structuring of the households, whether related to work or play, whether they take place individually, with peers, or under the supervision of adults [...]” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 134). These funds of knowledge are “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 133). This theory is especially

valuable in our work with students “whose households are usually viewed as being ‘poor,’ not only economically but in terms of the quality of experiences for the child” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 132) because it views students’ home lives as containing “ample cultural and cognitive resources with great, potential utility for classroom instruction” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 134).

Through a study that ultimately led to the development of funds of knowledge, Moll, Amanti, Neff, and González (1992) determined three notable findings. First, the families relied on their communities and other households in ways that were flexible, adaptive, and active. They often relied heavily on persons outside of the home. While classrooms can often be insular or isolated, households would often search out resources when they were unavailable within the home. This could serve as a model for teachers. Second, the researchers asserted the significance of reciprocity in household exchanges. These “reciprocal practices establish serious obligations based on the assumption of ‘confianza’ (mutual trust), which is reestablished or confirmed with each exchange, and leads to the development of long-term relationships” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 134). Children are active learners, and in this system, “knowledge is obtained by the children, not imposed by the adults” which further nourishes the relationship and strengthens mutual trust (Moll et al., 1992, p. 134). Lastly, the researchers determined the inherent power of the teachers, noting, “[...] it is the teacher, not the anthropologist, who is ultimately the bridge between the students’ world, theirs and their family’s funds of knowledge, and the classroom experience” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 137).

This theory is grounded in education and the work of our teachers, students, and schools, and its primary purpose is “to develop innovations in teaching that draw upon the knowledge and skills found in local households” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 132). The theorists behind funds of knowledge claim “that by capitalizing on household and other community resources, we can

organize classroom instruction that far exceeds in quality the rote-like instruction these children commonly encounter in schools” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 132). Ultimately, this exchange of knowledge about families and households can reduce “the insularity of classrooms” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 139).

Transnational Funds of Knowledge

In the decades since its inception, scholars have expanded upon the theory. For example, Dabach and Fones (2016) “focus[ed] on a broad interpretation of this asset-based concept: immigrant forms of knowledge, skills, and resources from their homes and communities into other settings. These homes and communities exist across borders and are transnational in nature” (p. 8). Dabach and Fones (2016) found this theory particularly relevant for social studies teachers who worked with ELLs. With the essential elements of funds of knowledge intact, Dabach and Fones’ (2016) addition of a transnational perspective presents a theory that can best aid in answering my central research question: *How do secondary social studies teachers who are working with an increasing number of ELLs take up the charge of educating for and about citizenship?*

Research Design

I pursued narrative inquiry for this project. “Narrative inquiry is stories lived and told” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 2). Central to narrative inquiry is experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) drew heavily upon 20th century educator and reformer, John Dewey, stating, “For Dewey, experience is both personal and social [...] People are individuals and need to be understood as such, but they cannot be understood only as individuals” (p. 2). “Furthermore, Dewey held that one criterion of experience is continuity, namely, the notion that experiences grow out of other experiences, and experiences lead to further experiences.” (Clandinin &

Connelly, 2000, p. 2). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) stressed that our lived and imagined experiences created a continuum of “the imagined now, some imagined past, or some imagined future” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 2). This is valuable for my study because I am investigating the stories of people, and people have pasts, presents, and futures. This kind of narrative thinking also allows me, as a researcher, to “see things in time versus seeing things as they are” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 30). There is room to accept that people may change. In fact, narrative inquiry innately recognizes and values that people are in a process of personal change (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 30). Narrative inquiry also views actions as signs of narrative history; that is to say, the narrative history of a teacher may help us better or more fully understand his approach to teaching citizenship education in ways that merely reviewing his lessons or his students’ test scores could not. While traveling temporally, one also is oscillating between the social and personal, as well. For example, when considering this inquiry, the past might be a teacher’s language acquisition process or experiences with immigration. The “imagined now” might be their current classroom context: their course load and student populations. Their future, along this continuum, may involve revised citizenship lessons based on the students in a given class or the then-contemporary political climate. Moreover, these experiences might manifest as deeply personal, as in how one understands and defines citizenship. These experiences are often social, as well, with how teachers understand their work with ELLs based on professional developments, priorities of school administrators, and support from colleagues. This robust emphasis on experience allows for rich stories and meaning to emerge. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) stated that “Experience happens narratively. Narrative inquiry is a form of narrative experience. Therefore, educational experience should be studied narratively” (p. 19). As a result, this design is particularly valuable for this inquiry since

teachers, ELLs, and citizenship education are layered and complex and impossible to reduce or simplify. Narrative inquiry does not hold certainty as a goal. Instead, as Bateson (1994) notes, it “accept[s] ambiguity and allows[s] for learning along the way” (p. 235 as cited in Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 9). Of all the characteristics of narrative inquiry previously outlined, the design’s relationship with certainty is what makes it particularly well-suited for this study because I am working with people, and I, myself, am an imperfect researcher. Narrative research is the act of “doing ‘one’s best’ under the circumstances, knowing all the while that other possibilities, other interpretations, other ways of explaining things are possible” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 31). I want to “do right” by the stories of others, but I am not an all-knowing researcher. Ultimately, as Geertz (1995) so aptly declared in a reflection on his life’s work: “what is needed, or anyway what must serve, is tableaux, anecdotes, parables, tales: mini-narratives with the narrator in them” (p. 65 in Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 7). That is what I have attempted to do.

Epistemological Stance: Constructionism

Definition. While Cartesian thinking splits mind and body, and thus, mind and world, constructionism does not acknowledge a separation between experience and some external world. Instead, the interplay between humans and their human world is where meaning is constructed. “According to constructionism, we do not create meaning. We construct meaning. We have something to work with. What we have to work with is the world and objects in the world” (Crotty, 1988, pp. 43-44). Importantly, this meaning-making process occurs within a larger social context and within confines of convention and culture. Referencing Geertz (1973), Crotty (1988) noted that “we inherit a ‘system of significant symbols’” (p. 54). As such, we can acknowledge that we have meaning in our world because we have minds to assign meaning; yet,

at the same time, we must recognize the limits that may be placed on one's mind by the nature and context of one's experiences. This opens constructionism to notions of relativism.

Degree of Relativism. "What is said to be 'the way things are' is really just 'the sense we make of them'" (Crotty, 1988, p. 64) This means that concepts can be understood or meaningful in one way to one person and in different ways for another. For example, a social studies teacher's definition of citizenship is contingent upon his exposure to 'significant symbols' and experiences. Is citizenship the notion of civic duty or is it the legal status of being a citizen of a country? It depends on who you ask. "A certain relativism is in order, therefore. We need to recognize that different people may well inhabit quite different worlds. Their different worlds constitute for them diverse ways of knowing, distinguishable sets of meanings, separate realities" (Crotty, 1988, p. 64).

Tentativeness. Constructionism, like narrative thinking in narrative inquiry, finds value in full and rich interpretation. One of their shared goals, then, is to construct useful meaning. "What constructionism drives home unambiguously is that there is no true or valid interpretation. There are useful interpretations, to be sure [...] 'Useful', 'liberating', 'fulfilling', 'rewarding', interpretations, yes. 'True' or 'valid' interpretations, no" (Crotty, 1988, pp. 47-48). This echoes the notion of tentativeness within narrative thinking, and as such, is an appropriate stance for this particular study.

Participants

First and foremost, participants are people. Throughout this narrative inquiry, I have always viewed this work as work with people. The participant, then, is always and fundamentally a person before he or she is a formalist category or a set of criteria or a data source for findings.

I opted for purposeful criterion sampling and was broadly interested in strong secondary social studies teachers in high schools in the Oklahoma City metro with ELLs (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 96). As such, the criteria for any participant included: a record and/or reputation of being a strong secondary social studies teacher, currently employed as a secondary social studies teacher, and currently employed in a high school in the Oklahoma City metro with ELLs. In order to identify participants who met these criteria, I utilized snowball sampling with graduate classmates, area teachers, and professors and was referred to several potential candidates. Moreover, in acknowledgement of my time limitations, my sampling procedure was also one of convenience because I limited my participants to the greater Oklahoma City area so that I could feasibly travel to the participant for an in-person interview. Ultimately, this combination of sampling produced a small pool of potential participants, and I then contacted them via email to invite them to participate in my study. This resulted in the affirmative response of six teachers. All six teachers were interviewed, and following data analysis, three participants were selected for inclusion in this study due to the prominence of ELLs in their student populations and to the richness of the teachers' reflections and stories around working with ELLs. Information for the three included participants is detailed below.

My three participants were Elijah,* Eduardo, and Allie. Elijah's home language is English, and he speaks some Spanish. He has a bachelor's degree in secondary social studies education and is in his second year of teaching. His current course load includes both mainstream and sheltered classes. He teaches Oklahoma history, personal financial literacy, civics, and Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), a college-preparation course geared toward students who are underrepresented on college campuses. Eduardo is a sequential bilingual,

* All names for persons and institutions are pseudonyms.

having learned Spanish at home and English through school and community exposure (Wright, 2015). Eduardo also has a bachelor's degree in secondary social studies education. He is in his third year of teaching, and his course load includes mainstream and sheltered courses. Eduardo currently teaches Oklahoma history, personal financial literacy, and civics. Allie's home language is English. She has a bachelor's degree in history education and is in her fourth year of teaching. Her current course load is exclusively mainstream and includes U.S. history and world history. Both Elijah and Allie teach at the same high school. All three teachers are in the same urban public school district. Official school district data indicates the ELL share of the student population is between 32.9% and 38.7% at the two high schools, but the teachers reported ELL numbers in their classrooms ranging from 50% to 90%. The district-wide average for the ELL share of the student population is 31% (OKCPSa, 2020).

Table 1

Description of Participants

Pseudonym	Personal Language(s) Spoken	Education Experience	Courses Taught	Identified % of ELLs in teacher's school*
Elijah	English, some Spanish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd year teacher • BA in secondary social studies education 	Oklahoma history, personal financial literacy, and civics, AVID	32.9
Vincent	English, Spanish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd year teacher • BA in secondary social studies education 	Oklahoma history, personal financial literacy, and civics	38.7
Allie	English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th year teacher • BA in history education 	U.S. history, world history	32.9

*Based on 2018-2019 school district data ([OKCPSa, 2020](#))

Data Collection

The purpose of this study is to explore how Oklahoma City metro area secondary social studies teachers approach citizenship education with their English language learner students in mind. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) use the term field text, instead of data, because “field texts are created, neither found nor discovered, by participants and researchers in order to represent aspects of field experience” (p. 92). Field texts can include a researcher’s journal, transcriptions of interviews between a researcher and participant, teachers’ stories, and so much of what we traditionally label as data. However, as a master’s student, I recognize that, again, I must navigate the boundaries between formalism and narrative inquiry in order to properly fulfill the expectations for my thesis. For this reason, even though I agree with Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) preference for the use of field texts over data, I will use the terms “data collection” and “data analysis” to be clear about my process. There are three data sources for this study: interviews, think aloud tasks, and classroom artifacts.

Interviews

I conducted individual interviews with each of my participants. Interviews took place in individuals’ classrooms or local coffeeshops and lasted from 40-73 minutes. My interview protocol consisted of 18 semi-structured questions (see Interview Protocol, Appendix A).

I asked the participants to answer demographic questions including the number of years they have been teaching social studies and their experiences with professional development around ELLs. I followed a semi-structured question protocol for the bulk of the interview, asking questions about their personal travel abroad experiences, their personal connections to immigration, their definitions of citizenship, and their examples of citizenship enactments in their daily lives and in their classroom curricula. When appropriate, which was often, I asked

probing questions stemming from the participants' responses to these questions. For example, when Eduardo revealed that he had 42 newcomer students enrolled in one class, I asked him to describe his class sizes and experiences with teaching in that environment. (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 110). I designed and implemented the interviews with the professed goal of interaction with individual teachers (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p. 111).

The initial three interviews were recorded on a single audio recording device. Following the loss of audio from Elijah's interview, which was the third interview conducted, I recorded all remaining interviews on two audio recording devices.

Think Aloud

The interview then transitioned to a task: reviewing two standards and their associated learning objectives from the revised 2019 Oklahoma Academic Standards for Social Studies (OAS, 2019). The think aloud method is a process developed by van Someren, Barnard, and Sandberg (1994) wherein participants are presented with a task and prompted to vocalize their thought processes as they contemplate and complete the task. This method enables participants to share their thought process as opposed to the final products of thought process (van Someren et al., 1994). It is a method that allows researcher to better understand how individuals, like teachers, arrive at their final products by revealing "what they think, what is difficult for them and what is easy, how they reconcile conflicting demands" and beyond (van Someren et al., 1994, p. 1). This particular method was valuable to my study because it created an avenue for teachers to reveal their thought processes behind their definitions of citizenship, their curricular choices, and how they view their mission in social studies with respect to ELLs. To better enable and encourage their sharing of their cognitive processes, they were prompted with three questions around two familiar U.S. standards from the OAS (2019). The three prompts included:

1) what does this standard mean to you?; 2) how might you design a lesson around this standard?; and 3) how does this standard reflect and connect to citizenship? The teachers reviewed U.S.H.2: “The student will analyze the social, economic, and political changes that occurred during the American Industrial Revolution, the Gilded Age, and significant reform movements from the 1870s to the 1920s” and U.S.H.7: “The student will analyze the cause and effects of significant domestic events and policies from 1945 to 1975” (OAS, 2019). Neither the prompts nor the standards explicitly mention ELLs. This was not an oversight on my behalf. The prompts and standards provide space and opportunity for ELLs, and I was interested in what ways and to what extent teachers incorporated ELLs into these discussions. Of the six total teachers interviewed, only the three teachers included in this study, explicitly and without any prompting, introduced ELLs into their think aloud discussions. This was one of the elements that contributed to these three teachers’ inclusion in this study.

Classroom Artifacts

In addition to the interview and think aloud, I also collected documentation of lesson(s) and associated lesson resource(s). I asked for a sample lesson that dealt with similar material to the standards reviewed during the think aloud portion of the interview. Each participant provided documents. I understand that the materials provided by teachers are “highly subjective” since the teachers determined what was important to include and to record and that these materials may not truly reveal how the lessons themselves unfolded (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 166). Yet, this is valuable because I am interested in what the teachers consider relevant and important. Essentially, the resources they chose to share reflect their perspectives, and this created another avenue, in addition to the interviews and think aloud protocol, for me to contemplate and explore their beliefs and practices. In an effort to remain grounded in their classrooms, I also

photographed each participant's classroom or requested photographs of the classroom if the interview occurred elsewhere.

Data Analysis

Throughout data collection, I kept memo notes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). These memos were drafted throughout the data collection process and were particularly helpful in narrowing the study, in making connections to the literature, and in identifying patterns and themes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). As a result, the memos contributed to early data analysis. Because the interviews were audio recorded, I listened to them several times then transcribed. Following transcription, I re-read each transcription several times and cleaned up the transcription, again taking memo notes throughout this process. I shared the full transcriptions and findings with participants for member checking, though no participant engaged in member checking the full transcription. Both Elijah and Eduardo responded affirmatively to the findings shared with them, while Allie did not reply. I then open coded the transcripts, categorized the labels, and explored the meanings of each category to construct themes. The classroom artifacts provided context and additional detail for the stories participants shared. Each artifact was reviewed fully. This process followed the typical inductive thematic analysis procedures for qualitative research. I utilized Burke's (1945, 1950) framework to organize my analysis into coherent aspects of teachers' stories. Burke's (1945, 1950) framework includes act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. Kissling's (2012) narrative study, including its organization around the theatrical concept of acts, also informed my analysis and organization.

Trustworthiness

To contribute to internal validity and to a reader's confidence that "results are consistent with the data collected", I took several steps (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 251). I used the data

from the participants' lesson resources, interviews, and think aloud tasks to triangulate via multiple sources of data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 244). I also shared full transcriptions with participants with the intention to incorporate all of their desired revisions and to ensure that my findings "ring true" to them (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 246). However, likely do the time-consuming nature of the task, no participants offered revisions. I engaged in researcher triangulation with my thesis advisor around my coding scheme and analysis. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) refer to this process as peer examination, and it means that Dr. Brugar had access to this study's raw data and that she regularly engaged in discussions with me about the plausibility and appropriateness of my findings (pp. 259-250). Data source triangulation, respondent validation, and researcher triangulation contributed to the study's internal validity.

In addition, I have included rich, thick descriptions of the participants and their teaching contexts and incorporated their ideas and beliefs as expressed in their own words often (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I also have conducted a critical self-reflection regarding my "assumptions, worldview, biases, theoretical orientation, and relationship to the study that may affect [this study]" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 259).

Ethical Considerations

I received approval from my institution's IRB for this study. I obtained written, informed consent from participants prior to beginning interviews. I shared each participant's written transcription, or a summary of the conversation in Elijah's case, with each participant for review and to provide opportunity for revision. This was important to ensure that participants' stories were accurate and authentic, according to the participants themselves. From my very conception of this study to its design and execution, I have strived to respect and value the teachers and their students and to hold them in the highest regard. Power dynamics are inherent to any research

study, and I acknowledge this imbalance while still striving to mitigate it whenever possible. Member checking with participants throughout, including with verbatim transcription and with my findings and interpretation, reflects this effort. I also recognize that I am studying a world that I have helped create, and that I have a responsibility to both reflect and remake myself “as well as offer up research understanding that could lead to a better world” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 61). I have been careful in the ways in which I interject myself into this study, and yet, I must acknowledge that “we work within the space not only with our participants but also with ourselves” and our world (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 61). This reflects notions of constructionism previously outlined.

Findings

In Toni Morrison’s (1987) eulogy for her friend James Baldwin, she declared, “Jimmy, there is too much to think about you, and too much to feel. The difficulty is your life refuses summation – it always did – and invites contemplation instead” (p. 27). In the three teacher profiles that follow, I, too, invite the reader to consider these teachers and their stories as rich, thoughtful, and heart-felt. These stories are not intended as reductive summaries but, rather, as invitations for contemplation.

Elijah

Act I: “He’d be perfect!”

Elijah’s reputation preceded him. When one of my classmates heard about my research interest, she instantly recommended I meet with Elijah. “He’d be perfect!” she exclaimed. But he was an Oklahoma history teacher, and at the time, I was interested in working with U.S. history teachers, so I filed away his name. Then, I came across an article in *The Oklahoman* about a phenomenal high school teacher who worked primarily with newcomer students and whose

classroom was decked out with the flags of his students' home countries. That teacher, no surprise, was Elijah. The article provided a glimpse into Elijah's teaching philosophy, and I knew then that the parameters of my study should shift to include Oklahoma history teachers. This also marked a turning point in thinking about my research questions related to teachers of ELLs in mainstream versus sheltered settings. I had to meet the man who was learning Spanish, French, and Vietnamese to better connect with his students, the teacher who diligently worked to make his classroom a welcoming new home for his newcomer students.

I knew who to look for due to his photograph in the newspaper article, so I flagged him down as he entered the crowded room making uncertain glances in every direction. What followed was a truly compelling 73-minute conversation guided by Elijah's experiences and beliefs. I left our meeting with a renewed sense of inspiration for the project at hand and with deep appreciation for the work of my colleagues in the field. The stories of teachers like Elijah were powerful and worth sharing. I continued to pore over our conversation later that evening and, unable to sleep, went to the living room to listen to the interview. At 11:05 P.M. that night, I experienced the agony of realizing the audio file was corrupted. The file contained 73 minutes of recording, but it was inaudible and, as it turned out, no amount of pleading with the Apple store help desk employees was going to change that. Fortunately, I took extensive notes during our conversation, and upon learning of the audio loss, I recorded everything in writing that I could remember. Though I lost the valuable opportunity for verbatim transcription, I still had Elijah's stories. Those were unforgettable.

Act II: "Wanting to be a 'globalized' person"

Elijah was raised in a small and rural town in northeast Oklahoma. He describes himself as Black and Creek and states that they are "a really important part of my identity." He is newly

married and talks excitedly about starting a family one day. He has kind eyes and a full-mouthed smile. He uses his hands often when he speaks and his head nods and bobs along, as well, as he enthusiastically engages with every question. Elijah's home language is English, but he is working diligently to acquire fluency in additional languages. He says he is "so-so" with Spanish at present. He uses Duolingo, a free phone application, at least thirty minutes a day for Spanish language learning, and he relies on his students to help him, too. He says his students know all about his drive to learn Spanish and encourage and support him, as many of them are native Spanish speakers. He plans to work on learning French and Vietnamese, as well, since those are the languages most commonly spoken by his students. His students, and his desire to connect with them in myriad ways, motivate him to learn additional languages. He also sees it as part of his responsibility as a "globalized person," a concept he first began to ponder in high school.

When Elijah was in high school, he left his small town for a life-changing trip. He traveled with other students on an organized study abroad experience to La Fortuna, Costa Rica. He cited this experience as the catalyst for nurturing in himself the characteristics of a more "globalized person", of someone who appreciated the broader, deeply interconnected world. He discovered the breathtakingly beautiful natural scenery of Costa Rica, so different from his hometown. He experienced new ways of knowing and doing life from his interactions with the local residents. He had first-hand experience of the power of language to assist or hinder one's ability to communicate. He fell in love with Costa Rica and her people and to commemorate his trip, he bought a souvenir: the national flag. That flag would serve as the linchpin for his future classroom aesthetic. It was the very first flag he hung in his new classroom when he began teaching at Central High. Now, that classroom is covered in dozens of additional national flags that symbolize the home countries of his students.

Elijah attended the state's flagship institution and is a proud graduate of its College of Education secondary social studies teacher preparation program. He spoke emphatically about his love and admiration for his professors and for the program generally. Elijah singled out one particular course from his undergrad experience, Schools in American Culture, as particularly useful preparation for the reality facing him at his current school. That class combined direct instruction and an opportunity to shadow a high school student at an area school with a large ELL student population. He is in his second year of teaching and is a high school social studies teacher at Central High. Central High is designated as a newcomer school and serves most newcomer students who reside north of the Oklahoma River. The other high school featured in this study, Lincoln High, primarily serves newcomer students who live south of the Oklahoma River (OKCPSb, 2019). Broadly, Northwest Oklahoma City is home to a predominantly White population; south Oklahoma City has a sizeable Latino community, and Northeast Oklahoma City is largely African American. Both high schools rank in the top three statewide for diversity of their student bodies, something that Elijah shared and that he clearly relishes about his school community. Elijah teaches AVID, Oklahoma history, and a combination course of civics and personal financial literacy. He teaches both mainstream and sheltered classes.

Elijah estimates that 85% of his students are ELLs, and of that 85%, about 60% are newcomers. His AVID course is mainstream, though he has ELLs enrolled in the course. He teaches a sheltered Oklahoma history course in the morning with native Spanish speakers, and he teaches an Oklahoma history course in the afternoon that combines Pre AP students and Spanish speaking newcomers. He also teaches a sheltered civics course with students whose native languages include Spanish, French, Vietnamese, and at least one language Indigenous to Rwanda. One of his sheltered courses started the year with 43 students. It took some time for the

administration to level that class, and it now sits at about 34 students. Each sheltered course is supposed to have a paraprofessional to work alongside the lead teacher; currently, Elijah has Ms. López, whose home language is Spanish, for his civics course and Ms. Nguyen, who is fluent in Vietnamese and Burmese, for his afternoon Oklahoma history class. He should have a paraprofessional in his morning sheltered Oklahoma history class, as well, but his pod was short-staffed which resulted in a first year Algebra I teacher not having a paraprofessional. Elijah felt confident that he could manage his class on his own, so he reassigned his paraprofessional to the Algebra I teacher because he knew she would need the support in her first year of teaching. When he shared that, I was taken aback. He was only a second-year teacher himself! Didn't he want the support, too? He likely did, and yet, he never said as much. He simply reiterated that it was more important to take care of his colleagues. That was the first glimpse of Elijah's leadership within his school. In casual conversation, Elijah later revealed that the other two teachers on his team are both emergency certified, and one of them teaches several sheltered sections of Oklahoma history and civics. De facto, Elijah was the lead of his PLC. He also volunteered, with equal parts excitement and anxiousness, that he was poised to become the social studies department chair in the fall. His principal had "noticed [his] success with standards-based instruction," he presumed, and she had recommended him for the position. It was unclear who was mentoring Elijah, though. After all, he was an early career teacher and was facing the reality that so many Oklahoma teachers face: large class sizes, emergency certifications, under-staffing, diverse student needs and assets. That can feel overwhelming for even the most senior, veteran teacher! Yet, Elijah indicated no sense of dread or of being overwhelmed, and he did not seem to harbor any grudge against individuals or systems. He remained unfailingly positive and upbeat when he spoke about his teaching reality. I thought

perhaps it could be a self-defense mechanism since he did not know me personally and may not be comfortable sharing his inner-feelings with a stranger, and yet, throughout our entire conversation and in later exchanges via e-mail, his attitude and energy never wavered: he was relentlessly positive. He simultaneously possessed both an ease with his teaching and an urgency to learn more and do more, but he never seemed to waver in his belief that he could be better for his students. He did not strike me as naïve. Instead, his stories and attitude indicated that he had certainly “taken up the charge” of educating his students regardless of any external circumstances. He believed deeply in his mission to educate and to provide the highest quality learning experience for all of his students.

When I pressed him more about his preparation for working with ELLs, Elijah spoke highly of a two-day program sponsored by his district. He had attended it the summer before his first year of teaching. He remembered it as being mandatory. It covered different teaching tools for working with ELLs. He singled out the importance of visual aids when working with ELLs as a key take-away. For this reason, he said he often prefers using photographs for primary sources. He also stated that the program emphasized including students’ home languages but not catering to them. He stated that he mainly instructs in English though he will make changes to ensure that the social studies content is being learned by his students since that is his primary objective. For example, if there is an important social studies term or concept that his students must grasp, he will translate it into all of their languages. He also mentioned Jill Cox, a district Title III ELL instructional facilitator, as a resource for additional professional development and assistance with grants. NCELA (n.d.) describes Title III as “part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Acts of 2015 [... and its] purpose is to help ensure that English learners attain English language proficiency and meet state academic

standards” (NCELA, n.d.). Title III enables federal funding to go towards state education agencies and local school districts (NCELA, n.d.). He plans to attend another district professional development related to ELLs soon “for a refresher since things are always changing.”

Act II, Scene II. Elijah shared one classroom scenario that was not be covered in his professional development, and yet, he handled it with both ease and enthusiasm. Several of Elijah’s students spoke French and were originally from central Africa. Nestled in the heart of that continent is Rwanda and to its west, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Elijah recalled the semester that he had students from Rwanda who did not speak French. They spoke Kinyarwanda.* Elijah struggled to translate and communicate with the students. Then, Elijah discovered that another student, one from the DRC, spoke both French and a mutually intelligible dialect of Kinyarwanda. That young woman translated the materials from the French that Elijah had available into Kinyarwanda. The two students from Rwanda responded to the questions and activities in their home language, and the third student translated it back into French. Then, Elijah could translate those responses into English. As Elijah described this, it felt like I was listening to a play-by-play sports broadcaster. Elijah was signaling with his hands to the left when he described the first round of translations then swinging his hands back to the right to signal the next phase. His intonations would change with excitement at each new play in the classroom saga. He described the story to shine a light on the ingenuity, skills, and heart of his students, but in so doing, he revealed his one, also.

* Elijah acknowledged in later e-mail correspondence that he thought it was Kinyarwanda, but it may have been another language.

Act III: “It’s not enough for my life to be good...”

Elijah defined citizenship as “caring about where you live and the people around you.” He declared, “it’s not enough for my life to be good, I want others’ lives to be good!” Throughout Elijah’s descriptions of his classroom, he continuously offered examples of how he held high expectations for all of his students, and his ELLs were no exception. For example, he described how his Pre AP Oklahoma history class, due to a scheduling need, had two groups of students enrolled: “advanced” and newcomer. He detailed how some of the advanced students scoffed at the idea of newcomers in their Pre AP class, but through Elijah’s leadership and practices, these students came to value and redefine what it means to be a contributing member of a learning environment. He said that ultimately, all of his students hold each other in high regard as learners but acknowledged that it took effort to reach that point.

He also described a conscious decision he and his wife made to live in a neighborhood nearby his school and in which his students and their families reside. He wanted to be a visible leader in his classroom but also in his home life. He thought it was important to live where his students lived, and he described that choice as an enactment of citizenship. He mentioned various instances where his neighbors would seek him out for guidance, and he enjoyed being able to serve as a community resource. He likened that to how his students would seek him out to share about their lives when they were at school, too.

Additionally, Elijah stated that citizenship looks like “fighting for the rights of others.” He linked this to both the formal curriculum, like how the social studies curriculum covers the Civil Rights Movement, and to the informal curriculum, where he helped students navigate how to be proud of their heritage without demeaning the heritage of others. He gave the example of how so many of his students hold strong, loyal attachments to their home countries, and how

many of these countries have histories of conflict or rivalry with their neighbors. He gave the example of working with a Peruvian student to highlight and celebrate his country but to do so in a way that no longer denigrated El Salvador. While Elijah has a clear vision of what citizenship means to him and what it looks like, he said his ultimate goal was for his students to develop and fulfill their own definitions of citizenships. He hoped his classes would foster his students' ability to do just that.

He also created opportunities for his students to bring their full selves into his classroom. He described one of the ways he cultivates community and tackles core social studies concepts: he asks his students in every class, not just designated shelter or ELL classes, about their affiliations with countries other than the United States. He let students define for themselves what that meant. Once he had heard from all of his students, he began ordering national flags to represent each of their countries. He said his students love it so much. They often take pictures with their flags. He lets them take their flags with them when they graduate, if they want. He also mentioned that he uses the street view feature on Google Earth with his students so he can explore their home communities. He says the flags and virtual field trips create camaraderie between the students.

I asked Elijah to consider the selected Oklahoma standards. He said that many teachers disliked teaching the Gilded Age but not him. He loved it, even going so far to say that he “geeked out” over it. He declared that when he shows intense interest in a subject, his students take notice and become intrigued, as well. He viewed the standard as connecting to citizenship because “it’s [about] continual fights for rights” and it “sets the foundation for what we hold dear,” listing women’s suffrage, the early iteration of the Civil Rights Movement, and the labor movement. Notably, Elijah outlined modifications necessary for covering the standard with his

ELLs. He strategized that he would need to translate high impact words, like capitalism (noting its cognate in Spanish), to build on students' prior knowledge. He mentioned that students' backgrounds and prior knowledge can present the most problems because his students have varying levels of formal education and even greater discrepancy in their familiarity with the ideas and people outlined in the standard. In addition to translation, highlighting cognates, and acknowledging students' backgrounds, he said that he would use "lots of primary sources," primarily music, speeches, and photographs. He postulated that he might approach a lesson related to the standard by having students analyze J.D. Rockefeller and Jeff Bezos because he likes to bring everything current. He would emphasize the political, social, and economic changes broadly as opposed to minutiae, suggesting, for example, that the intricate details of Teddy Roosevelt's presidency were less consequential than the sweeping idea of conservation; his goal was for his students to "dance with the ideas" and not get bogged down. Throughout his conversation, it truly was clear that he held incredibly high expectations for his students and respected their capacity to learn and master the social studies content.

Throughout Elijah's discussion of the standards, he spoke with a degree of authority about the accommodations required in his sheltered classes. He felt more confident that his students would have sufficient prior knowledge related to the standard around social movements from 1945-1975 because so many of them were familiar with the Civil Rights Movement in that it "transcend[ed] national boundaries." Interestingly, Elijah also noted that it was important for his "non-ELs to see how things are global," too. He noted that his newcomers and his ELLs had a lot to offer and their own deep reservoirs of knowledge. Their perspectives were vital to the conversations around the social studies content, as well. This standard seemed more relevant to his students; he felt that it, again, connected to citizenship because the Civil Rights Movement

was all about fighting for rights. He works to make “every lesson culturally relevant to all [his] students” and strives to find a way to connect lessons to them in significant ways.

Eduardo

Act I: ¡Tierra y libertad!

I was nervous but excited to meet Eduardo. He came highly recommended by my professor, and he taught at a school I was interested in seeing for myself. I paced the hallway outside his classroom while I waited for the bell to ring, and as I paced, I reviewed the college posters lining the wall. When I worked with my high school seniors on college admissions, we had criteria for evaluating the schools: cost of attendance, strength of majors related to the students’ interests, quality of life on the campus, among others. What struck me about the college posters lining the walls at Lincoln High were that these same considerations appeared, but there was a noticeable addition: whether the school accepted or made any accommodations for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students, commonly referred to as Dreamers. I knew that Lincoln High had a sizeable population of immigrant students, but this put that reality in stark relief. It was as if knowing the average ACT score for incoming freshman at one’s college of choice was tantamount to knowing the school’s offerings for Dreamers. Because, for many students here, they are equally vital pieces of information. Eduardo would speak at some length in our conversation about how his students’ immigration statuses, and that of their families, impacted access to higher education. The students I counseled about college admissions never had to navigate our complicated, by design, immigration system at the same time. College admissions is stressful enough for seniors; can you imagine adding uncertainties surrounding immigration status? These posters helped ground me in the Lincoln High student body and school community. It was a reminder that my interest in English language learners was neither

simply theoretical nor exclusively about language acquisition and social studies content learning. Language is a cultural construct, and language carries the weight of tradition and of values, and, in this case, of immigration status.

The bell rang, and students flooded out of the doors. I was 7 months pregnant at the time, and as I receded against the wall to attempt to make room for the students passing, a girl blurted out, “Oh my gosh! Your stomach is huge! It really does look like those suits they make us wear in Life Skills!” That warranted a good laugh. The student unwittingly eased my mind about the upcoming conversation with Eduardo, and I peeked my head through his classroom door. I saw a few students in conversation but no sign of Eduardo. Then, a young man retreated behind the teacher’s desk. The desk was flanked by a large, framed photograph of General Emiliano Zapata atop his horse on one side and by various artwork depicting a pair of retro Nike Jordans and a profile of a Native American in full headdress on the other. I later learned that Eduardo was a hobbyist painter, and the artwork were his originals. That area of five square feet, a small space of land, told an interesting story about Eduardo and his students. In his classroom, peripheral voices held the center, and the voices were loud and beautiful. They were Mexican; they were Indigenous; they were sneaker fanatics. The rest of the room was pretty typical: white walls, a Chrome book cart, learning objectives on the white board, student desks, and a stacks of student work and textbooks. And yet, when I centered my eyes on the front of the room and the visuals Eduardo chose to hang, it did not feel like any social studies classroom I had been in before.

Eduardo could easily be mistaken for a high school student, though I didn’t tell him that, and he wielded a wide smile when I introduced myself. He was lean, above average height, and had short, dark hair. He admitted that he had forgotten that we were scheduled for an interview that morning and informed me that a last-minute all-school assembly had been called “for right

now.” In retrospect, I wish I would have accompanied him to the assembly, but I waited in his classroom for about 25 minutes until he returned. He was out of breath, like he had run from the gym back to his room, and I recognized in him the hustle of a young teacher. He bounced with the morning’s unexpected events without any sign of frustration. I had shown up, although scheduled, still unexpectedly, and the assembly had shortened his plan period, but he went with it, grinning through it all. As we organized ourselves for the interview, he announced that he also had to meet with his assistant principal in about 40 minutes and so we would need to watch the clock. I suspect Eduardo didn’t have a single minute to himself that day. I recognized many days like that from my own teaching career, but at what cost do we demand that teachers go, go, go without a moment’s pause? Young teachers can keep up the pace, but teaching is a marathon, not a sprint, so how can we support ourselves – pace ourselves - on this journey?

Act II: “*How do you say that in Spanish, you know?*”

Eduardo is currently teaching ninth graders in Oklahoma history and in a course newly devised by his district that combines civics and personal financial literacy. He teaches both mainstream and sheltered courses. This is his first year to teach sheltered classes. Eduardo described his sheltered ELL class as containing newcomers from Mexico, Honduras, and El Salvador.

Eduardo noted that he was born in the United States but that his family hails from Ciudad Juárez in Chihuahua, Mexico. Eduardo was the only participant who had close and continuing family relationships with recent immigrants. Eduardo was raised in the richness of his family’s Mexican heritage and calls south Oklahoma City home. He is a proud graduate of the state’s flagship institution and has a bachelor’s degree in secondary social studies education. Eduardo reflected quite fondly on his professors and his time in the program. Eduardo’s home language is

Spanish, and he is a native English speaker, also. Eduardo's English wafted between standard and non-standard English. Having attended schools in Oklahoma City, English reigned supreme in his formal schooling experiences; as a result, his Spanish language assets were undervalued. In schooling for Eduardo, Spanish was reserved for social interactions with friends and to the confines of his homelife; it was not conferred with the importance associated with school and with learning. What is striking, however, is that his Spanish language skills are now one of his greatest assets as a teacher, though he noted the skills were not fully developed in his pre-service teaching program.

Upon reflecting on the unexpected hardships of teaching a sheltered social studies class for the first time this year, he stated, "so, like, the different terms, is like, I don't know, how do you say that in Spanish, you know? [...] Like a couple chapters they'll say archaeologists, and like, how do I say that in Spanish?" This was an "aha!" moment for me because I had not given sufficient thought to translating Eduardo's Spanish language proficiency into teaching sheltered classes. I made the blanket assumption that, because he was a highly qualified social studies teacher and a native Spanish speaker, that teaching social studies in Spanish in a sheltered classroom would be easy. But we know that language capacities, like vocabulary, are developed in different ways depending on where and how they are wielded. Until he became a teacher at Lincoln High, he had never taught a lesson in Spanish. He had no practice, no experience with formal teaching in his home language of Spanish. In fact, that language had not been cultivated in school and yet, it was in high demand now as teaching professional. This is too often the case where students are exposed to a subtractive bilingualism in formal schooling wherein, they gain strength and fluency in English but at the expense of their home languages (Wright, 2015). In a

sad twist, when these very students enter their professional worlds, they often do not have the dual language skills demanded by the job market (Billings & Walqui, 2019).

What strikes me as deeply poignant and equally troubling is that Eduardo represents exactly the kind of teacher we know our profession needs: a bright young person with a strong desire to teach who authentically reflects the backgrounds of our evolving student body. And yet, one of his core essences, his bilingualism, was not fully supported or leveraged in his teacher education program. Moreover, Eduardo has not undergone any in-service professional development on teaching ELLs in either a mainstream or sheltered classroom context. He acknowledged that his district did offer PD on the topic periodically, but it was clear that it was not a prerequisite for teaching ELLs in any capacity. Moreover, after three years in the district without Eduardo receiving any specific SIOP professional development, one might assume that it is not a high priority for the district. When I asked Eduardo if teaching his sheltered class was what he had expected, he responded, “So, a little different. Uh, I speak Spanish, right? Spanish everything. I just never taught in Spanish. [...] So it’s a little different, kind of, it was a little different.” Eduardo said that teaching a sheltered class that relied on his Spanish skills was “A little difficult but after the first couple weeks. Yeah. We kinda got the ball rolling. It’s been good.” His reflection on this again underpinned his resiliency, earlier described as hustle, as a person and as a teacher. Without formal pre-service or in-service experience in teaching ELLs using Spanish, Eduardo adapted and persevered. He, too, had clearly “taken up the charge” for educating his students regardless of barriers or burdens. Without a doubt, all teachers, and perhaps particularly early career teachers like Eduardo, must navigate their teaching experiences with resiliency; yet, our current system seems to demand a disproportionate amount of resiliency from teachers working with large populations of ELLs.

Eduardo proudly informed me that he was a graduate of Lincoln High, the very high school where he now teaches. Eduardo related to his students because he had been in their shoes. He noted that, while other teachers “are kind of informed and kind of know what’s going on,” many students seek him out because he “was raised around here” and “cuz [he’s] Hispanic, as well.” In many turns throughout our conversation, Eduardo revealed how his grounding in the community manifested in his teaching. Eduardo never identified as Mexican American though he did refer to himself as Hispanic on several occasions. That term, though hotly debated in wider circles, seemed to be Eduardo’s way of asserting his language capacities and his connections to Mexico in a very positive manner. He could connect with his students in meaningful and authentic ways that were unavailable to other teachers who did not share his background. This attribute is inherent to who Eduardo is and is not something that can be taught, though Eduardo acknowledged that he extends and values identity connection to his students through his culturally relevant lessons. He offered his lesson about the origins of a distinctly Latino south Oklahoma City as an example: students in his Oklahoma history class first learn about Black Wall Street and Greenwood in Tulsa, Oklahoma then about the development of Oklahoma City’s south side.

Act II, Scene II: Eduardo shared that, in addition to teaching social studies, he also coaches the varsity boys’ soccer team at Lincoln High. He said,

So, they’re actually really good here. But a lot the problem is a lot of them don’t have papers, so like, college is kind of, they’re really good and get scholarships and stuff, but they can’t really go, you know what I mean? Or they’re scared to go [to college] just in case they get deported.

He spoke in particular about his star player, Charles, who had just graduated the previous spring. He described Charles as “the best player in the state. He had the most goals [... but] his citizenship has some issues. So, we’re trying to find him where he can go, you know what I

mean? He's, he should be playing college soccer." Charles has been in the United States since elementary school. Eduardo described the efforts he has undertaken to "guide [Charles] in the way to go to a university." He is connecting Charles with coaches at area private colleges, and Eduardo and his coaching friends are continuing to train with Charles in the hopes that he will be awarded a future tryout. Eduardo noted that "We're trying to brainstorm and see what would come up by next August." I mentioned to Eduardo that I saw his relationship with Charles as ways in which they both demonstrated citizenship, and Eduardo agreed. In the meantime, Eduardo connected Charles with a friend in construction. Charles is currently working with him to install in-ground swimming pools. Eduardo noted, "that's, like, the reality here. They want to go [to college], but they think they can't, you know what I mean?"

Act III: "Who is our voice?"

When I initially asked Eduardo for his definition of citizenship, he stated, "So for me, I think citizenship is just if you've been here, you know, not necessarily born here, but if you've been here long enough and this is the only country you know, I think you're a citizen of that country." Eduardo's definition stood out for its singular focus on citizenship as the legal process of who is and is not a legal, documented citizen of a given country. I had provided no parameters on my question and do not consider there to be a right or wrong answer, by any means. Still, I was surprised with his response. It underscored the need for expanded notions of citizenship. His examples of citizenship enactments were more traditional, or at least, more expected. For example, he offered "helping the community out when possible." Eduardo offered demonstrations from his own life, also, of enactments of citizenship, such as when he volunteers at Hispanic festivals or when he tutors students. Eduardo discussed how he viewed his volunteerism as an important way he fulfills his civic duties, but he mentioned that his students

felt different. He said, “a lot of them are a little afraid to kind of volunteer. They don’t want to put their name ‘cuz then they’re scared that somebody, they’ll find it and then deport them.” He elaborated that this fear stemmed from “different raids, people, you know what I mean? They don’t want to get pulled over, ask for the ID. Ask for stuff like that, ‘cuz a lot of them might not have, or their parents might not have, it.”

After offering these, Eduardo built out his definition further by adding “you know, there’s kind of part of the city that gets a bad rap for a bunch of crime. You know what I mean? I think if you don’t get involved with them, do a little better to help the community, I think that’s a citizen.” When probed about ways that Eduardo incorporated citizenship education into his own classes, he stated that in his class “we bring up citizenship, immigration quite a bit, you know what I mean? [...] ‘Cuz of what’s going on right now and then, so you know, I’ll have them debate or talk or just discuss it, you know, ‘this is happening.’” He said he acknowledged the complexity around immigration and citizenship questions when he led these class discussions, saying,

It’s just difficult and I know, like, not everyone could come to this country, so I don’t have the answers. I started telling them, like, ‘well, you know, some of it’s wrong. Some deportations might be right. Some are criminals. So, we got to come up with something where the kids that were that young, you know, shouldn’t be deported.’ And I tell them I don’t have the answers.

The conversation around citizenship continued into our discussion of standards. In particular, Eduardo acknowledged that he would “compare the viewpoints of Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. DuBois, and the response to rising racial tensions” because

most of these, they were citizens, but they weren’t treated like citizens, you know? And I think that’s true for a lot of people here. Well, they feel like citizens but then, you know, they’re told by other people, radio or television, social media, that they’re not citizens.

I followed up with the question “So who do you think gets to decide who’s a citizen?” A telling moment came when Eduardo ultimately responded, “the kids.” This notion of being a citizen but being denied the rights afforded to a citizen again came up in our conversation around the curriculum. He noted that,

All of these [Civil Rights leaders], they were, I mean, they were from the United States: Martin Luther King, but they were fightin’ like to have equal rights as a United States citizen [...] and I think yeah, it’s just hard. Like, if you were born in Mexico and then you got here when you’re like six months old, then at 18 you get deported. It’s kinda, ya know...and I’ve had friends and cousins that’s happened to. And most of their life they didn’t do nothin’ wrong. They just live in fear, drive to work, drive back. And they don’t want to be, you know, ‘cuz if you get pulled over once, ask for your insurance, your license, you don’t have it [...] they’ll look you up and then...

Eduardo articulated the concern that his community did not have a voice, did not have a spokesperson or a leader who was championing their cause and who understood their fears and their hopes. He said, “And I kind of, sometimes, make the connection that, like, all these, there was a voice. Like, right now, we don’t really have a voice. Somebody, you know, willing to sacrifice [...]” And what struck me is that Eduardo is a voice for his students. His students’ voices are valued by Eduardo, too. The students who live in fear, the cousins who are scared to drive to work, they are sacrificing. There are powerful voices in this arena, but the greater public is not listening. And so, I understood what he meant, and I also wondered about the implications of a narrow, traditional conception of citizenship in terms of dampening or erasing these voices.

Allie

Act I: One More Thing

The day’s dismissal bell sounded as I made my way into Central High’s main office. The office and halls were buzzing. The receptionist took my information and asked me to be seated until Allie could come to the office to meet me. After 15 minutes passed, Allie trudged into the

office and apologized for her tardiness. “I’m sorry, cheer practice ran late today.” I assured her it was no problem and that I understood. Truly, I was very familiar with long teaching days and the burden of “one more thing” added to an already long day. As we traveled through the halls and up the stairway to her second story classroom, Allie sighed and slumped her shoulders. The day seemed to weigh heavily on her, and I felt deeply guilty about prolonging her day. Plus, she shared that she had two small children waiting for her at home, and I sympathized with her longing to be with them. Once I had my daughter, I would rush through the school doors alongside my students at the end of the day. We shared some other similarities: we both had pursued non-traditional paths to teaching, and we were young White women. Even so, I wasn’t sure what to expect from our conversation. I knew very little about her, but she had been recommended by two colleagues as a secondary social studies teacher who worked with a large population of ELLs and who cared about her students. I thanked her profusely for her time, and as the interview unfolded, she began to open up and to reveal a spirit that I had overlooked upon first meeting her.

Act II: “I don’t teach elementary for a reason.”

Allie’s entire teaching career has been at Central High. She is in her fifth year at the school, four as a lead teacher and one as a student teacher. It is clear that she loves her school community. She graduated from a regional institution’s history education program. She teaches U.S. history and world history. For the first year ever and to her immense relief, she is only teaching mainstream classes. Her relief stems from the additional commitments that came from teaching sheltered classes.

Even with her exclusive mainstream course load, Allie estimates that about half of her students are ELL and that most “really should still be in a sheltered class.” When I pressed her on the that statement, she elaborated,

They’re still flagged as ELL, so they still get some services, but some of them still need a sheltered class. They need...they need more time. Like, two years isn’t enough for them to gain enough academic language for them to be successful. And so, after that two years, though, they’re kicked into mainstream. And so, you end up with kids that are still reading on a very low level.

Allie’s students represent a piece of Oklahoma City’s linguistic diversity. They primarily speak Spanish, though she also has students whose home languages are Vietnamese, Burmese, and Mandarin. When she was describing her students, she detailed a young man from Guatemala. She said of the Guatemalan student from her first year of teaching: “No matter what I do, he’s not getting this. It doesn’t matter how I structure it. It doesn’t matter if it’s oral or written, it just doesn’t matter. Well, he hadn’t been in school since second grade [...]” and was a student with interrupted formal schooling. She described working with him as “super frustrating” because “I don’t teach elementary for a reason. I don’t have the patience to teach reading and writing.”

Allie’s history education preparation did not fully prepare her for the complexity of teaching in a classroom with ELLs, and yet her first year schedule was loaded with sheltered classes. Allie’s expressed disdain for teaching reading and writing reflected a tension between what she expected teaching secondary history education would be like and what it actually was like. Allie has attended two district-sponsored SIOP trainings since beginning at Central High, and she described them as helpful. The training covered WIDA, and she was the only teacher I spoke with that mentioned this, even though its implementation is district-wide. WIDA stands for World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment and is a “consortium [...] which offers

states programming for identifying and annually assessing the English language development of [their] English learners” (Colorín, 2019). Allie also stated that the SIOP training covered

different strategies of how you can scaffold. And so, I mean, and the strategies are pretty good. Like, I use quite a few of them [...] We do a lot of stuff with vocab and not just copying definitions but using them in different ways [...] I use a lot of visuals.

While the district SIOP training offered some helpful strategies, Allie still recalled her struggles.

“I’m not really sure if you could call it Aristotle anymore”. Ultimately, though, Allie realized that her teaching context mandated a certain set of teaching skills, whether she liked it or not. She stated,

I’ve really had to be, like, okay, some of these fundamental skills I do have to teach. And even so, like, I still have to throw all this other content at them and they’re supposed to be doing all this rigorous critical thinking and it’s just, something always falls, you know? It’s a lot of things to juggle.

She described one experience where she reached out to her district’s Title III ELL Instructional Facilitator, Jill Cox. Allie said that Jill mostly helped teams modify district tests but that she reached out to her once when she was feeling desperate. Allie needed to cover key ideas from the writings of Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero in her world history sheltered classes. “So, I sent [Jill] an email and was like, ‘We have to teach this tomorrow, here. Help me.’” Allie recalled that,

We cut down so much. We were, I’m not really sure if you could really call it Aristotle or Plato anymore [...] So it was the same information, but it was completely, like, instead of a paragraph, it was almost like sentence, I don’t know, I actually have a copy of that I think.

Allie showed me her original and the draft she reworked with Jill; they were dramatically different, and I understood how Allie struggled with whether she had appropriately adapted her lesson or if she had merely butchered the philosophers’ ideas by oversimplifying. It highlighted the challenge that so many social studies teachers describe: how do you lower the cognitive, linguistic load without lowering expectations or rigor? Allie’s modified draft dramatically

shortened the texts, incorporated visual aids, and offered definitions and literal translations for key terms. However, the takeaways she expected from her students remained the same from the original draft to the modified one. She maintained high expectations for that lesson. She expected that students, regardless of English fluency, to understand and to engage with the ideas of the philosophers. Allie seemed to undersell herself, saying only, “I think it went pretty good. So, I think they got something out of it.” She credited Jill’s assistance with making the lesson successful. Unfortunately, though, Jill’s assistance was mostly limited to district-wide tests and not to the day-to-day lessons. She said that particular lesson was one of the only times she was able to collaborate with Jill during her five-year tenure at Central High.

Moreover, Allie noted that she had mixed results with the paraprofessionals assigned to her sheltered classes. “It’s another set of eyes, another set of ears of like, ‘Hey, can you help them with this or at least explain it?’” Allie’s paraprofessionals were fluent in Spanish, like the majority of Allie’s students, but she noted that it really “depends on who you get.” Allie stated that “mine never did a whole lot.” Her district, however, suggest that there is untapped potential in its paraprofessional force (OKCPSa, 2020). The district, alongside the Foundation for Oklahoma City Public Schools, has established a Bilingual Teacher Pipeline Project that provides financial and academic aid for paraprofessionals who seek teacher certification (OKCPSa, 2020). For the first time ever, Allie does not have a paraprofessional in any class this year since she is teaching exclusively mainstream courses; though, she estimated about 50% of each class are ELLs.

“I don’t even know because that’s just like my normal”. I asked Allie what resources she wished she had to better equip her for her work, and she responded, “I don’t even know because that’s just like my normal. Like, I came in, I started like this, and this is how it’s always

been for me [...]” Allie’s expression indicated that she had trouble even imagining what adequate resources and support could look like. She admitted that she relied heavily on Google to supplement her lessons with appropriate material for ELLs. It should not be the norm for teachers to feel unprepared to face their students. Allie attended the SIOP professional development that her district offered, reached out to the district ELL instructional facilitator, and had paraprofessionals in her sheltered courses; yet, Allie felt overwhelmed by her job. Allie’s story mirrors what many other teachers have shared on the subject. She stated,

I’d rather do mainstream just because it’s, it’s so much more work to modify all their assignments and all their tests [in sheltered], and there’s, like, some resources out, out there. There’s some help out there, but like, I’m not being compensated for spending an extra, you know, three or four or five, you know, however many hours I am.

In addition to feeling unprepared and under-resourced, Allie noted the time commitment outweighed her willingness to continue teaching sheltered courses.

Act III: “Like, how do I raise them up but not lower the bar for everyone else?”

Allie stated that,

my kids know I will move mountains to help you pass. If you talk to me, I will do whatever I can [...] I can’t do it by myself, though. And so, there’s a lot to make sure, like, I’m doing my part, but not all kids these days are doing their part [...] But it falls on me. They’re not doing their part? It’s my fault.

I found this sentiment embedded in Allie’s description of the young boy from Guatemala, who she had introduced earlier in our conversation. When I asked what happened to him, Allie said, “Well, he stopped coming. He didn’t pass despite me being like, ‘Hey, I can work with you. Let’s do this. Let’s try this.’ And he was just like, ‘I’m just here because I have to be because we immigrated and it’s legally required for me to be here, but I have a job outside of here.’” Allie has the desire to reach her students and to work with them through hardships, yet based on Allie’s accounts, it seems that she feels like there are unmovable mountains. My impression is

that Allie did not expect that teaching would be a cakewalk. She is not naïve. She is level-headed and hard working. It strikes me, though, that Allie is disappointed with just how hard it is, and that she disproportionately gives weight to the students who do not succeed in her class as opposed to those who do. She reflected on another student, this one a current student in her U.S. history class. His home language is Mandarin, and she noted that her course is fast-paced and overflowing with content. She said, “It’s just, it’s a lot that you have to, like, constantly be thinking about.” The student has started to skip class, and she reiterated that “it’s just a lot.” He translates the class readings and assignments from English to Mandarin, responds in writing in Mandarin, then translates his writings back into English. She said his assignments are always on topic, so she knows he is understanding the content and is proficient in his home language as a result of the constant translation. Yet, she sees how taxing this process is for him, and in some ways, she seems to understand why he is skipping her class. I can tell that his absence is really bothering her, as if just under the current of our conversation, she is thinking that she has not done enough for him. It seems to be a central question for her: “Like, how do I raise [ELLs] up but not lower the bar for everyone else?” She is asking the right questions. It does not seem like she feels she is getting any answers, though.

Allie’s definition of citizenship included “having pride in your country” and “being active in what’s going on around you. Not just, like, on Twitter. Like, we can complain all we want on the internet, but actually being involved.” Her first point, about pride in one’s country, made me wonder: what if you feel connected to more than one country? That is undoubtedly the case for many of the students in her room. She described citizenship as voting, especially being a high information voter, and by “making sure you keep up on the news.” When generating ideas around citizenship, she posed the question, “how can you go out and make a change?” Allie said,

“You don’t all have to, like, go riot in the streets. So, just trying to have [the students] be, like, be aware of their rights and how to exercise their rights” would be another way that she supports citizenship education in her classes. She mentioned that she attended a collaborative project-based learning (CPBL) seminar sponsored by the Oklahoma state Department of Education last summer, and that one of the goals of CPBL is to organize lessons around the question, “How do we make this matter?” She emphasized that the question demanded an activism element that she is working to incorporate into her lessons but has not yet done so. Allie declared that “as much as I love this country [USA], we suck, you know, and American history, it’s just not a pretty subject as much as, like, we’re not as exceptional as we think we are.” When pressed on this comment, Allie said that she wanted “to teach them the truth and not just what the textbook says” and “Like, I’m not going to sugar coat history to make anyone feel better.” She noted that her students appreciated her honesty “especially since the majority of the people, like, I teach minorities, so they’re very happy that I’m not just white washing American history.”

Allie’s first reaction during our turn to the standards was that she hated it because it’s big and “[kids] don’t get it.” In response to students struggling with the broad concepts of the Gilded Age and social reform movements from 1870-1920, she divided it into four smaller units: industry, immigration and urbanization, social progressivism, and political and economic changes. She wanted students to be able to show knowledge and learning in multiple outlets, so students took an assessment and created a newspaper. She was quick to note that “paper and pencil tests are always hard, especially with such big standards.” When I asked about the newspapers, she said, “it was really a hit or miss [...] My kids that were going to do it or, like, need a little help? They, they did it. But, my kids, that of course, that weren’t going to do it, still, still weren’t inclined to do it.” I reviewed some of the newspapers and found them impressive.

Allie struck me as someone who aimed for perfection and was disappointed when anything fell short, a quality that precluded her from reveling in any of her successes.

A strength that Allie shared was how she never accepted the standards at face value or as a strict suggestion of chronology. She noted that “we’ll switch back and forth between standards [...] “Like, we’ll do this president’s domestic [policies] and then we’ll do their foreign [policies].” She noted that she does this so she’s “not teaching all domestic and then going back and being like, ‘Oh, this president that you forgot about three months ago? Like, he was also doing this.’”

When she discussed the Civil Rights Movement in the curriculum we were discussing, she noted that her unit on it tends to fall flat. Even so, she noted that it is important “because you can’t fix something if you don’t know what’s broken and what other people have tried [...].” She said it was important that students understand that “you can apply these lessons to a lot of different things in history and in your own life. And so, trying to understand that [history] is not just a bunch of dead guys. Like, it’s relevant.” She elaborated that this connected to citizenship because, “they have to know they have a voice and, like, when you have a voice, like, things can change.” Paramount to understanding and using your voice, though, is also learning “how to listen and that’s, you know, it’s not just about screaming about this or that injustice but, like, you have to think about it, too, you know? Like, slow down and think about it now. What can we do about it? [...]”

“But if they’re not sitting in a class learning something, how equal is it?”. Allie summed up her objective with both standards, as they relate to her ELLs, with “just making them small enough for them to get it so it’s not, like, too, too much, too overwhelming.” As our conversation drew to a close, she finally verbalized that her students “need more supports in

place, but I guess they only get that two years and they're mainstreamed." Her frustration bubbled over when she focused in on the inequity of the situation for both teachers and students. She asked, "If they're not sitting in a class learning something, how equal is it?" She wanted to know "how do I give them, you know, the same opportunity without dragging down the others that are there? Like, how do I raise them up but not lower the bar for everyone else? Like, you know, it's a balancing act. And, I, I mean, I'm still working on it." She noted that this work is not going away. "There's a reason why people come to this country and trying to say, like, 'Oh, we're going to end that' Like, it's not. So, let's just figure out how to best help everyone and best help teachers who deal with it on a daily basis."

Discussion

The Final Act

Individual teachers' practices in their classrooms with their students

The teachers featured in this study have unique backgrounds, just like the students in each of their classrooms. Yet, these teachers largely employed similar instructional strategies, like use of visual aids, intense vocabulary work, and varying degrees of primary language support. These teachers achieved different results. The stories that Elijah and Eduardo shared, in particular, suggest that both teachers believe that their students hold immense and valuable funds of knowledge. Importantly, both Eduardo and Elijah acted on their beliefs. They served as "the bridge between [their] students' knowledge, background experiences, and ways of viewing the world and the academic domain" (Moll et al., 1992, p. 8). And importantly, Elijah and Eduardo "moved from recognizing these funds of knowledge to incorporating them into [their] classroom[s] to promote critical" learning opportunities (Dabach & Fones, 2016, p. 20). A funds of knowledge approach does not necessarily require that a teacher challenges the status quo,

though practitioners with that stance often do (Dabach & Fones, 2016). Paris (2012) notes that current education policies have “the explicit goal of creating a monocultural and monolingual society based on White, middle-class norms of language and cultural being” so without resistance, “students will continue the age-old American saga of being asked to lose their heritage and community ways with language, literacy, and culture in order to achieve in U.S. schools” (pp. 95-96). Elijah and Eduardo intervened and transformed this all-too common saga by implementing the appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs while also attending to sociocultural considerations and transnational dispositions; in so doing, they effectively challenged “traditional approaches to social studies instruction” by employing a transnational funds of knowledge stance (Fránquiz & Salinas, 2013, p. 452).

Similar to the secondary social studies teacher featured in Dabach and Fones’ (2016) study, Elijah brought his students’ countries of origin into the classroom space. His vibrant display of the various national flags of his students’ home countries was one way he recognized their transnational funds of knowledge and provided them opportunities for self-making citizenship (Bondy, 2016). His development of lessons that utilized Google Earth’s street view feature so students could showcase their home towns and former neighborhoods presents another example of recognition. In so doing, he explicitly communicated to his students that their connections to two or more countries was an asset (Dabach & Fones, 2016). Moving beyond recognition alone, Elijah, too, “strove to help students make connections across countries and to critique the power asymmetries across borders” (Dabach & Fones, 2016, p. 20). When Elijah offered that one way to be a good citizen is to be proud of your country without denigrating another person’s country, he demonstrated his commitment to expanding our understanding of

what it means to be a citizen and to challenging whether allegiance to one country necessitates harm to another (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Elijah said that citizens were always engaged in a “continual fight for rights.” He saw the work as unfinished, thereby supporting the idea that our current status quo is an unacceptable finish line for citizenship education. Elijah’s view of the formal citizenship curriculum as a work in progress reflects notions captured in Barr et al.’s (1977) study where they, too, acknowledged that the social studies was, and should be, under constant negotiation. Because Elijah drew on the funds of knowledge of his students, he broadened his understanding and instruction around citizenship education so that all students could envision themselves as citizens.

Eduardo drew from a deep reservoir of funds of knowledge from his own life experiences (González et al., 2005). He grew up in the same community, graduated from the same high school, and spoke the same home language of his students. His accumulated knowledge around language and immigration was an asset in his teaching, similar to teachers featured in Jaffee’s (2016) study. Eduardo recognized his students’ funds of knowledge in ways that his own teachers had not fully afforded him when he was a student, and at the same time, his caring and critical teaching philosophy also reflected much of what he had learned from that same truly high-quality teacher education program. In particular, when his students shared their very real fears about signing up for volunteer opportunities or about sharing personal information during the college application process, Eduardo recognized their fears surrounding citizenship and immigration, and he created space for these students and their realities in his classroom (Dabach & Fones, 2016). His own background established a firm basis for cultivating mutual trust, *confianza*, with his students. Through his relationship-building, he could leverage, in Jaffee’s (2016) words, “a pedagogy of community.” He challenged his students to contemplate who

could be their ‘voice’ and what message that ‘voice’ should carry. He believed that his students, “the kids, they get to decide” who is a citizen (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Through his lessons, he worked to support them in developing their voices and messages by using the students’ own stories (Paris, 2012). Though Eduardo acknowledged fear as a component of the students’ knowledge base, he did not dwell solely in this fear. He offered his students the opportunity to envision a brighter, transformative future where their voices and their messages resounded in the public discourse as loudly as those of earlier Civil Rights leaders (Jaffee; 2016; Paris, 2012).

Eduardo understood that citizens had to “sacrifice stuff to get stuff.” Eduardo worked with his students and through the curriculum to understand ways that they could contribute to their community, ways that they could be citizens. He offered them the opportunity to create their own destinies and to define citizenship on their own terms.

Although Allie did not demonstrate a stance I would associate with funds of knowledge, her story is valuable to explore and offers important insights. Salinas et al. (2017) declare that “the significance of teachers’ understandings and pedagogies cannot be overstated because the majority of [ELLs] are not placed with teachers certified in bilingual education or ESL but rather mainstreamed [...]” (p. 452; García et al., 2008). Additionally, Allie’s disposition toward both ELLs and citizenship education may be more reflective of teachers in the field statewide than the dispositions of Elijah and Eduardo. Notably, funds of knowledge is not intended as a judgmental or evaluative theory, but it is one way of interpreting actions and beliefs. For instance, when Allie described her student from Guatemala, she did so in ways that I interpreted as stemming from a deficit orientation of her students. She, understandably, was frustrated in the situation: she did not feel prepared for working with SIFE ELLs and was struggling to connect with this student in particular. Yet, based on her own telling, he was committed to his job outside of

school. Much of the original emphasis of funds of knowledge revolved around building family histories and labor histories of students (Moll et al., 1992; González et al., 2005). “The narratives that emerged from these household histories are incredibly powerful and often are testimonies to the resiliency and resources of people whose lives are often lived at the economic margins” (González et al., 2005, p. 11). The young student likely had a wealth of knowledge to share, with particular insights about labor, but he needed to be asked.

Referring again to Allie’s student from Guatemala, he explained that he did not want to be in school because he had a job. In addition to the value of labor histories for understanding funds of knowledge, Bondy (2016) also advocates for expanding our understanding of who citizens are and how they contribute to the civic good. In particular, Bondy (2016) acknowledged that some students who work in the paid labor force do so to support their families, whether locally or by sending remittances to family in their home countries. Bondy (2016) asserts that these instances are essential and significant enactments of citizenship, and they should be lauded as such on the same scale as traditional understandings (e.g. voting). Equally significant, the schools featured in this study fall under Anyon’s (1980) conception of “working-class schools.” According to school district data, at Allie’s school in particular, over 67% of students come from “economically disadvantaged” background (OKCPSa, 2020). In addition to Bondy’s (2016) important call to include students’ labor in the paid workforce as a form of citizenship, it is also valuable to apply a critical lens to better understand why these students are in positions of economic peril that mandate their labor to supplement family income.

Anyon (1980) found that socio-economic statuses are problematically reinforced and replicated when schools and teachers present their students with learning opportunities commensurate only with the skills required by jobs common to the students’ current social class.

In particular, Anyon (1980) found that social studies curriculum in working-class schools offered little connection to larger contexts, creativity, decision-making, and logical reasoning. Instead, it privileged rote exercises, compliance, and obedience. Anyon (1980) noted that students in working-class schools resisted such work (p. 76). Allie also highlighted several instances where her students exhibited resistance, most often through absenteeism and failure to complete assignments. The problem, however, is that these types of resistance are “highly constrained and limited in their ultimate effectiveness” (Anyon, 1980, p. 88). According to Anyon (1980), expectations of student work in working-class schools are degrading and are only appropriate for preparation for “future wage labor that is mechanical and routine” (p. 88). For many students in the stories throughout this study, that wage labor is not in a distant future but is a reality for them already. Still, this interpretation is not intended to devalue their work and the important contributions they make to the community and to their families. Allie’s story shows us that not only should social studies teachers expand what good citizenship looks like, we must also attend to the skills we cultivate in our students (Anyon, 1980; Bondy, 2016). Ultimately, our students, ELLs included, should develop the skills necessary to obtain physical and symbolic capital, yes, but equally important are the skills necessary to contemplate the power dynamics of labor and capital. This, then, would mean that students also would have the skills to understand and to critique the class system. Moreover, these skills would empower students to decide for themselves whether they continued to participate in that class system, regardless of their opportunity for mobility within it, or whether they chose to transform it. That is to say, Allie’s story exemplifies why expanded notions of citizenship should perhaps not only value the labor history of students and their families, but that these approaches to citizenship also could build capacities in students for challenging their working conditions and their need to work so hard.

As a complement, critical global citizenship can provide a postcolonial view on this issue “by acknowledge the complicity of [the so-called ‘Global North’] in what are being constructed as global problems but which are being understood as ‘Third World Problems’” (Pashby & de Oliveira Andreotti, 2015, p. 14). So, again, returning to Allie’s student from Guatemala, representative of so many of our students, an alternative citizenship education approach could empower students and teachers alike to critically question why he was unable to attend formal schooling in Guatemala, why he and his family were unable to remain in their home country, and why he now finds himself hard at work in the paid labor force for survival yet is viewed as a “dropout” and “failure” by society and the system of schooling. A critical global perspective would interrupt the trite liberal, individualistic, and meritocratic understanding of his situation (Pashby & de Oliveira Andreotti, 2015). Allie’s stories about her students offered glimpses into how a funds of knowledge approach to her students, particularly around labor histories, could be a valuable tool in this effort. Yet, a funds of knowledge approach does not necessarily challenge the status quo. A funds of knowledge approach in combination with a critical economic lens and global/transnational citizenship education could, however.

Innovative and Resourceful, but at What Cost?

Conversations around ELLs in social studies revolve around expecting more from our teachers, but they also should consider the roles others have to play. There are countless ‘others’: state and federal legislators who determine funding allocations, community members who determine community priorities and possess their own knowledge bases, district and school administrators who set priorities and goals; the list is endless. We each have a role to play in more fully supporting teachers and their students (Lewis-Moreno, 2007). Teachers have called for more support and more resources. We have yet to answer their calls satisfactorily.

Elijah, Eduardo, and Allie shared that over 50%, and sometimes up to 90%, of their students are ELLs. All three teachers shared that they started the year off with over 40 students in their classes. It took months for school administrators to level their enrollments. Elijah, in his second year, is his team's lead and is poised to become his department's chair. The other two members on his team are emergency certified teachers. Eduardo has not yet had the opportunity to engage in any professional development on ELLs. Allie referenced the paralyzing cloud of accountability culture that shapes her outlook. These teachers also highlighted ways in which they and their students were highly flexible and adaptive; they were "keenly aware that survival is often a matter of making the most of scarce resources and adapting to a situation in innovative and resourceful ways" (González et al., 2005, p. 13). While it is valuable to highlight their strength and resiliency in the face of great odds, it is also important to contemplate why we demand such resiliency from them in the first place.

As an early career teacher, Elijah met obstacles with the confidence of a veteran. He led his emergency certified colleagues in daily collaboration sessions, is poised to become the social studies department chair, and reassigned his own paraprofessional to a colleague he knew was struggling. Elijah demonstrated characteristics, like the "ability to shift strategies in mid-stream" that González et al. (2005) argued are skills "that the successful and productive citizen must embody" (p. 13). His need to do so professionally may have contributed to a degree of personal reflexivity whereupon he could reflect on and value those same traits in his students. The scenario where his students from Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo translated across three languages showed how Elijah not only created space for students' funds of knowledge to thrive in his class but of how he celebrated it and considered it fundamental to his social studies learning goals. It also highlighted his adaptability; he did not know the Indigenous

language, and he did not have resources immediately available. While it is important that teachers do not overburden students with translation work for their peers at the expense of their own high quality content learning, Elijah understood that this kind of exchange centered his students' knowledge and, as a result, it ultimately conveyed a valuable social studies lesson in its own right (Wright, 2015). At the same time, this story underscores why teachers working with large populations of ELLs need resources and support to meet and anticipate student needs and assets.

Eduardo demonstrated many ways that he and his students were resourceful. By exploring new avenues for college for Charles and by continuing to encourage and support his students as they applied for college in the face of very real threats, Eduardo demonstrated resourcefulness as he challenged the system. Eduardo has never participated in professional development related to ELLs or teaching in sheltered classrooms, either, and research suggests that many social studies teachers are similarly unprepared (He et al., 2018; Mullins et al., 2020; O'Brien, 2011). Even though he has much to learn, as he readily admits, he is exceling at connecting with his students and valuing their contributions. Yet, Eduardo's steep learning curve with his sheltered classes should be a reminder that working with ELLs requires a specific set of skills and knowledge (Cruz & Thornton, 2013). Eduardo deserves adequate professional development and support. He should not be expected to learn entirely 'on the fly' and then celebrated for his tremendous resiliency and success. His resiliency is a true asset, but he should not have to rely so heavily on it.

When Allie described the Mandarin-speaking student whose constant efforts at translation were wearing him down, she sounded resigned to the fact that he would give up and stop coming to class altogether. She did not relish that fact, but she did seem to accept it. Yet,

Allie was very interested in improving her practice and was actively working to do so by attending professional developments, like the SIOP and CPBL ones mentioned earlier. Mullins et al. (2020) noted that the work of Meuwissen (2017) may offer an idea: teachers who work with large populations of ELLs may benefit from effective professional development that builds enduring professional communities and takes into account the reality of harsh accountability culture. Allie, and teachers at large, need the education community to recognize the realities facing teachers: large class sizes, emergency certified colleagues, standardized testing, and more. Gaudelli (2013) also advocates for a global citizenship approach when considering the accountability culture facing teachers and students because, although we often understand high-stakes testing or school privatization, for example, as strictly local or domestic matters, they are truly informed by prevailing global economic conditions. Ultimately, Allie's story reinforces the need to appreciate the context in which teachers like Allie work in order to develop meaningful learning opportunities related to ELLs (Rapoport, 2010).

Limitations

There are a few notable limitations to this study. First, there were time limitations that prevented me from obtaining and receiving district and site approval for classroom observation. These time limitations also prevented more extensive, repeated conversations with the teachers. As such, this study provides snapshots into teachers' stories through their own voices. Their voices are truly valuable and essential to any attempt at telling their stories, though the study may have been strengthened with additional conversations and observations. Moreover, the three teachers in this study are considered early career educators, each with five years or less in the classroom. As such, it is difficult to determine with certainty if the challenges they may be

experiencing related to teaching ELLs stems from their early career statuses or from the broader issue of preparation pertaining to teaching ELLs.

Implications and Conclusion

Elijah, Eduardo, and Allie each shared their individual stories, yes, but their stories also reflect the stories of our state's teaching force overall. These three teachers are being asked to do a tremendous amount with very limited resources. Likewise, Oklahoma's teachers at large are being expected to overcome enduring, structural obstacles with very little support. Elijah, Eduardo, and Allie are bearing these burdens and taking on these responsibilities in unique and individual ways. Still, across their stories, we can see that, regardless of their degree of motivation, of fatigue, or of innovation, they all still need and deserve our support. We cannot expect that teachers will be able to meet the growing and evolving needs and assets of their students if we are not meeting the needs and assets of our teachers (Lewis-Moreno, 2007). Put another way, if our aim is to transform social studies instruction so that it reflects and values the background of all students, then we must dedicate equal interest and attention to fully supporting teachers in that endeavor. For social studies teachers to "take up the charge" of educating for and about citizenship in ways that center ELLs, social studies teachers must have the resources, support, and preparation adequate for the task. Salinas et al. (2017) articulate the urgent civic imperative that "social studies educators should lead the charge in co-creating an inclusive civic space and vision with our emergent bilingual students" (p. 457). In order to meet this compelling imperative with the urgency and forcefulness that it demands, we must support teachers in their practices and through our research. At present, our support is falling far short of what teachers, and by extension their students, deserve and require.

It is essential that we attend to teachers' work with ELLs because of the sheer number of ELLs in our schools, the legal obligation teachers have to meet students' language skills and language needs, and the fundamental aim of social studies to nurture and cultivate citizenship (Salinas et al., 2017). Moreover, teachers like Elijah and Eduardo, who find success in this work, ultimately contribute to reframing "how we collectively characterize youth who cross both material and symbolic borders and derive knowledge from their lived experiences, transnational social practices, and interactions within their communities [...]" (Dabach & Fones, 2016, p. 19). Elijah, Eduardo, and Allie have been generous and forthcoming with their stories, and they present much to ponder.

First, both Elijah and Eduardo had positive, sustained travel abroad experiences. They both acknowledged that those experiences contributed to their world views. Both teachers also leveraged their students' funds of knowledge in purposeful and effective ways and seemed to hold more transnational understandings of citizenship. Other researchers exploring social studies teachers and ELLs have also identified travel abroad as a factor in cultivating more global-minded teachers (Jaffee, 2016; Merryfield, 1998; González et al., 2005). An interesting future direction for researchers might include the exploration of whether college teacher education programs should create equitable and enriching opportunities for their pre-service teachers to experience travel abroad. What implications might this travel experience have for shaping teachers' stances and dispositions towards their students and their ELLs particularly?

Next, and related, future researchers might be interested in better understanding the ways that college teacher education programs support a funds of knowledge approach within their own faculty/student populations. Both Elijah and Eduardo attended the same program; they both spoke very highly of their professors and of their program. Future researchers may benefit from

the exploration of how teacher preparation programs impact the teaching philosophies, dispositions, and attitudes of their graduates related to citizenship. Additionally, it may be valuable for future researchers to explore how the assets of bilingual pre-service teachers, just like Eduardo, can be better leveraged in the formal teacher preparation curriculum.

As a personal implication, this study gives me optimism. In my first year of teaching, I had a class of 30 fifth graders, 29 of whom were classified as ELL. They deserved the very best teacher, but they ended up with me. They extended tremendous grace and generosity to me throughout that year, and I learned so much from them. I was thankful for our school year together, but I also felt discouraged and deeply troubled by a system that would place an inexperienced teacher like me in that setting with such limited resources and support. This study has highlighted that there are brilliant, dedicated teachers already paving the way for us in this work, and now we must have the wisdom to follow them and the willpower to fight alongside them and alongside our students. There is still time for all of us to learn and to redeem ourselves.

References

- American Immigration Council (AIC) (2016, October 24). *Public education for immigrant students: Understanding Plyler v. Doe*.
<https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/plyler-v-doe-public-education-immigrant-students>
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67-92.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity and citizenship education in global times. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (pp. 57-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Barr, J., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Washington, DC: NCSS.
- Bateson, M. C. (1994). *Peripheral visions: Learning along the way*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Billings, E. & Walqui, A. (2019). *Topic brief 5: Dispelling the myth of “English Only”*: Understanding the importance of the first language in second language learning. New York State Department of Education. <http://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/topic-brief-5-dispelling-myth-english-only-understanding-importance-first-language>
- Bondy, J. M. (2016). Latina youth, education, and citizenship: A feminist transnational analysis. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(2), 212-243.
- Borden, R. S. (2014). The English only movement: Revisiting cultural hegemony. *Multicultural perspectives* 16(4), 229-233.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Callahan, R. M. & Obenchain, K. M. (2016). Garnering civic hope: Social studies, expectations, and the lost civic potential of immigrant youth. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(1), 36-71.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. S., & Herwanto, S. (2006). *The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 6, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq (1964).
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Colorín Colorado (2019). *Oklahoma: ELL resources*.
<https://www.colorincolorado.org/ell-basics/resources-state/oklahoma>
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Cruz, B. C. & Thornton, S. J. (2009). Social studies for English language learners. *Social Education*, 73(6), 271-274.
- Cruz, B. C. & Thornton, S. J. (2013). *Teaching Social Studies to English Language Learners*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority-language children*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Cummins, J. (2001). An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummings (C. Baker & N. H. Hornberger, Eds.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Dabach, D. B. (2014). "You can't vote, right?": When language proficiency is a proxy for citizenship in a civics classroom. *Journal of International Social Studies*, 4(2), 37-56.

- Dabach, D. B. & Fones, A. (2016). Beyond the “English learner” frame: Transnational funds of knowledge in social studies. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 18(1), 7-27.
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 101-124.
- Dong, Y. R. (2017). Tapping into English language learners’ (ELLs’) prior knowledge in social studies instruction. *The Social Studies*, 108(4), 143-151.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2014). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Fránquiz, M. E., & Salinas, C. (2013). Knowing English is not enough! Cultivating academic literacies among high school newcomers. *High School Journal*, 96(4), 339-357.
- García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What’s in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 322-326.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J. A., & Falchi, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals*. New York, NY: Campaign for Educational Equity, Columbia University.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gaudelli, W. (2013). Critically theorizing the global. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 41(4), 552-565.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1995). *After the fact: Two countries, four decades, one anthropologist*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). Introduction: Theorizing Practices. In N. González, L. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms* (pp. 1-29). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hanvey, R. G. (1976). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into Practice*, 21(3), 162-167.
- Harshman, J. (2016). Critical global competence and the C3 in social studies education. *The Social Studies*, 107(5), 160-164.
- He, Y., Journell, W., & Faircloth, J. (2018). Preparing teachers for English learners: Integrating academic language and community service projects. *The Social Studies*, 109(1), 13-26.
- LaCelle-Peterson, M. & Rivera, C. (1994). Is it real for all kids? A framework for equitable assessment policies for English language learners. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(1), 55-75.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: AKA the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, (84)1, 74-85.
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
- Lewis-Moreno, B. (2007). Shared responsibility: Achieving success with English-language learners. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(10), 772-775.
- Jaffee, A. T. (2016). Social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Towards a theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(2), 147-183.
- Journell, W. (2011). Teaching the 2008 presidential election at three demographically diverse schools: An exercise in neoliberal governmentality. *Education Studies*, 47, 133-159.
- Kissling, M. T. (2012). A living curriculum of place(s). *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 28(3),

109-127.

- Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory & Research in Social Education*. 26(3), 342-379.
- Meuwissen, K. W. (2017). "Happy professional development at an unhappy time": Learning to teach for historical thinking in a high-pressure accountability context. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 45(2), 248-285.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Morrison, T. (1987, December). James Baldwin: His voice remembered; Life in his language. *The New York Times*, 27.
- Mullins, R. D., Jr., Williams, T., Hicks, D., & Mullins, S. B. (2020). Can we meet our mission? Examining the professional development of social studies teachers to support students with disabilities and emergent bilingual learners. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 44(1), 195-208.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELAa) (2011). *The growing number of English learner students*.
http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELAB) (n.d.). *Title III Grant FAQs*. <http://ncela.ed.gov/title-iii-grant-faqs>
- National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (2013). College, Career, and Civic Life (C3)

framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history. Silver Springs, MD: NCSS.

O'Brien, J. (2009). High school social studies teachers' attitudes toward English language learners. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(2), 36-48.

O'Brien, J. (2011). The system is broken and it's failing these kids: High school social studies teachers' attitudes towards training for ELLs. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 22-38.

Oklahoma City Public Schools (OKCPSa) (2020). *Oklahoma City Public Schools Statistical Profile 2018-2019*.

https://www.okcps.org/cms/lib/OK01913268/Centricity/Domain/96/2018-2019_STATISTICAL_PROFILE.pdf

Oklahoma City Public Schools (OKCPSb) (2019). *Attendance Maps*.

https://www.okcps.org/cms/lib/OK01913268/Centricity/domain/115/attendance_maps/ALL_High_20190422.pdf

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2019, May 15). Oklahoma academic standards for social studies.

<https://sde.ok.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Oklahoma%20Academic%20Standards%20for%20Social%20Studies%205.21.19.pdf>

Palmer, P. J. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.

Pashby, K. & de Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2015). Critical global citizenship in theory and

- practice: Rationales and approaches for an emerging agenda. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 9-35). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Pike, G. (2008). Global education. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (pp. 468-481). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982).
- Rapoport, A. (2010). We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 5(3), 179–190.
- Rapoport, A. (2015). Global citizenship education: Classroom teachers' perspectives and approaches. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 119-137). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Salinas, C. S., Rodríguez, N. N., & Blevins, B. (2017). Emergent bilinguals in the social studies. In M. M. Manfra & C. M. Bolick (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of social studies research* (1st ed.) (pp. 440-460). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in language disorders*, 32(1), 7-18.
- Short, D. J. (1997). Teacher discourse in social studies classrooms: How teachers promote academic literacy for English language learners. Unpublished manuscript. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Talmy, S. (2004). Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3), 149-172.
- Valdéz, G. (2000). Nonnative English speakers: Language bigotry in English mainstream

- classes. *Associations of Departments of English Bulletin*, 124(Winter), 12-17.
- Valdéz, G. (2014). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In T.G. Wiley, J. K Peyton, D. Christian, S. C. K. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.) *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and education practice* (pp. 27-35). New York, NY: Routledge; Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- United States Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (USDOE) (2020). *Developing programs for English language learners: Lau v. Nichols*.
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/lau.html>
- van Someren, M. W., Barnard, Y. F., & Sandberg, J. A. C. (1994). *The think aloud method: A practical approach to modelling cognitive processes*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). Educating the ‘good’ citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science & Politics*, 37(2), 1-7.
- Wright, W. E. (2015). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Calson, Inc.
- Zhang, Y. (2017) Supporting English language learners in social studies: Language-focused strategies. *The Social Studies*, 108(5), 204-209.

Interview Protocol, Appendix A

Introduction and Demographics Script:

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time, and you do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. As a reminder, your name will not be used in any publications or presentations resulting from this study; your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

First, I would like to ask you a little about yourself and your background.

1. Name:
2. School/district:
3. Number of years teaching:
4. Grades taught:
5. Number of years teaching courses associated with U.S. history:
6. Educational Background (degree(s), certification):
7. Languages skills (additional languages, proficiency levels, etc.):
8. Travel abroad experience:
9. Personal connections to immigration:
10. Number (%) of English Language Learners in each class:
11. Context of English Language Learners (additional languages, proficiency levels, etc.):
12. Have you participated in professional development experiences directly related to teaching English Language Learners? If so, please describe those experiences.
13. What is your definition of citizenship?
14. What does citizenship look like enacted? Can you provide examples from your daily life?
15. What are some examples of opportunities where you provide space for students to explore and enact citizenship?

Standards Protocol Script:

Today I have brought standards and associated objectives from the Oklahoma Academic Standards for U.S. History. For about 15-20 minutes, you are going to read and review one of these standards and its associated objectives. What I really want to know is what you are thinking about as you review these, especially with our earlier conversation in mind. It might be helpful to consider the following questions as you review and think aloud: **A) What does this standard mean to you? B) How might you design a lesson around this standard? C) How does this standard reflect and connect to citizenship?** There are no right or wrong things to say. Anything you can tell me about what you are thinking would be helpful because I'm trying to learn more about how secondary social studies teachers think. You can stop and tell me what you are thinking at any time. Sometimes, I will stop and ask you to tell me what you are thinking. Are you ready to begin? Is there anything you are thinking about before we start? [After teacher's response] Great, go ahead and begin. [After each minute without a comment from the teacher, the researcher will say,] Stop for a moment and tell me what you are thinking about right now? [After the task is complete or around 15-20 minutes, the researcher will say,] Is there anything else you want to say about what you are thinking, doing, or feeling before we are done?

Follow-up Prompts

When comment is unclear: *Can you tell me a little more about what you are thinking? Or, What did you mean when you said XYZ?*

The research will ask the teacher what he or she is thinking any time there is a non-verbal response (e.g. shrugging, making a face, etc.)

After completing the task, the researcher will say, *Now that we are finished, do you have any other thoughts or feelings that you would like to share with me?*

OPTION A	
U.S. History Standard	USH.2 The student will analyze the social, economic and political changes that occurred during the American Industrial Revolution, the Gilded Age, and significant reform movements from the 1870s to the 1920s.
U.S. History Objective	USH.2.1 Evaluate the transformation of American society, economy and politics during the American Industrial Revolution. A. Analyze the impact of capitalism, laissez- faire policy and the role of leading industrialists as robber barons, captains of industry and philanthropists including John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie and his Gospel of Wealth essay on American society. B. Identify the impact of new inventions and industrial production methods including new technologies by Thomas Edison, Alexander G. Bell, Henry Ford, and the Bessemer process. C. Evaluate the contributions of muckrakers, including Ida Tarbell, Jacob Riis and Upton Sinclair, in changing government policies

	<p>regarding child labor, working conditions and regulation of big business.</p> <p>D. Analyze major social reform movements including the Women’s Suffrage and Temperance Movement and the leadership of Susan B. Anthony, Alice Paul, and Jane Addams.</p> <p>E. Evaluate the significance of the Labor Movement on the organization of workers including the impact of the Pullman strikes, the Haymarket Riot, and the leadership of Eugene V. Debs.</p> <p>F. Assess and summarize changing race relations as exemplified in the Plessy v. Ferguson case.</p> <p>G. Compare early civil rights leadership including the viewpoints of Booker T. Washington, and W.E.B. DuBois in response to rising racial tensions, the anti-lynching work of Ida B. Wells, and the use of poll taxes and literacy tests to disenfranchise blacks.</p>
OPTION B	
U.S. History Standard	USH.7 The student will analyze the cause and effects of significant domestic events and policies from 1945 to 1975.
U.S. History Objective	<p>USH.7.1 Analyze the major events, personalities, tactics and effects of the Civil Rights Movement.</p> <p>A. Assess the effects of President Truman’s decision to desegregate the United States armed forces and the legal attacks on segregation by the NAACP and Thurgood Marshall, the United States Supreme Court decisions in the cases of Oklahomans Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher and George McLaurin, and the differences between de jure and de facto segregation.</p> <p>B. Evaluate the events arising from separate but equal, policies, such as poll taxes and literacy tests, violent responses such as the Birmingham church bombing and the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and conflicts over segregation including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas decision 2. Montgomery Bus Boycott 3. desegregation of Little Rock Central High School 4. Oklahoma City lunch counter sit-ins led by Clara Luper 5. Freedom Rides 6. Marches on Washington and Selma to Montgomery 7. adoption of the 24th Amendment 8. passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. <p>C. Compare the viewpoints and the contributions of civil rights leaders and organizations linking them to events of the movement, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his I Have a Dream speech, the leadership of Malcolm X, the role of organizations such as the Black Panthers; describe the tactics used at different times including civil disobedience, non-violent resistance, sit-ins, boycotts, marches, and voter registration drives.</p>