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This dissertation study examined how teachers in four newcomer schools conceptualized and implemented social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth. I designed this multi-site, collective case study to examine the perspectives and decision making of four social studies teachers’ enacted pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. I documented how social studies teachers (U.S. History and Global History) were teaching Latino/a newcomer youth within urban newcomer high schools through the research question: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? As evidenced in their culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy, teachers in this study provided constant support, encouragement, and opportunity for Latino/a newcomer students to succeed academically, and encouraged active civic engagement by using students’ cultural, linguistic, and civic knowledge and experiences as central to their pedagogy.

I analyzed the findings within and across four case studies to develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. This developing grounded theory analyzed the intersections of culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship. These intersections and cross-case analysis of the four teachers’ social studies pedagogy for newcomer Latino/a students developed five principles of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. These principles included: pedagogy of community, pedagogy of success, pedagogy of making cross-cultural
connections, pedagogy of building a language of social studies, and pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship.

This study has the potential to add to and expand on the discourse regarding social studies pedagogy for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011), newcomer schools (Short & Boyson, 2000), English Language Learners (Cruz & Thornton, 2009), and citizenship education for newcomer youth (Salinas, 2006). Possibilities for future research might include examining how Latino/a immigrant students’ cultural and linguistic experiences influence their perceptions of social studies and how they conceptualize citizenship. Furthermore, additional research might also explore how the findings in this study may be used to develop a more culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education program, create professional development opportunities for in-service teachers, and examine how elementary teachers and teachers in rural/suburban contexts conceptualize their social studies pedagogy for immigrant youth.
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I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

My study examines how four social studies teachers conceptualized and implemented their pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students in the context of various urban newcomer high schools through an emerging framework of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings 2004; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). In this introductory chapter, I describe the problem, list the major and subsidiary research questions, outline the theoretical framework, discuss the significance of the study, and conclude with a chapter summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Chapter I:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conceptualizing Cultural and Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linguistically Responsive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active and Engaged Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the last decade, Latinos have become the largest and fastest growing ethnic group in the United States (Rong & Preissle, 2009). There are approximately 51.9 million Latino/a residents in the U.S. (Motel & Patten, 2013) and roughly 12.4 million are enrolled in pre-K-12 schools, accounting for one-quarter (23.9%) of the nation’s public school enrollment (Fry & Lopez, 2012). The rapid growth of Latino/a residents in the United States is shaping U.S. civil society. It is especially important to understand how Latino/a newcomer youth are making sense of citizenship, civic and political engagement, and democratic society, as these new immigrants will soon enter adulthood. Perennial questions involving the civic education of immigrants
Knowledge about the experience of Latino/a newcomer youth helps educators understand more effective ways to achieve the goals of the social studies, which are to promote, encourage, and prepare students to be active and engaged citizens of the United States (Thornton, 2008). Considering Latino/a newcomer students’ prior and current experiences, what they are learning about social studies and citizenship, and how they make sense of the subject matter, is critical to understanding how teachers can best meet their students’ needs in the secondary social studies classroom.

I explore how four social studies teachers conceptualize and implement their pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students through an emerging framework for culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings 2004; Lucas & Villegas, 2010), in the context of various urban newcomer high schools. Newcomer schools (Short & Boyson, 2000) are unique social and cultural schooling environments, providing educational opportunities that are centered on meeting the cultural, linguistic, academic, and community needs of newcomer youth (Bartlett & García, 2011). I examine teacher pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth to better understand how to harness the initial positive sentiments expressed by most newcomers (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Furthermore, I explore how newcomers’ experiences, contexts, and knowledge(s) (Yosso, 2005) provide insight into curricula, instruction, school/classroom climate, and parental/community interaction, all elements which encourage youth to reach their full potential as active and engaged citizens in the U.S.
Previous studies indicate that the organization of many schools “fracture[s] students’ cultural and ethnic identities,” and creates a “subtractive schooling” environment (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 5) for Mexican immigrant students. These students felt disconnected, alienated, and dismissive towards schooling. The notion of “subtractive schooling” for Latino/a immigrant students is problematic, as schools play a large role in “shaping societal relations” (Olsen, 1997, p. 15) and are places whereby we might witness a representation of the democratic and social processes enacted in U.S. society (Dewey, 1915). While the literature reflects a pressing demand for reconstructing the social studies curriculum and pedagogy for newcomer students (Salinas, 2006; Cho & Reich, 2008), it also reveals that current practices in the social studies classroom do not reflect the various dimensions of school experience, such as community networks and membership (Zhou & Bankston, 1998), school structure and climate (Conchas, 2001), and family capital and parental impact (Louie, 2004). These other elements affecting newcomers’ schooling experience might also influence how Latino/a newcomer youth conceptualize social studies, citizenship, and their civic identity (Rubin, 2011). A more in-depth understanding of how the social studies (curriculum and pedagogy) are preparing Latino/a newcomer students for active and engaged citizenship, taking students’ contexts and experiences into consideration, can occur through a close examination of four social studies classrooms in urban newcomer high schools.

Although the demand for reconstructing the social studies curriculum for Latino/a newcomer students is indispensable, the examination of high school social studies teachers’ conceptualization of curriculum and pedagogy is relatively unknown. Through an in-depth, qualitative, multi-site, collective case study, I examine how teachers conceptualize social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth and whether the enacted pedagogy is culturally and linguistically relevant when preparing Latino/a newcomer students for active and engaged
citizenship. Culturally relevant pedagogy seeks to center students’ cultural knowledges, backgrounds, and experiences as assets (Yosso, 2005) in the classroom. Focusing on these assets empowers students to choose academic excellence, maintain their cultural integrity, and develop a critical consciousness, while meeting the diverse cultural and linguistic needs of all students (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Furthermore, understanding newcomers’ social studies experiences, which are in theory tied to their conceptions of citizenship, is critical to meeting the needs of our Latino/a students and sustaining the health of U.S. democratic society (Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012).

**Research Questions**

I examine the perspectives and decision making of four social studies teachers’ enacted pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. I document how four social studies teachers (U.S. History and Global History) are teaching Latino/a newcomer youth within urban newcomer high schools through the research question: How do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? Subsidiary questions include:

1. How does the teacher conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth?
2. How does the teacher implement social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth?
3. [How] does the teacher conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? What new theories emerge from the social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth?
4. What are implications of the teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth with regards to social studies education?

**Theoretical Framework**
In examining four secondary social studies teachers’ conceptualizations and implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth, I constructed a theoretical framework of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer youth (see Figure 2). This framework includes overlapping and intersecting elements of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994), linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), and notions of active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 2004). A framework for culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education emerges from the teachers’ orientations (or attitudes and beliefs), knowledge, and skills (or ideas and actions) for implementing social studies education that focuses on students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds “as a vehicle for learning” (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 161) and promotes active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth.

I used culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) (Ladson-Billings, 1994) as the initial theoretical framework to inform my views regarding how four social studies teachers enacted their social studies pedagogy; however, ongoing analysis and interpretation of the collected data indicated additional theories to understand how and why teachers constructed meanings of and engaged in (Charmaz, 2009) their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students (for more information regarding the reconstructed theory see Chapter III: Methodology, Data Analysis section). Using interviews, classroom observations, and reviews of classroom artifacts, I analyzed teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions.

After a consideration of these elements, I theorized how participants conceptualized and implemented their pedagogies. Analysis and interpretation of why teachers constructed meanings of their social studies pedagogy, and engaged in enactments of this pedagogy, occurred through a
consideration of how theories of pedagogies emerged from the teachers’ conceptions and implementations of social studies classroom practice. In ongoing data analysis and interpretation, notions of CRP appeared throughout the data collected; however, there were other elements regarding language, identity, and citizenship, pertaining particularly to Latino/a newcomer youth, that informed an emerging framework for culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. I explain the three overlapping theoretical frameworks here and the intersection of the frameworks and principles found in the emerging grounded theory will be further explored in Chapter V’s cross-case analysis.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 2. Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education**

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

Culturally relevant pedagogy “uses students’ culture in order to maintain it and to transcend the negative effects of the dominant culture…[it] is a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 17-18). Ladson-Billings’ (1994) has provided a framework of successful teaching for African American students, offering a model for teaching practice, and I seek to understand whether this type of culturally relevant teaching can
occur for Latino/a newcomer youth, and what this pedagogy might look in the social studies classroom. By using students’ culture in the classroom, Ladson-Billings’ (1995a; 1995b) articulated three main principles or tenets of CRP (see Figure 3): academic success, cultural competence, and critical consciousness of the current social order.

Academic success largely focuses on students’ development of their academic skills. Culturally relevant teachers in Ladson-Billings’ (1995a) study all focused on meeting their students’ needs, “not merely to make them ‘feel good’…[but] to ‘choose’ academic excellence” (p. 160). What academic success looks like varies depending on the school, the context, and the students; however, the ultimate goal is “to help students perform at higher levels” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 475) as compared to other schools in the district or students’ own academic achievement (i.e. literacy, numeracy, problem solving, etc.).

Culturally relevant pedagogy requires that students’ maintain their cultural integrity, while emphasizing academic success. CRP does not ask students to “negotiate the demands of school while demonstrating cultural competence” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 476), but instead requires cultural values and schooling to work together to encourage students to see academic engagement in school as positive. Lastly, developing a critical consciousness helps students “recognize, understand, and critique current social inequities” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 476). This requires students to become critical citizens, employing Freire’s (1970) notion of “conscientization,” who digest, examine, and act upon issues of social injustice in their school, community, nation, and world. However, teachers should know and understand these issues, develop a pedagogy that seeks to question these inequities, and successfully implement a “social action curriculum” (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 162) in order to encourage a critical consciousness among their students.
The three principles of CRP are situated in the theoretical underpinnings of exemplary culturally relevant teaching. Ladson-Billings (1995b) noted that although the principles of CRP can take on different forms and structures they all seem to embody certain “beliefs and ideologies” (p. 478). She organized these beliefs and ideologies into broad propositions of culturally relevant teaching in order to make “practice more accessible” (p. 478) for in-service and pre-service teachers who might not share their students’ cultural and experiential knowledge and understandings. These propositions included: 1) the conceptions of self and others, 2) the conceptions of social relations, and 3) the conceptions of knowledge (see Table 1).

Although Ladson-Billings (1995a) discussed the importance of using students’ home language to promote cultural competence, she largely focused on the experiences of African American students and “code-switching” (p. 161) between one’s home language and the “standard” English students experience in school; for example, students work on translating their spoken and written work. While Latino/a students might have similar linguistic experiences in the classroom, these experiences do not necessarily encompass other elements of language and identity, language and power, and other linguistic needs of English Language Learners (ELL). Therefore, linguistically responsive teaching is used as a lens through which to view how
participants addressed the nuances of culture, language, and identity discussed and implemented in their pedagogies.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions of Self and Others</td>
<td>All students are capable of academic success, Pedagogy is art—unpredictable, always in the process of becoming; They are members of the community; Teaching is a way to give back to the community; Believe in a Freirean notion of “teaching as mining,” (1974, p. 76) or pulling knowledge out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions of Social Relations</td>
<td>Maintain fluid student-teacher relationships; Demonstrate a connectedness with all of the students; Develop a community of learners; Encourage students to learn collaboratively and be responsible for one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions of Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge is not static; it is shared, recycled, and constructed; Knowledge must be viewed critically; Teachers must be passionate about knowledge and learning; Teachers must <em>scaffold</em>, or build bridges, to facilitate learning; Assessment must be multifaceted, incorporating multiple forms of excellence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptualizing culture and identity. CRP requires that understanding culture should be open and not constrained by essentialist notions of immigrant community membership (Lee, 2010). For example, immigrant communities’ cultural and experiential knowledge is central, legitimate, and necessary to understanding, analyzing, and challenging racial and linguistic subordination in U.S. society (Yosso, 2005). I define culture, by combining both Siddle Walker (1999) and Tillman’s (2002) definitions, as a group’s individual and collective beliefs, values, experiences, histories, and traditions; a shared cultural knowledge that varies within and among cultural groups and has a strong influence on how one sees the world. For example, elements of culture might include: race, ethnicity, language, class, gender, political ideology, and religion. I contend that culture is fluid, shifting, and dynamic and depends on contexts, histories, identities and whether one has acknowledged and/or acted upon her/his cultural identity or identities in a given context or moment (Gee, 2000; Siddle Walker, 1999). This definition critiques deficit notions of culture and cultural knowledge, which perceives students to not possess the “normative cultural knowledge and skills” in schools (Yosso, 2005, p. 75).

In contrast, my understanding of culture forefronts community’s cultural knowledge as assets, highlighted through emphasizing the “voices of People of Color,” recognizing the “empowering potential of the cultures of Communities of Color,” and demonstrating “community cultural wealth […] possessed and utilized by Communities of Color to survive and resist macro and micro-forms of oppression” (Yosso, 2005, p. 75-77). Community cultural wealth highlights assets and resources in the experiences, lives, and histories of communities of color including knowledge, skills, and abilities, through six forms of capital: aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familial, and resistant capital. These forms of capital are
mentioned here to forefront the assets already possessed by Latino communities and youth, and to recognize the importance of utilizing these experiences in the classroom.

Siddle Walker (1999) conceptualizes the interplay between culture and identity as such: “If culture is defined by shared beliefs, values, and norms within a group...[then] a cultural group may or may not be identified with a particular ethnic group, since ethnic groups are a particular kind of cultural group where members share an involuntary ancestral history and members may consciously choose to embrace or reject their ethnic identity” (Siddle Walker, 1999, p. 227). Although one may belong to a particular ethnic group, this does not necessarily mean that she/he will identify with this group or groups due to differences in cultural knowledge and experiences. Human beings construct meaning based on their “cultural lenses:” one’s meanings and understandings of her/his place in the world, which have “their origins and their significance in the culture in which they are created” (Bruner, 1996, p. 31). Gee (2000) calls this perspective on identity, “the affinity perspective,” wherein identity is based on experiences, practices, and access to a group whose “allegiance is *primarily* to a set of common endeavors or practices and *secondarily* to other people in terms of shared culture or traits” (p. 105, emphasis in original). Thus, identity formation from this perspective requires social practices to establish a connection to other people, to sustain group membership, and to remain in existence. An understanding of the nuances between culture and identity and how/if people recognize and engage with their identity(ies) (Gee, 2000), should be considered when examining the diverse experiences, histories, and cultures among Latinos of various countries of origin, races, classes, languages, ideologies, and genders.

**Linguistically Responsive Teaching**
Linguistically responsive teaching (LRT) (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) seeks to prepare educators for the successful instruction of ELLs by developing the orientations, knowledge, and skills necessary for teaching linguistically diverse students. The LRT framework includes seven central tenets (see Table 2): 1) sociolinguistic consciousness, 2) value for linguistic diversity, 3) inclinations to advocate for ELL students, 4) learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies, 5) identifying the language demands of classroom discourse and tasks, 6) knowing and applying key principles of second language learning, and 7) scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students’ learning. Lucas & Villegas (2010) contend that principles one through three are the orientations or “inclinations...toward ideas and actions, influenced by attitudes and beliefs” (p. 302) necessary for the foundational development of principles four through seven, which contain the teachers’ knowledge and skills for linguistically responsive teaching. I used this framework to theorize social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students.

Table 2

*Tenets of Linguistically Responsive Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic Consciousness</td>
<td>Understanding and awareness that language and identity are interconnected; Knowledge of sociopolitical dimensions of language use and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Linguistic Diversity</td>
<td>Encouraging students’ engagement in class; Showing respect for and interest in students’ home language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclinations to Advocate for ELL Students

Working toward improving ELLs’ educational experiences;
Promoting and advocating for greater educational equity for ELLs.

Knowledge and Skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenet</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning about ELL Students’ Language</td>
<td>Linking students’ prior knowledge and experiences to new material;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backgrounds, Experiences, and Proficiencies</td>
<td>Understanding diverse linguistic needs of students and the skills to employ techniques to meet these needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the Language Demands of Classroom Discourse and Tasks</td>
<td>Explicitly identifying and teaching linguistic tasks needed for classroom activities; Promoting language, content, and skill development for ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing and Applying Key Principles of Second Language Learning</td>
<td>Knowing the difference between conversational and academic language proficiency; Acknowledging the importance of literacy and academic skill in students home language; Creating a safe and welcoming classroom climate for ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding Instruction to Promote ELL Students’ Learning</td>
<td>Employing a temporary support for certain knowledge and skills necessary for developing academic and linguistic tasks; Considering the relationship between students’ linguistic capabilities and the academic tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociolinguistic consciousness includes an understanding and awareness of two main items: 1) the interconnectedness of language and identity and 2) the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and instruction. Teachers who understand that language and identity are strongly related acknowledge and consider that “students’ ways of expressing themselves and using language reflect cultural values, expectations, and membership” and that one’s home language is very much a part of her/his language development in and out of school (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 303). Teachers who are sociolinguistically conscious incorporate and build on students’ linguistic knowledge and backgrounds in their teaching and clearly include students’ linguistic experiences in their enacted pedagogy. Furthermore, teachers who have an understanding of the sociopolitical context of language, wherein “language of wealthy and powerful groups in any social context come to be seen as superior to the language of poor and powerless groups” (p. 303), will be able to challenge the myth that some languages are better than others and work to overcome language discrimination.

Teachers who value students’ linguistic diversity, the second tenet of the LRT framework, perceive students as linguistically rich and encourage students’ success regardless of their English proficiency level. These teachers are not “dismissive or disrespectful” of students’ languages, but instead seek to recognize students’ “linguistic resources” (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 303) by engaging and challenging students throughout the enacted curriculum. These conceptions support Yosso’s (2005) notion of “linguistic capital,” which includes “the intellectual and social skills attained through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style” (p. 78), such as engaging in storytelling, artistic expression, or translating for parents. The third tenet of the LRT framework, an inclination to advocate for ELL students, requires “actively working to improve one or more aspects of ELLs’ educational experiences.”
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(Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 304). For example, this might include additional tutoring for ELLs, professional development for teachers around issues facing ELLs, or bilingual parent groups and conferences (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Teachers who advocate for ELLs promote and argue for equity inside and outside of the school, thus encouraging fairer assessment practices and language policies in school and moving culturally and linguistically marginalized students to the forefront of school policies.

Learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds is the fourth tenet of the LRT framework. Lucas & Villegas (2010) contend that this includes the knowledge and skills teachers possess for linking students’ prior knowledge and experiences (culturally and linguistically) to disciplinary content in order to encourage learning new material taught in the content-area classroom. Linguistically responsive teachers need to learn and understand the linguistic needs of their students and how best to meet these needs through preparation and implementation of various techniques, including scaffolding, modeling, and promoting students’ use of home languages in class to help make sense of the material. García, Flores, & Chu’s (2011) notions of “translanguaging,” in which students make meaning of content through communicative bilingual practices of both English and their native language, is an example of how teachers can learn about and incorporate students’ language backgrounds in their instruction to help students understand the academic content material presented.

Two key pieces of the LRT framework are implementing both a rigorous and challenging curricula for ELLs, and making it accessible and understandable for students. In order to do this effectively, teachers need to have the knowledge and skills to identify the language demands of classroom discourses and tasks. This tenet of LRT requires that teachers know what linguistic tasks they want students to learn from an assignment or classroom activity, explicitly direct
students to this task, explain and model ways students might be expected to complete this task, and assess students on whether this task was successfully employed. Lucas & Villegas (2010) state, “the more detailed teachers can be in their analysis of the language demands built into learning tasks and related written materials used, the more able they will be to identify aspects of the tasks and written texts that could interfere with ELLs’ understanding” (p. 305). With these elements in mind, teachers can more effectively promote language, content, and skill development for ELL students.

The sixth tenet of the LRT framework, knowing and applying key principles of second language learning, includes teachers’ understanding of “the difference between conversational proficiency and academic language proficiency” (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 306). While communicating and interacting with native speakers of the desired language of acquisition is important (in this case English), it is somewhat different than academic language proficiency. Critical thinking skills like comparing and contrasting, debating various sides of an issue, and inquiring and hypothesizing, are important academic skills that must be addressed by LRTs. In addition, linguistically responsive teachers recognize the importance of strong literacy and academic skills in students’ home language as a way to foster the success of learning English and promoting academic engagement (Cummins, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Lastly, in order to encourage these principles of second language learning, the classroom must be a safe and welcoming environment for ELLs, wherein speaking, reading, and writing are frequently addressed and ELL students are made visible in the teacher’s decision-making process and implementation of the curriculum.

The last tenet of the LRT framework, instructional scaffolding, combines the six elements of LRT and helps students “carry out learning tasks beyond his or her current capability” (Lucas
& Villegas, 2010, p. 307) by employing a temporary support for certain knowledge and skills necessary for developing academic and linguistic tasks. For example, teachers might first encourage student conversations in small groups centered on students’ prior experiences and knowledge, before asking students to share their new learned knowledge with the entire class. This can occur in a number of forms, such as a pair-share, but it is a critical component for providing support for the development of ELLs in the content-area classroom.

Notions of citizenship highlighted in both culturally relevant pedagogy and linguistically responsive teaching include a critical social and linguistic consciousness, valuing cultural and linguistic diversity, advocating for issues of injustice, and bringing marginalized youth voices to the forefront. In addition, several further elements of citizenship education emerged from teachers’ social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. An exploration of how teachers construct an understanding of and implement a pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth centered on active and engaged citizenship will be theorized in the following section.

Active and Engaged Citizenship

According to the Civic Mission of Schools (2003), a report written by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), civic education aims to encourage students to “acquire and learn to use the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that will prepare them” to become active and engaged citizens (CIRCLE, 2003, p. 4). They further conceptualize that such citizens:

- **are informed and thoughtful.** They have a grasp and an appreciation of history and the fundamental processes of American democracy; an understanding and awareness of public and community issues; an ability to obtain information when needed; a capacity to think critically; and a willingness to enter into dialogue with others about different points of view and to understand diverse perspectives. They are tolerant of ambiguity and resist simplistic answers to complex questions.
- **participate in their communities.** They belong to and contribute to groups in civil society that offer venues for Americans to participate in public service, work together to
They have the skills, knowledge, and commitment needed to accomplish public purposes — for instance, by organizing people to address social issues, solving problems in groups, speaking in public, petitioning and protesting to influence public policy, and voting.

**have moral and civic virtues.** They are concerned for the rights and welfare of others, are socially responsible, willing to listen to alternative perspectives, confident in their capacity to make a difference, and ready to contribute personally to civic and political action. They strike a reasonable balance between their own interests and the common good. They recognize the importance of and practice civic duties such as voting and respecting the rule of law. (CIRCLE, 2003, p. 10)

Active and engaged citizens, therefore, have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to participate in civic and political activities (i.e. voting, deliberating on public problems, discussing current events, partaking in community service (Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012; Parker, 2003)) that seek to support the needs and interests of the community (locally, nationally, and globally). Verba, Schlozman, & Brady argued these citizens desire to enact change for the common good of the community through participatory activities that seek to “influenc[e] governmental action” (as cited in Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012, p. 6). These goals of citizenship privilege traditional modes of civic and political engagement, not taking new methods of active citizenship into consideration (Levinson, 2010). This lack of consideration, along with a lack of (and normative conceptions of) civic opportunities presented in schools, has contributed to a widening civic opportunity gap (Levinson, 2012).

In order to work toward closing the civic opportunity gap, active and engaged citizenship of Latino/a youth considers the cultural, linguistic, and civic assets of youth and how these inform and construct how Latino/a students “acquire and learn to use the skills, knowledge, and attitudes” (CIRCLE, 2003) for citizenship. Through a framework of “new citizenship” (Ladson-Billings, 2004), in which “people of color in the United States are adopting (and adapting)” (p. 117) alternative or re-conceptualized notions of citizenship, considers how to build on Latino/a
youths’ already possessed civic and political knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These notions of new citizenship challenge normative views of active and engaged citizenship by focusing on local and global projects and are concerned with working towards equity and social justice.

Ladson-Billings’s (2004) notions of “new citizenship” reflect the observed teachers’ views on active and engaged citizenship, in which “new citizenship defines allegiances and self-interests along a variety of axes - racial, ethnic, international, regional, religious, and political” (p. 117). I argue that these new notions of citizenship also include cultural and linguistic axes (Flores & Benmayor, 1997). Furthermore, these re-conceptualizations of citizenship are due to the “creative imaginings” of people of color who have been faced with and challenged by the “limits” and “constraints” in society, such as political representation and participation, and want to “remake their world into a more just and equitable one” (Ladson-Billings, 2004, p. 117). In thinking about the unique civic positionality of newcomer youth, immigrant youth, and Latino/a youth, I explore acquiring the civic and political knowledge, attitudes, and skills for active and engaged citizenship as conceptualized by “Latino/a cultural citizenship” (Flores & Benmayor, 1997).

Knowledge. Latino/a cultural citizenship centers on the perspective that “difference is seen as a resource, not a threat” (Flores & Benmayor, 1997, p. 5). United States democratic society, according to this perspective, is strengthened by difference and thrives due to the cultural knowledge drawn from the resources, perspectives, and cultural attributes brought to the U.S. by immigrant communities. Cultural citizenship seeks to explore how culture (in this instance, practices that inform the lives of Latino communities and families, like language and art) “interprets” and “constructs” citizenship [a sense of belonging in a community that has named Latinos “second class or ‘illegal’ ” citizens (Flores & Benmayor, 1997, p. 6)]. Cultural
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citizenship as defined by Blanca Silvestrini (1997):

> refers to the ways people organize their values, their beliefs about their rights, and their practices based on their sense of cultural belonging rather than on their formal status as citizens of a nation. (p. 44)

Cultural citizenship, therefore, is informed by values, beliefs, and practices based on feeling a sense of belonging to a group that reflects the cultural attributes and experiences one possesses. Thus, cultural citizenship asks what role culture plays in civic and political engagement and how participation in civic and political activities affects culture. It is important to note, therefore, that Latinos “move back and forth from cultural citizenship to legal citizenship and from one identity to the other” (Silvestrini, 1997, p. 46) due to the fluid sense of belonging within communities and movements in and out of different social, civic, and political spaces in U.S. society. For example, this might take place when moving from school, to community-based organizations, to campaign fundraising, and to youths’ homes. This movement in and out of different spaces reflects an ability to use and acquire the knowledge one already has with the knowledge learned to navigate the various spaces that make one’s community of belonging.

**Attitudes.** Scholars seek to highlight how Latino communities are claiming membership and recognition, asserting and maintain social and public rights, and identifying as active change agents in U.S. democratic society (Rosaldo, 1997). Latino/a cultural citizenship is built on and from a cultural environment of *cariño* (caring, affection) and *confianza* (shared trust) [or a place of positive collective support and encouragement for individuals and/or community’s to voice their goals and concerns] within and among Latino communities, who demand *respeto* (respect) [or an understanding of an individual and/or community’s goals and concerns and actively listening to how these are being voiced in society] for full citizenship of Latinos in the U.S. (Benmayor, Torruellas & Juarbe, 1997; Flores, 1997; Rosaldo, 1997). These attitudes of care,
trust, and respect that encompass cultural citizenship, also inform how youth participate in civic activities, and are important to consider when understanding what encourages and motivates Latino/a immigrant youth to engage in active citizenship.

For example, Haste & Hogan (2008) argue that in order to understand what active citizenship looks like, we need to start with how the youth understand citizenship and her/his individual motivations for civic participation, such as voting behavior or helping in the community. These participatory actions have different political purposes, and are likely to have different motivations. In considering youths’ motivations for civic engagement, Rubin (2007) argues that students’ daily experiences create “complex and varied contexts” informing their attitudes and understanding of civic/political participation and contribute to their developing civic identity (p. 451).

*Skills.* Immigrant youths’ “cultural identity” (Jensen, 2008) also affects their enacted civic and political skills based on what Stepick and Stepick call a “commitment to their cultural groups” (as cited in Jensen, 2008, p. 75). When examining the behaviors and motives of immigrants’ civic engagement, they found that a majority of participants were more involved at the community level rather than at the political level. Findings showed that political engagement was motivated by a “cultural or immigrant sense of self” (Jensen, 2008, p. 70) and noted various cultural themes of engagement including cultural remembrance, tradition of service, and welfare of immigrant or cultural communities. Jensen & Flanagan’s (2008) findings showed that immigrants’ community involvement included bicultural skills (i.e. translating) and bicultural consciousness (i.e. sending remittances) as active civic engagement.

Latino/a cultural citizenship claims that communities “become essential foci for solidarity and for the struggle to claim and expand existing rights” (Rosaldo & Flores, 1997, p. 60-61).
Therefore, skills that encourage community development (i.e. communicating and organizing to create and expand networks, developing relationships, or claiming their rights) support an understanding of active and engaged citizenship of Latino/a youth. Community development is furthered by shared social and political commitments (Rosaldo & Flores, 1997), and therefore a consideration of what these commitments are and how to access them in the social studies classroom needs to be explored when understanding and building on Latino/a students’ civic assets in the classroom.

The civic and political knowledge(s), attitudes, and skills conceptualized by Latino/a cultural citizenship alter normative conceptualizations of citizenship and civic and political engagement, and re-conceptualize immigrant youths’ spheres of engagement, forms of engagement, and purposes of engagement (Jensen & Flanagan, 2008). Latinos’ civic skills and civic engagements are situated within “social identities and binding solidarities” including ethnicity, race, class, and gender (Benmayor, 2002, p. 98). Cultural citizenship seeks to disrupt and question normative notions of citizenship by creating “new rights and new ways of practicing citizenship itself” (Benmayor, 2002, p. 98). Awareness of how these notions of civic engagement are constantly shifting depending on political, social, cultural, or economic situations and how they are affecting immigrant students’ experiences in both schools and everyday contexts, is critical to consider and is further re-conceptualized by social studies teachers in this study.

**Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education**

Culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education includes overlapping and intersecting elements of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994), linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), and notions of active and engaged citizenship
A framework for culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education emerged from examining how four secondary social studies teachers conceptualized and implemented their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. This framework developed from the teachers’ orientations (or attitudes and beliefs), knowledge, and skills (or ideas and actions) for implementing social studies education that focused on Latino/a newcomer students’ cultural, linguistic, and civic knowledge(s) and assets. Examples of intersecting elements of each component of the framework that were highlighted in the social studies teachers’ pedagogy include: academic success; maintaining cultural competence; value for linguistic diversity; scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students’ learning; sociolinguistic and critical consciousness; encouraging community development; and local, participatory civic action and engagement. Further exploration of these intersections and the principles found in the emerging grounded theory will be discussed in Chapter V.

**Significance of the Study**

This study has the potential to contribute to the growing literature on how teachers conceptualize and implement social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth, employ culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for newcomer students, and understand what these pedagogies look like in an urban newcomer high school context.

By constructing grounded theories of social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth that focuses on culture, language, and citizenship, this study has the potential to meet the need for more research on culturally relevant practices for historically marginalized communities (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). This study critically examines Latino/a newcomer students’ current economic, linguistic, and educational contexts, offering the perspective of four
teachers in various urban newcomer schools who are committed to and engaged in teaching newcomers students. Understanding how to best meet the needs of newcomer youth, by examining the practice of social studies teachers in newcomer schools, has the potential to inform all teachers, scholars, and teacher educators who are striving to include the voices, perspectives, and contextual experiences of all students in their classrooms.

Findings from this study contribute to the growing literature on how teachers conceptualize and implement social studies for newcomer youth, employ culturally relevant pedagogy, implement linguistically responsive teaching for newcomer students, and conceptualize citizenship education for newcomer youth (Cruz & Thornton, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Salinas, 2006; Short & Boyson, 2000). This study adds to the literature on social studies programs within newcomer schools (Short, 2002). Research on newcomer schools in particular helps bridge the gap between what we know about social studies curricula and pedagogy for immigrant students and how teachers conceptualize this pedagogy in a newcomer school environment. It encourages an understanding of how to conceptualize curricula and instruction that promotes active, engaged, and participatory citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. Examining newcomer programs provides insight into various curriculum, instruction, school/classroom climate, and parental/community interaction. As scholars, if we continue to examine what culturally and linguistically relevant teaching looks like for newcomers, we better understand how to harness the initial positive sentiments and energies expressed by most newcomers (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001), and learn from the unique environment provided by inclusive newcomer programs, thereby tapping into a resource that will benefit all schools experiencing an increase in new immigrant student populations.
Scholars argue there is still much research to be done on the teaching and learning of culturally and linguistically diverse groups and this study has the potential to add to and expand the discourse on effective teaching practices for Latino/a newcomer youth in the social studies (Salinas, 2006). Examining teachers’ pedagogy in four culturally and linguistically diverse social studies classrooms, this study has the potential to inform the practice of in-service teachers who are striving to include the voices and perspectives of all their students in the classrooms. Pre-service teachers and teacher educators might benefit from this study by understanding how to effectively conceptualize and implement culturally and linguistically relevant social studies for newcomer students by promoting an academic success that meets the current social, linguistic, and academic needs of their newcomer students and considering how to develop English language proficiencies through the content areas. Teacher educators might consider critically examining the pedagogies employed by teachers in this study with pre-service teachers by analyzing the teachers’ culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education practices for newcomer students in relation to their own experiences, either as a student or student teacher, and developing an understanding of how to employ these emerging pedagogies for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Chapter Summary

In chapter one, I introduced this dissertation study with a statement of the problem and listed the major and subsidiary research questions. I outlined the theoretical framework, culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education, and discussed the significance of the study. In the next chapter, I will present the literature reviewed for this dissertation study regarding the research that has been conducted on curricula and pedagogy for teaching Latino/a youth in the social studies. I analyze and synthesize the literature reviewed using three categories
for teaching immigrant youth in the social studies: (a) teachers’ beliefs and practices; (b) immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences; and (c) contextual influences on adaptation and achievement in school.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I conceptualize the research that has been conducted on curricula and pedagogy for teaching Latino/a youth in the social studies. I analyze and synthesize the literature reviewed using the following three categories: (a) teachers’ beliefs and practices for teaching immigrant youth in the social studies; (b) immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in the social studies; (c) contextual influences on newcomers’ adaptation and achievement in school. While this study is focused on teachers’ conceptualizations and implementation of social studies pedagogy, a review of the literature of immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in school is also necessary. Immigrant youths’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences help contextualize how teachers’ pedagogies influenced students’ understandings, what teachers did to attain these understandings, and how teachers might or might not be responding to students’ experiences and needs inside and outside of the social studies classroom. These are all critical factors in considering newcomer youths’ cultural, linguistic, and citizenship knowledge and experiences in the social studies classroom.

I begin this chapter by analyzing the literature on teachers’ beliefs and practices for teaching newcomer youth in the social studies. I synthesize this section using two categories: cross/cultural learning/discussion; and English language acquisition/literacy, to focus on how teachers have used students cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the social studies classroom. The next section discusses the literature on immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in the social studies. I synthesize this section using the following categories: cultural contexts and understanding history; and civic and political participation and conceptualizing citizenship, to understand how immigrant youth have experienced social studies in relationship
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to their cultural contexts, prior schooling experiences, and civic and political participation. The final section analyzes the literature on various contextual influences on newcomer youths’ adaptation and achievement in school. This section synthesizes the literature using four categories: a brief history of Latino/a immigrant to the United States; teacher practice and pedagogy; community network and membership; and family capital and parental impact. I conclude the chapter with a summary of the literature reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Chapter II:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices for Teaching Newcomer Youth in the Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Learning/discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition/literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Students’ Perceptions, Understandings, and Experiences in Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Contexts and Understanding History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and Political Participation and Conceptualizing Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Influences on Newcomers’ Adaptation and Achievement in School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief History of Latino Immigration to the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Practice and Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Network and Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Capital and Parental Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Summary

Figure 4. Overview of Chapter II

**Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices for Teaching Newcomer Youth in the Social Studies**

A review of the literature on teachers’ beliefs and practices demonstrates an overall desire to try new strategies and map out new practices using interdisciplinary approaches, such as cross-cultural learning/discussion and English language instruction/literacy, in order to develop an active and participatory social studies classroom for newcomer students.

**Cross-cultural Learning/discussion**

Research on high school social studies teachers’ curricula and pedagogy for newcomer youth revealed consistent themes of cross/cultural learning and awareness. In his study, Subedi (2008) highlighted the “cross cultural view-point” two immigrant teachers’ offered their students. He discussed how these teachers fostered and encouraged critical dialogue in the social
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Both teachers used particular pedagogical strategies to “offer ideas and understanding that can help social studies teachers create classroom communities that are dialogic, respectful, and antioppressive” (p. 415). These strategies included a “cross-cultural interview project” and discussion about voice, “to help students recognize the harmful effect of stereotypical and prejudicial statements and acts” (p. 415). Subedi (2008) concluded “the fundamental belief that ethnically diverse students are silenced in the classrooms and in schools informs the teachers’ practices…since the teachers embody immigrant subjectivities, they are in a unique position to examine the subtleties of immigrant students’ subject positions in schools” (p. 435). Therefore, this study informs teachers about the importance of developing an awareness of their subjectivities, in order to become more critical teachers and foster safe and comfortable environments for immigrant students at the secondary level.

Skills such as creating a safe and comfortable community of learners and encouraging critical thinking and cross-cultural discussions in the classroom foster competencies important for citizenship education. These competencies include dialogue and deliberation within and across cultural, linguistic, and ideological diversity (Parker, 2003). Encouraging communication and discussion with culturally and linguistically diverse students about civic and political issues fosters skills for community development in the classroom. Creating a community in the classroom is essential for scholars who forefront culturally relevant pedagogy for immigrant youth.

The literature on teachers’ beliefs and practices for newcomer students articulates an emphasis on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Salinas (2006) calls for broadening the social studies curriculum and pedagogy for newcomer youth to include culturally
relevant pedagogy, wherein “active and inclusive participation and the development of critical skills necessary to address controversial economic, social, and political issues” (p. 26).

Furthermore, her call for re-conceptualizing democratic education for newcomer youth includes critical citizenship where “ideals of a more transnational or bicultural citizenship, multicultural history, and culturally relevant pedagogy” are enacted (p. 26). Salinas’ builds upon the notions of active and inclusive participation, critical and bicultural citizenship, and culturally relevant pedagogy in a study that observed an enacted curriculum for teaching world geography to newcomer youth (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel, 2008).

Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel (2008) argue that a world geography curriculum fosters culturally relevant material for “late-arrival” Latino/a students in Texas because it “highlights the intersection between citizenship and language, culture, and legal status” (p. 74), by discussing how humans interact with the earth and global migration patterns of various ethnic populations. Furthermore, they argue that a world geography class offers more visual representations and physical models versus other subjects (i.e., U.S. History) that are more dependent on written texts and abstract concepts (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel, 2008). This case study design focused on one teacher’s practices and revealed how her course encouraged newcomer students to enter the classroom knowing their cultural, political, and economic experiences were valued and utilized to construct the content and pedagogy employed. These findings support the concept of drawing upon students’ “funds of knowledge” to develop an active and participatory classroom (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Funds of knowledge are “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functions and well-being” (p. 133). Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez (1992) argue that teachers who draw upon students’ household “funds of knowledge” will learn about the child as a “whole
not merely as a student” (p. 133). The classroom teacher that learns about the student’s experiences outside of the classroom develops a mutual trust, or “confianza,” building a reciprocal relationship, fostering an environment for learning, and supporting notions of cultural citizenship (Flores & Benmayor, 1997). Further, teachers that foster a learning environment for immigrant youth also consider students’ linguistic backgrounds in their enacted pedagogy. The literature also showed how teachers’ beliefs and practices for teaching newcomer youth in the social studies demonstrates a desire to try new strategies to encourage English language acquisition and literacy practices in their instruction.

**English Language Acquisition/literacy**

In elementary school, scholars argue the best way to teach immigrant youth is by examining student communities through literature (Carter, 2009), focusing on historical inquiry and language acquisition (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman, 2006), and implementing a “two-way bilingual immersion” (TWI) program (Gort, 208). All three studies focused on the importance of language instruction through writing, reading, or discussion inside and outside of the classroom, as well as fostering a community of learners for immigrant students. Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman (2006) examined three bilingual student teachers in the Southwestern United States and how they used various strategies to teach historical thinking. They contend that historical inquiry for second language learners should begin with accessing students’ prior knowledge, developing a learning environment for thinking about history, and emphasizing content and language learning to foster historical thinking.

Similarly to Carter (2009), Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman (2006) use multicultural children’s literature to access students’ prior knowledge and develop an environment for historical inquiry. They also emphasize pointing out key vocabulary and visuals to promote
English language learning. Using pictorial visuals and graphic organizers helped students understand and organize the historical content being taught. Carter (2009) also highlighted the use of visuals, as well as other texts, including songs, to bring history alive for her immigrant students. In her self-study, she reflected on the importance of social studies for these students, stating: “our students learn about becoming citizens. ‘America is a work in progress,’ we tell them, ‘it is growing and changing as we speak. You need to become part of this process if you wish to make a difference’” (p. 13). Encouraging immigrant students to become part of our growing and evolving democracy is an example of how social studies instruction engages the immigrant experience to foster notions of citizenship education for newcomer youth.

Furthermore, a bilingual classroom can also help students to bridge the gap between their home country and their new community through historical inquiry, multiple texts, and citizenship education (Gort, 2008).

Gort’s (2008) study examined two first grade classrooms where TWI programs were implemented. TWI includes dual language/literacy, content learning, and a multicultural curricular framework for both English learners and native English speakers. Her study focused on six students and how their contextual influences affected the collaboration between students in the classroom. The observed experiences exhibited “peer teaching/learning,” “ongoing negotiation of meaning,” and “[facilitation of] the development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and cross-cultural understanding” (p. 195). These findings offer implications for understanding how bilingual and bicultural children bring rich perspectives, experiences, and social/cultural understanding to engagement in classroom discussions (Gort, 2008, p. 199). The studies examined in elementary classrooms clearly show how social studies is a language-rich content for English language learning that develops the skills necessary for participatory citizenship and
community building for newcomer youth (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman, 2006).

Scholars of the middle and high school grades have also found integrating language instruction in social studies important for immigrant youth. Expanding on English language learning, middle level scholars reveal classroom discussions around culture to be of critical importance for these students as they are discovering themselves and the world around them (Secules & Thompson, 2007; Short, 1993, 1994, 2002). Secules & Thompson (2007), in their self-study, argue that students must participate in experiential learning to facilitate an understanding of who they are and where they see themselves in the world. Through world geography, immigrant students were asked to bring artifacts from their country of origin to initiate discussion about various topics dealing with global interconnectedness. Exploring the concept of “economic interdependence,” Thompson had students discover what it means to live in an interconnected world by grappling with issues of product origin, culture, and communication. Findings showed that after this activity immigrant and non-immigrant students “were practicing increased communication and tolerance for one another” (p. 13). Short’s (1994) study, though slightly dated, stressed the importance of using immigrant or second language learners’ background knowledge. This knowledge included language, culture, and content understanding. As the current curricula and textbook were proven to be irrelevant and difficult for ELLs, learners’ background knowledge was used to make the material relevant and meaningful for the students. She contends that relating the social studies topics to the students’ lives develops their “communicative language skills” (p. 603), an essential component of linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010).

Social studies teachers in various ESL-centered high schools in Virginia revealed a desire to foster content understanding for ELLs. Cho & Reich (2008) collected survey data of 33 social
studies teachers, revealing significant challenges due to the lack of background knowledge and language barriers faced by ELL students (p. 237). They suggest teachers should increase the comprehensibility of English, interactions between ELLs and non-ELLs, awareness of one’s own speech and texts used, and collaboration with ESL instructors. An analysis of Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel (2008) and Cho & Reich’s (2008) studies reveals how new Latino/a populations are affecting regions in the United States differently based on the prior experiences of the differing districts, schools, and teachers with newcomer students. Cho & Reich’s (2008) study on ELLs frames students, concerns, and attention to newcomers as lacking in the necessary background knowledge and linguistic proficiencies. In contrast, Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel’s (2008) study observes newcomers bringing cultural and linguistic assets (Yosso, 2005) that are accessed and used to bridge the new content material presented in the social studies classroom.

Overall, these studies illustrate a desire to try new strategies in English language instruction and cross-cultural awareness in the social studies to develop a curriculum that is more culturally and linguistically relevant for Latino/a students. What is missing from these studies, however, is an understanding of how teachers conceptualize and implement social studies curriculum and pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth through the following practices: teaching in an environment completely dedicated to newcomer students; understanding and using students’ culture and linguistic backgrounds as a key component of social studies and citizenship education; implementing a standardized U.S. History or Global History curriculum. This study attempts to fill this gap by making sense of four teachers’ enacted social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth that focuses on fostering academic success, cultural competence, critical consciousness, linguistically responsive orientations and knowledge and skills, and active and engaged citizenship.
Immigrant Students’ Perceptions, Understanding, and Experiences in Social Studies

A number of other scholars have explored Latino/a immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in the social studies. Their studies reveal the need for social studies teachers to understand Latino/a immigrant students’ contextual backgrounds and schooling experiences when conceptualizing curriculum and pedagogy. An understanding of immigrant students’ contexts is critical to consider when learning how best to assess students’ cultural, language, and citizenship knowledge(s) and experiences.

Cultural Contexts and Understanding History

Students’ perceptions of history and social studies are largely affected by their cultural contexts. Almarza’s (2001) qualitative case study investigated the perceptions and understanding of U.S. history through observation of and interviews with 18 Mexican-American middle school students and one social studies teacher in Nebraska. He contends that the teaching and learning of history does not take place in a vacuum, and there are multiple and competing contexts that influence how teachers teach and what students think about the content and instruction of the U.S. History class in this study. For example, contexts included assimilationist policies, “monocultural” educational practices, and student-teacher relationships.

Similarly, Terzian & Yeager (2007) sought to discover how an urban, high achieving, largely Cuban-American population’s cultural experiences and identities influenced their interpretation of the historical narrative taught in an advanced placement (AP) course. This study employed a qualitative mixed-methods design including survey and interview data with 70 high school students and their AP teacher. In contrast with Almarza (2001), Terzian & Yeager (2007) examined a curriculum that was prescribed and culminated with a high-stakes test, and arguably observed a very different immigrant experience, socially, politically, and economically, in the
United States. Terzian & Yeager (2007) looked particularly at how Cuban-American students “negotiated the official or school narrative with their own sense of what was important in the nation’s past” (p. 58) and how this population’s conceptions of history reflected the official curriculum and the teacher’s understanding of U.S. history. They found that the students did not reflect on or question the curriculum that was taught. Generally, the students’ perception of history was often based on their teacher’s views of the nature, importance, philosophies, and conceptions of teaching U.S. history (pp. 60-61). This reflected what they called the narrative of “twin themes of freedom and national unity” (p. 68).

Although both cases showed the teaching of history reflected a “monocultural” view of U.S. history, Almarza (2001) revealed negative influences on the Mexican-American students, such as detachment from the curriculum, disengagement in class, and unfriendly learning environments. These findings reveal similar evidence of “subtractive schooling” explored by Valenzuela (1999), wherein schools took resources, such as cultural and linguistic knowledge, away from students, and did not provide a community environment in which students and teachers could interact to create a caring community of learners. In these instances, immigrant students’ cultural backgrounds were marginalized in the curriculum and instruction of the teachers, resulting in either disengagement with or an uncritical examination of the historical narrative. Hickey’s (1998) piece on “cultural models of schooling” further addresses the findings of these studies, by examining cultural factors (e.g., home, community, language) and their effect on students’ understandings within the social studies.

Hickey (1998) explores the differences in cultural models of Asian and Latino children and how their cultural models at home, and in their community, conflict with the cultural models of school. She contends that as a social studies teacher, it is important to understand recent
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immigrant students’ backgrounds and cultures in order to facilitate effective classroom instruction. Reflecting the “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) discourse examined in the previous section, Hickey emphasizes both Asian and Latino students’ explanations of their cultural models, including respect for elders, emphasis on education, desire to learn English, and emphasis on family and the good of the group. Understanding these models helps social studies teachers “build on what students already know…[and] use what children have learned at home to teach new social studies knowledge and skills” (p. 445).

Hickey (1998) offers the home, community, and greater cultural context that are not examined in Almarza (2001) and Yeager & Terzian’s (2007) pieces, however, she does not consider the question of the newcomers’ views of social studies found in the other two studies. Based on this analysis, the scholarship on immigrant youth and social studies suffers from a lack of understanding of how students’ cultural contexts and school experiences affect their perceptions of social studies curricula and pedagogy. Other scholars have attempted to address the discontinuity of newcomer students’ experiences and how this affects their perceptions of social studies by examining immigrant students’ understandings and perceptions of civic and political participation (Callahan, Muller, & Schiller, 2008; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld, 2007).

Civic and Political Participation and Conceptualizing Citizenship

Callahan, Muller, & Schiller (2008) and Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld (2007) address how newcomer students’ experiences in school affect their understanding of citizenship, through an analysis of data involving civic and political knowledge and expected civic and political engagement. Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld (2007) examined ninth grade Latino students’ “civic knowledge, expectations of voting, and positive attitudes toward immigrants’
rights” (p. 115), and asserted these as precursors of informed citizenship, political participation, and civic engagement, respectively. Torney-Purta, et al.’s results showed Latino students had high-level positive attitudes toward immigrant rights, a precursor for civic engagement, but low-level anticipated civic knowledge and expectations of voting, thus not reflecting precursors for informed citizenship and political participation. Factors that affected these results included open classroom climate and parental education. These factors and others were also examined in Callahan, Muller, & Schiller’s (2008) study. This study differed from Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld’s piece because it focused on a general category of immigrant youth (rather than solely Latino students), interpreted a different data set, and focused specifically on social studies curricula and pedagogy.

Callahan, Muller, & Schiller (2008) analyzed a set of data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health and the Adolescent Health and Academic Achievement Study. Their analysis was guided by the question: “How do schools prepare immigrant high school students’ for citizenship?” When examining immigrant students’ voting behaviors, they considered generational status as a factor. Findings indicated that children of immigrants with more social studies coursework have “higher levels of voter registration and voting” in the United States (p. 6). Therefore, they conclude that schools in the U.S. do initiate conversations inside and outside the classroom about civic participation (through the enacted social studies curriculum—using discussion and service learning; and the informal curriculum—through social interactions and positive school climate). This supports the results afforded by Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld (2007), whose study revealed that fostering an open classroom dialogue, with discussion of political topics, leads to greater civic knowledge and higher civic participation among immigrant youth. Also, they found communities and parents that discussed “civic-related
topics” and practiced “democratic ideals” (p. 121) were indicators of greater civic participation in the future.

Findings on immigrant youths’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences revealed that there are significant gaps in understanding how newcomer youth perceive the social studies. There exists a need for social studies teachers to understand immigrant students’ contextual backgrounds as “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), and structure schooling experiences to prevent “subtractive schooling” (Valenzuela, 1999), when conceptualizing their curriculum and pedagogy. Studies revealed immigrant students’ perceptions of history content and instruction in the social studies lack relevance and connection to their lives and prior experiences (Almarza, 2001; Hickey, 1998; Yeager & Terzian, 2007). These connections are critical when assessing immigrant students’ perceptions of citizenship (Callahan, Muller, & Schiller, 2008; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld, 2007).

This study strives to contribute to the literature by attempting to further understand how teachers are using students’ prior experience, cultural and linguistic knowledge, and notions of citizenship in conceptualizing their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Furthermore, this study attempts to move beyond how teachers conceptualize and implement historical content knowledge and strives to understand how four teachers make sense of citizenship education by examining and theorizing their pedagogical approaches for teaching Latino/a newcomer students in the social studies classroom.

Contextual Influences on Newcomers’ Adaptation and Achievement in School

In order to consider teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth, it is important to examine the larger contextual factors that influence newcomer youth outside the social studies, as these factors might affect youths’ experiences and conceptions inside the social studies. What
broader consideration might social studies teachers take into account when conceptualizing, creating, and implementing curriculum and pedagogy for newcomer students? After reviewing the literature on immigrant youth and schooling, several dimensions were extrapolated regarding newcomers’ experience in schools. These dimensions were examined for how they might influence newcomers’ perceptions of the social studies. Dimensions included: immigration histories, teacher practice and pedagogy, community networks and membership, creating and sustaining positive peer relationships, school structure and climate, family capital and parental impact, and socioeconomic and gender factors. Four of these components are unpacked in this section, as scholars have articulated that these dimensions have significant influence on how Latino/a newcomer youth might adapt and achieve in school: 1) Latino immigration histories to the U.S., 2) teacher practice and pedagogy, 3) community networks and membership, and 4) family capital and parental impact. One can hypothesize that the influence these dimensions have on adaptation and achievement might also have a similar influence on how newcomer students’ understand social studies, engage in civic and political activities, and influence conceptions of citizenship. Therefore, these factors are critical to consider when examining how teachers enact their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students.

**Brief history of Latino immigration to the United States**

There is a long history of Latinos in the United States, and one that goes back to before the sixteenth-century (Ruiz, 2006). However, this history is not the history of immigration, but the history of the United States. On the other hand, the history of Latino immigration is one that continues to develop today, as Latinos are currently the largest immigrant group and one of the fastest growing populations in the U.S. (Motel & Patten, 2012). Latino/a is “an ethnoracial category that encompasses a fragmentary set of experiences situated in strikingly different
regions in the United States” (Hoffnung-Garskof, 2010, p. 426) and includes a diversity of national, ethnic, cultural, racial, and historical backgrounds including African, European, and Indigenous as well as English, Spanish, and Portuguese-speaking (among many others) groups. These are critical contexts to consider, as the history of Latino immigration varies across the United States.

Historically, the largest immigration waves to the United States have taken place between 1880-1920 and 1965-present. Both waves resulted in a considerable increase of immigrants into the United States; however, the racial and ethnic make-up of immigrants arriving at these particular historical moments is notably different. Immigrants arriving shortly after 1965 included families from a broader range of social classes than the prior large immigration wave who established new communities throughout the country. Furthermore, in the latter wave, mostly Latinos and Asian immigrants arrived to the U.S., a trend that continues to the present day. In addition to voluntary immigration of Latinos in both immigration waves, involuntary immigration (Rong & Preissle, 2009) occurred as well through annexation and colonization.

The Latino population has grown steady in the last 4 decades, from 9.5 million in the 1970s to 51.9 million in 2011, and is 17% of the total U.S. population (Motel & Patten, 2013). In 2050, it is anticipated that 105 million, or 25% of the U.S. population, will be Latino (Rong & Preissle, 2009). The largest nationality within the Latino population is Mexican, followed by Cuban, Salvadorian, Dominican, Guatemalan, Columbian, Ecuadorian, Honduran, Peruvian, and Nicaraguan. It is important to consider that although Latinos fall under the same, very broad category, the histories of the different included groups vary. For example, Cuban-Americans and Mexican-Americans, although similar in terms of Spanish colonization and linguistic backgrounds, have very little in common. Rong & Preissle (2009) note, “Cuban immigrants,
mainly White and professional, escaped a communist regime and settled in the United States as political refugees; Mexican-Americans entered the United States under completely different conditions” (p. 213), such as the annexation of Mexican territory into the U.S., the Bracero Program, the Hart-Cellar Act in 1965, and the Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1986.

The third largest and arguably fastest growing Latino population in New York City is the Dominicans. The Dominican population in the U.S. is growing and accelerated in the 1960s due to economic turmoil and political instability under the dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo (Rong & Preissle, 2009). Uniquely, this population is very racially mixed, including White, Black, and Taíno. Lastly, the newest immigrant Latino group is the Central Americans (Rong & Preissle, 2009), who arrive in the U.S. for numerous reasons, including political or economic motivations, and adoption. Furthermore, for many Central Americans, such as Guatemalans, Spanish is their second language, as many Guatemalans speak various Mayan languages. Overall, Latino immigrants to the U.S. vary in terms of country of origin, history, race, language, legal status, and work status (i.e. unskilled/semi-skilled laborers, professionals, entrepreneurs, etc.) (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). We must consider these varied experiences to better understand our students’ aspirations, desires, communities, and families, (Banks, 2008) in order to best meet student needs in the classroom.

**Teacher Practice and Pedagogy**

Similar to findings in the social studies literature, the broader literature on immigrant students in schools revealed that teachers’ instruction influences students’ overall achievement and performance in school. Research conducted outside the social studies illuminated the implications of caring teachers and staff on how newcomer students’ feel about education, identity, culture, and language (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2008; Olsen, 1997; Salinas & Reyes, 2004;
Valenzuela, 1999; Yoon, 2008). What differs between the literature on caring educators for newcomers versus non-immigrant students is the critical need for an “advocate educator.” An advocate educator establishes a personal relationship with students, creates support systems, acts as an activist, and fosters connections with immigrant students’ communities and school to encourage achievement in school and beyond (Salinas & Reyes, 2004). The challenges faced by newcomer youth are unique among students, and the caring educator acknowledges these challenges and acts on them to promote powerful (Yoon, 2008) and humanizing (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2008) pedagogy developing confianza (mutual trust) and comunidad (community). Furthermore, these educators work to nourish the cultural and linguistic diversity of newcomers (Olsen, 1997), “value and actively promote a search for [a] connection” (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 255), and take time to listen, be fair, and acknowledge that students themselves do care about their education (Valenzuela, 1999). These notions of teacher caring are critical to citizenship education, as illustrated by Noddings’ (2005) work on caring as moral and relational ethics. Teachers who engage in dialogue, modeling, practice, and confirmation, “show how to care” through “creating caring relations” with their students (p. 22). One could argue that showing how to care, or reflecting a cultural environment of cariño (caring, affection) by implementing practices Noddings describes into the social studies curricula, may develop caring and responsible citizens of the future. These practices include interacting with the community, participating in discussion, and promoting societal change.

**Community Network and Membership**

Schools that promote active community membership inside and outside of school walls will foster greater adaptation and more positive experiences for immigrant youth (Conchas, 2001; Salinas & Reyes, 2004; Short, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). Zhou &
Bankston (1998), in their study of Vietnamese refugee children in New Orleans, recommend schools assess cultural and structural assimilation practices, as these practices negatively affect how immigrant students fair in school. They suggest schools should promote policies that actively work toward building “interdependent communities” outside of school. Conversely, promoting a sense of community inside of school was critical for the Latino students in Concha’s (2001) study. His findings suggest that a sense of school community for immigrant students was an element of the schools’ hidden curriculum, influencing students’ motivation and academic engagement. Some scholars argue newcomer programs have a similar community effect on immigrant students (Salinas & Reyes, 2004; Short, 2002), while others argue newcomer programs further isolate students and suggest smaller, heterogeneous communities of learners for new immigrant youth (Coulter & Smith, 2006). These findings are significant because scholars have shown that immigrant students’ civic engagement is linked to commitment to their community and cultural group (Jensen, 2008; Stepick & Stepick, 2002; Flores & Benmayor, 1997).

**Family Capital and Parental Impact**

Immigrant youths’ perceptions of educational performance and attainment have been shown by historians, sociologists, and educational scholars (Cortina & Gendreau, 2003; Louie, 2004; Noguera, 2003; Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Zhou & Bankston, 1998; Yosso, 2005) to reflect that of their parents and/or family capital. When immigrant children move to the United States, they might experience a life different from that in their country of origin. This difference is often due to the need for dual parent income, the frequency of single parent homes, and the role of children as family translators (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). What has not changed for most immigrant families is the importance of
education for their children (Hickey, 2008; Louie, 2004). When understanding newcomers’ views on education and schooling, one must be sensitive to the influences of their parents and household “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), or cultural knowledge nurtured by one’s *familia* (family or kin) “that carr[ies] a sense of community history, memory and cultural intuition (Yosso, 2005, p. 79). Yosso’s (2005) notions of family capital widen understandings of kinship and family beyond one’s parents and siblings, to include uncles, aunts, cousins, and grandparents. This expanded notion of kinship provides numerous forms of *educación* (education both formal and informal), including social, emotional, civic, and political education (p. 79).

Understanding the educational background of a newcomers’ parents might also render insight into students’ educational experiences, achievement, and aspirations (Cortina & Gendreau, 2003; Louie, 2004), which might also influence their future civic and political participation (Ong, et al., 1996). The influence of parental education on civic/political participation is particularly apparent for Chinese students in Ong et al.’s (1996) study. They analyzed the racialization of Asian Americans and how this affected student perceptions of citizenship. Ong et al.’s (1996) explanation of “family biopolitics,” in which parents of wealthy Chinese families protect their children by rendering “members’ sense of moral worth in terms of relations within the family” (p. 248), proved to work against the structures that might have prevented their children from full citizenship. Included in the “family biopolitic,” was the use of children’s enrollment in United States public schools to obtain residence, therefore placing the emphasis on education in a different light.

Contextual dimensions and educational experience have been shown to affect how newcomer youth adapt, engage, and perform in school. These factors include: immigration...
histories (Rong & Preissle, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2006), teacher practice and pedagogy (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999), community networks and membership (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001; Zhou & Bankston, 1998), and family capital and parental impact (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Yosso, 2005). These factors are important considerations for a clearer understanding of how and why newcomer youth might experience the social studies in particular ways. Effective curricula and pedagogy must account for students’ cultural, linguistic, and educational contexts, in order to promote active and participatory citizenship of newcomer students.

The themes that emerged in the review of the literature included: (a) teachers’ beliefs and practices; (b) immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences; and (c) contextual influences on adaptation and achievement in school. The literature on teachers’ beliefs and practices highlighted how social studies teachers encouraged immigrant youth to engage in cross-cultural learning and discussion and acquiring English language and literacy skills. These beliefs and practices aimed for a more culturally and linguistically relevant social studies curriculum. The literature on immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in the social studies highlighted how students’ cultural contexts, prior experiences in school, and historical knowledge influence one’s understanding of social studies content. The studies revealed that immigrant students’ perceptions of history content and instruction lacked relevance and connection to their lives and prior experiences. Furthermore, the literature showed that immigrant youths’ experiences in school affect their understandings of citizenship and civic and political participation. Finally, the literature on the larger contextual factors that influence newcomer youths’ experiences outside the social studies classroom included: the history of Latino/a immigrant to the United States, teacher practice and pedagogy, community network and
membership, and family capital and parental impact, all influence how newcomers’ adapt, engage, and perform in school and therefore have the potential to affect youths’ experiences and conceptions of social studies inside the classroom.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I reviewed the literature on curricula and pedagogy for teaching Latino/a youth in the social studies. I organized the reviewed literature using three categories: (a) teachers’ beliefs and practices for teaching immigrant youth in the social studies; (b) immigrant students’ perceptions, understandings, and experiences in the social studies; and (c) contextual influences on newcomers’ adaptation and achievement in school. In the next chapter, I will discuss the methodology used for this dissertation study. I will discuss the research context, data analysis, positionality of the researcher, IRB/Human subject clearance, and limitations of the study. I will conclude with a summary of the chapter three.
III. METHODOLOGY

I examined the perspectives and decision making of four social studies teachers’ pedagogy by documenting how they are teaching Latino/a newcomer youth within urban newcomer high schools. The major research question for this study asked: How do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? I used qualitative research methods of inquiry, data collection, and analysis in this study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), and is situated through the lens of an, “interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world…attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 4). Qualitative inquiry seeks to explore the naturalistic qualities and happenings of the setting and contexts, understand the multifaceted interrelationships that exist, and analyze how these elements influence the participants’ actions and behaviors (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Stake, 1995). I employed a multi-site collective case study design (Stake, 1995), observing, interviewing, and gathering artifacts in four U.S. and Global History classrooms in various newcomer schools.

The goals of this multi-site collective case study design were to learn about and understand the “uniqueness and commonalities” of the four cases studied – four social studies teachers in four newcomer programs. The cases are instrumental in nature (Stake, 1995), as I explored how and why teachers conceptualized and implemented teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth. Each instrumental case was a “bounded system,” including four individual social studies teachers, in U.S. and Global history classrooms, in separate newcomer schools. I examined each bounded case’s “working parts” (Sake, 1995, p. 2), by explaining how each teacher taught social studies for their newcomer youth (see Chapter IV for details of each
case). The data collection techniques aimed at observing, understanding, and interpreting each case to illuminate findings of social studies practice for newcomer students.

In this chapter, I describe the research context including an explanation of the case selection, an overview of the school contexts and participants, and a description of the data collection methods. Furthermore, I describe the four phases of data analysis used: 1.) organizing and immersion in the data; 2.) coding the data and memo writing; 3.) theoretical sampling, sorting, and diagramming; and 4.) reconstructing theory. I continue with a statement of my positionality of the researcher, IRB/human subject clearance, and limitations of the study. Lastly, I conclude with a summary of the chapter.
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*Figure 5. Overview of Chapter III*
Research Context

Case Selection

I selected schools and participants using “community nomination” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 147), whereby I initially relied on members of the Teachers College, Columbia University community to suggest teachers of newcomer students. When soliciting my colleagues for suggestions, I was notified that three of the participants either: worked with our student teachers in the past, attended Teachers College at some point, and/or were personally or professionally acquainted with my colleagues. The relationship with Teachers College is significant, and perhaps creates a bias toward equity and social justice, therefore it is important to note here in the case selection. The fourth participant was contacted due to snowballing methodology (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007), where I found out about the school from one of the other participants and contacted various social studies teachers directly.

I worked to ensure, through conversations with colleagues, and through observing each teacher prior to data collection, that participants were committed to and engaged in teaching newcomer students, teaching ELL students in a social studies class dedicated to citizenship education, and teaching within a school that is committed to newcomers in its mission. I selected these categories based on my analysis of the following: the principles of CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995b); the goals for social studies education—preparing students for the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Thornton, 2008); and the argument that newcomer education is critical to meeting the unique demands of newly arrived immigrant youth—fostering the initial positive sentiments towards schooling through connecting to newcomers rich cultural and linguistic lives (Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel, 2008; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Although each case selected had similarities in terms of a
commitment to newcomers, ELLs, social studies, and citizenship education, they varied in regards to school, student, and classroom contexts.

School Contexts and Participants

After contacting and visiting over eight newcomer programs, I found four teachers who agreed to participate in this study, and all four teachers were chosen as participants for the study. I chose to include all four teachers to provide an interesting cross-case analysis given that two participants teach U.S. History and two participants teach Global History (see Table 3). Also, the schools are housed in various communities in New York City, representing three out of the five boroughs, and demographically represent highly diverse new immigrant populations.

Furthermore, newcomer schools (Short & Boyson, 2000) are unique social, cultural, and linguistic schooling environments. They provide educational opportunities that are focused on meeting the cultural, linguistic, academic, and community needs of newcomer youth (Bartlett & García, 2011). Newcomer schools also provide a safe and welcoming environment for new arrival immigrants, offering a number of services for families, students’ academic needs, health services, and technology access and training (Bartlett & García, 2011). Most newcomer programs have similar goals: to help students acquire English language skills; support content instruction in the core disciplines (Science, Math, Social Studies, and Language Arts); respond to the other local needs of students’ (specific to the area/community where the school is housed) (Short & Boyson, 2000). The newcomer schools in this study varied slightly depending on mission, structure, and organization of the school, due to student population, communities, and the overall academic goals of the school. In each school, the new arrival immigrant students were usually in the United States for six months or less.
In this section, I provide a very brief overview of each case (more in-depth analysis about each teacher can be found in Chapter IV). Three of the participant teachers are male, one is female, and all four teachers speak Spanish (one is a native Spanish speaker, Mr. Burgosvi, and the other three teachers speak varying levels of Spanish). All of the classrooms focused on teaching English through the content areas, or a type of sheltered English instruction (Cruz & Thornton, 2009), but varied in the enactment of this language model. Interestingly, three out of the four teachers served in the Peace Corps and two out of the four teachers were immigrants (Mr. Burgos is a 1st generation Mexican immigrant, and Mr. Garrett is a 2nd generation Cuban immigrant who has lived in the U.S. his entire life and whose mother is Cuban). All four teachers have a particular orientation towards and dedication to teaching newcomers. Their commitments to their newcomer students, schools, and communities are indeed noteworthy. On multiple occasions, participants mentioned that being a teacher was not just a job, but rather a way of giving back to communities, a service to the U.S., or a way of working to challenge oppressive systems in U.S. society. These are critical contexts to consider regarding the schools and participants in this study.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Linda Sanford</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mission Valley International High School</td>
<td>U.S. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeremy Sharp</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Empire International High School</td>
<td>Global History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rafael Burgos</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pacific International High School</td>
<td>Global History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Colin Garrett</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Newbridge International High School</td>
<td>U.S. History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission Valley International High School and Ms. Linda Sanford. Mission Valley International High School (MVIHS) is located in a busy, urban neighborhood and also shares its building with multiple elementary, middle, and high schools. Mission Valley seeks to provide
quality education for recently arrived immigrants. One of the goals of MVIHS is to teach English to newcomers through the content areas. There are over 50 countries represented at Mission Valley with more than 30 different languages spoken. MVIHS uses cooperative learning as its main teaching strategy, and students are frequently found sitting at tables working on projects, reading texts, and having small group discussions. The U.S. History department received an exemption for the statewide exam, and instead requires students to complete a senior portfolio to graduate.

Ms. Linda Sanford is a white woman in her mid 30’s and is originally from Massachusetts. She graduated from college in Virginia where she studied social studies education and has been teaching for over seven years. Ms. Sanford is a former AmeriCorps and Peace Corps volunteer, where she served in Paraguay as a teacher trainer for two years. This is Ms. Sanford’s third year teaching U.S. History at MVIHS and she notes this school “is a perfect fit for me […] I love the school—the different cultures, and where the students are from, and that aspect of it—and it is such a supportive administration, and no statewide exams.” Ms. Sanford feels MVIHS is a place where she is given the freedom to “do whatever I want” and is able to work with students one-on-one on literacy skills, historical content, and pushing them to support their opinions with evidence.

**Empire International High School and Mr. Jeremy Sharp.** Empire International High School (EIHS) is housed in a building with over five schools and is situated on a large campus. The sprawling campus is unusual for the city where it is housed; it was formerly the site of a large comprehensive high school that has now been broken up into smaller, boutique schools. Empire’s stated mission is to serve the academic and social needs of recently arrived young people and their families, with a particular focus on over-aged students’ English language
instruction. According to EIHS’s admission requirements, students must reside in the city and have lived in the U.S. for less than one year, be between ages 16-20, and have limited English proficiency. The school is four years old, and the classes are “inter-aged,” divided into first/second years and third/fourth year students. Students take classes as a cohort with the same group of teachers throughout the day. The demographic breakdown of EIHS is 80% Latino, 15% Black, and 5% Asian.

Mr. Jeremy Sharp, a white male in his 30’s and a former Peace Corp volunteer in Kazakhstan, has been teaching at EIHS since the school opened four years ago. Prior to coming to EIHS, Mr. Sharp taught at another newcomer school, and feels that the mission of these schools and programs aligns with his goals for teaching. He stated “you know a lot of sort of personal experience with a different culture and a different language, I think then led me to think about things, like teaching international kids.” As a certified TESOL and social studies teacher, he is dedicated to the mission of the school and is interested in having students actively participate in class, inquire about current and historical issues, and support claims with evidence. Currently, Mr. Sharp teaches Global History to 1st and 2nd year students.

Pacific International High School and Mr. Rafael Burgos. Pacific International High School (PIHS) is a small school focused on English language development for Latino students. Located in a bustling, highly diverse neighborhood, PIHS admits students who are residents of the city and have been in the U.S. for fewer than five years. Additionally, admittance to PIHS requires that students are native Spanish speakers and ELLs. PIHS has been open for 4 years, and currently there are 216 students in grades 9-11. 100% of the students at PIHS are Latino, with the majority of students being from the Dominican Republic, followed by Mexico and El Salvador. Pacific International High School’s mission is to develop students’ social, academic, and
leadership skills through collaborative, project-based, and experiential learning. The school hopes through these strategies students will develop both Spanish and English language skills in preparation for college and professional careers.

As a Mexican immigrant, Mr. Rafael Burgos connects to his students linguistically and culturally. He self-identifies as “Brown,” an ethnic identity that he believes includes all Spanish-speaking Latinos. Mr. Burgos has been a Global History teacher at PIHS for over two years. Mr. Burgos is in his late 20’s and feels as though he can identify with his students socially, culturally, and experientially, stating “At my high school we didn’t have a lot of bilingual teachers, or basically even teachers that really cared, to be honest […] I think that more than anything pushed me to teach at a school like this, because I have that experience […] it is not the same, but I think just being aware of what they face […] basically how important education is for them.” Mr. Burgos served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Costa Rica, and returns as often as he can to visit with his friends, colleagues, and family in Costa Rica.

Newbridge International High School and Mr. Colin Garrett. Newbridge International High School (NIHS) is situated in a quiet, family-friendly urban neighborhood and is housed in an older building, sharing its space with one other school. There are over 1,000 students making up grades 9-12. Roughly 57% of the students are Latino/a, and 100% of the student population is considered ELL. Admission to NIHS is based on residence within the neighborhood and new immigrant status (4 years or less) in the U.S. The primary mission of the school is to provide newcomers with a rigorous academic program that responds to their unique needs. NIHS has both Spanish and Chinese transitional bilingual programs in the social studies, and Mr. Garrett teaches content-based English as a Second Language social studies classes. NIHS is over 15 years old and has been consistently ranked as one of the top newcomer high
Mr. Colin Garrett, a U.S. history teacher is in his late 20’s, graduated with a degree in history and received his state certification in social studies from a nearby college. He has been teaching at NIHS for seven years, and when asked why he wanted to teach at this school he noted, “I really fell in love with it.” Mr. Garrett is half Cuban; his mother was born and raised in Cuba and his father was born and raised in the area. He discussed how his mother has a large influence on his desire to teach at NIHS; he explained that she spoke no English when she arrived at the age of 16 and “struggled to graduate high school and had no support system whatsoever. So to me, teaching in a place like this is a lot more than having a job and the benefits of a paycheck.” Mr. Garrett sees teaching as a way to give back, a service to his community.

Data Collection

I used qualitative methods of data collection to employ a multi-site collective case study design to observe, interview, and collect artifacts in four social studies classrooms in four newcomer schools in New York City. I chose to use these three methods of data collection to encourage validity and triangulation of the data collected (Stake, 1995). Examining four teachers in different newcomer schools encouraged a cross comparison of diverse contexts, students, programs, and instruction. The data collection techniques aimed to illuminate the unique and diverse perspectives of each case in its natural setting. This study examined the nuances of each teacher’s enacted social studies education by employing constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) of teachers’ conceptualizations and implementations of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students.

Observations. I conducted observations both inside and outside of the classroom. I observed and made mental notes of the setting, the people, the bodegas and stores, and the
atmosphere of the neighborhood as I arrived to the school for each classroom observation. This informal observation helped to set the stage for entering into the school and classroom observations (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). As I entered the school, I recorded routines, events, behaviors, student work, and documents in the school setting. These “vicarious experiences” (Stake, 1995, p. 63) helped contextualize the classroom observations, giving me a sense of what students and teachers felt like while walking into and spending time within the school walls. It also encouraged a sense of the school culture and environment for Latino/a newcomer students. For example, were school mission statements, policies, and/or announcements in only English or were postings also in Spanish and other languages? Was student work highlighted on school bulletin boards, and if so, how was student work represented and displayed? These observations made outside of classroom walls were significant and continue to be important factors in gaining a sense of the overall school environment for newcomer youth.

I observed four social studies classes, two-three times per week from September 2011-February 2012. I chose to go into classrooms two-three times per week as this gave me a clear sense of how teachers were implementing their articulated pedagogical practice for newcomer youth. I observed a total of 94 lessons across all four teachers (Mr. Sharp- 25 observations, Mr. Garrett- 24 observations, Mr. Burgos- 24 observations, Ms. Sanford- 21 observations). Class lesson varied in length from one hour to one hour and forty-five minutes. For each teacher, I focused on one particular class, as this offered consistency in the observations of one group of students in each school. I observed multiple units of study in both U.S. History and Global History classrooms, to offer multiple examples of how teachers chose to implement their curricula and numerous ways to observe how they constructed their pedagogies. Observing multiple units of study offered flexibility in historical content and strategies used, and
illuminated how teachers thought about their curricula and pedagogy within and across various subject matters, grade-level, and students’ length of stay in the United States.

In some settings I took the role of “complete observer,” whereby the researcher “does not participate in activities at the setting,” and views the classroom and the teacher’s practices “through a one-way mirror” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 91), having no interaction with the students and teacher during the lesson. However, in other classrooms, the teacher encouraged interaction between the students and me, and often I walked around the room talking and working with students. This role as a researcher varied depending on the teacher’s instruction and comfort with my interaction with students during the lesson.

During classroom observations I took detailed notes on a laptop for the purpose of understanding how the teacher employed their U.S. or Global History curriculum (See Appendix A: Observation Protocol), whether the teacher enacted elements of culturally relevant pedagogy, how students engaged in the content and instruction, and how general behaviors (verbal and nonverbal interactions, active and non-active participation) affected the classroom environment. The overall goal of the classroom observations was to take notes on “events and interactions” during the lessons (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 140) noting how the teacher enacted their conceptualized U.S. or Global History curricular content, implemented various pedagogical strategies in the social studies classroom (noting culturally relevant teaching), and how students interacted with and responded to the enacted pedagogy.

**Interviews.** I conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews one-on-one with each teacher, roughly once per week, ranging anywhere from 20-60 minutes. I conducted a total of 39 interviews (Mr. Sharp- 11 interviews, Mr. Garrett- 12 interviews, Mr. Burgos- 7 interviews, Ms. Sanford- 9 interviews). The decision to conduct interviews each week was not only to ask
broader questions, but also to reflect with teachers about how they thought lessons went and whether their curricular goals were being met for the week. These interviews elicited deep exploration and understanding of each participant’s teaching and educational background, philosophical foundations in social studies, incorporation of students’ culture and language in the curriculum, conceptualization of social studies for newcomer Latino/a students, pedagogical strategies for Latino/a newcomer students, and citizenship education for newcomers (See Appendix B: Interview Protocol).

Due to the nature of qualitative research, interviews were conducted face-to-face and in each teacher’s “natural setting,” which varied depending on the case. These settings included the teacher’s classrooms, workrooms, or offices (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 91). The goals of each interview were to develop a deeper understanding of the “multiple realities” (Stake, 1995, p. 64) the participants were experiencing in their class lessons, including student learning, others contexts (i.e. school-wide constraints or policies), curricular goals, and content, in order to encourage a nuanced description, analysis, and interpretation of each case.

Interviews most often took place after observations, and varied as to whether they occurred after the first or second observation that week. Sometimes interviews skipped a week, due to changes in the teacher’s schedule, the school schedule, and/or the teacher not feeling particularly well that day or week. If interviews skipped a week, they were usually conducted the following week for a longer period of time (roughly 45-60 minutes versus 20-30 minutes). While some interviews remained close to the interview protocol, others took a relatively unstructured path due to something the teacher was particularly interested in discussing that day, something I was fascinated by in the lesson, or curricular items I was curious or wanted more information about from the teacher.
Overall, interviews became more unstructured as the semester progressed, either due to researcher-participant comfort and/or as the teachers became more familiar with the interviews and enjoyed the time to reflect on their practice. For the most part, I listened more than talked (Merriam, 1998), but if there were items I was particularly interested in, I asked participants to expand on their ideas or extrapolate on what they meant about certain terms/concepts. For example, often I asked further about items referencing Latino/a newcomer students’ academic success, cultural competence, critical consciousness, language knowledge/skills, or citizenship. My commentary as a researcher was limited, and the interviews focused mostly on participants’ responses, as I wanted them to reflect on items that were important to them regarding their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students.

Artifact Collection. I collected artifacts, including teacher created materials, student work, photographs, and school/official documents to help contextualize the observations and interviews conducted, and illuminate more factual information through analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Teacher-created materials collected included curricular and lesson plans, handouts/unit packets, texts, PowerPoints, quizzes, tests, project guidelines, and websites. Student work included projects, completed handouts/packets, tests/quizzes, class notes, and other written work. School/official documents included mission statements, handouts home, and school-wide/district-wide curricular plans. Lastly, I took photographs of the classroom layout, bulletin boards, discussion protocols, classroom rules, posted quotes/images/posters, word walls, and student projects. Bogdan & Biklen (2007) state that artifacts can provide factual information and offer a curricular context for instruction that might be implemented in the social studies classroom. Gaining the background knowledge of classroom artifacts, often made for a clearer understanding of the situation, experience, and context informing observations and interviews,
helping to make sense of what my participants were saying, explaining, or experiencing in particular situations.

**Data Analysis**

In employing an instrumental multi-site collective case study design, I sought to understand, in each case’s naturalistic setting and with a holistic perspective (Stake, 1995), how teachers conceptualize and implement their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. In addition to these case study design goals, I also desired to construct an understanding of the meanings and actions of my participant teachers’ pedagogies by analyzing the data collected through grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). In this section I will discuss the four data analysis phases used in this study to analyze the data collected, answer the research questions, and construct grounded theory. The phases of data analysis are drawn from qualitative research methodologists including: Bogdan & Biklen (2007); Charmaz (2006); Marshall & Rossman (2011); and Stake (1995). The data analysis phases included: 1.) organizing and immersion in the data; 2.) coding the data and memo writing; 3.) theoretical sampling, sorting, and diagramming; and 4.) reconstructing theory.

**Phase One: Organizing and Immersion of the Data**

During and after data collection, I spent some time organizing the data. I created folders for each participant with dated interviews, observations, and artifacts. After creating folders for each teacher, I developed an Excel spreadsheet titled, “data collection inventory,” that included a record of all of the data collected (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). As I began coding the data, I used the inventory to make notes about what was included in each observation and interview. These notes were used as a reference throughout data analysis and writing when looking for key items, phrases, or moments captured in the data.
After organizing the data, I transcribed all of the interviews by hand and revisited the observation field notes, making sure they were clear and readable enough to enter into immersion and coding phases of data analysis. Once the data was clear and organized, I began reading and re-reading interviews and observations, to get further acquainted with the data. As I knew my goal was to examine teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, ideas, and actions, I made notes of categories and themes I felt were emerging very early on in the data analysis stages based on these principles. I created a chart with emerging themes and data I felt related to these themes, such as “conceptualizing academic success,” “using culture and language,” and “notions of citizenship.” Becoming familiar with the data, immersing myself in interviews and observation field notes, and revisiting what participants had said, helped make the data collected feel more manageable and workable as I entered into phase two: coding and memo writing.

**Phase Two: Coding the Data and Memo Writing**

Observation field-notes and interview transcripts were coded using inductive data analysis (Patton, 2002) and employed grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) through initial line-by-line coding for emergent themes, focused coding for developing categories, axial coding for linking the developing categories, and theoretical coding to generate theoretical relationships within and between developing categories (see Table 4). Constructing grounded theory encourages the researcher to “make sense of their [participants’] experiences…[and] begin to make sense of their meanings and actions” (Charmaz, 2006, p, 11). Initial line-by-line coding took place soon after data was collected and transcribed, allowing for codes to emerge and categories to be considered when engaging in ongoing data analysis.

Initial line-by-line coding involved naming each word, line, or segment of the data in interview transcripts. I looked for actions in the data, therefore tried to use gerunds and *in vivo*
codes (or codes of participants’ actual terms/words), to support “enacted processes” and avoid “static topics” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 136). This process worked toward actively theorizing throughout the data analysis process. These initial coding phases are particularly important in constructing grounded theory, as the goal is to “build your analysis step-by-step from the ground up without taking off on theoretical flight of fancy” (p. 51). Coding participants’ words and phrases unearthed details and nuanced understandings of what teachers were thinking and doing at the very micro level of analysis, which might have been missed if coded holistically or by chunking the data.

After initially using line-by-line coding of observation field notes, I began coding using incident-to-incident coding. Incident-to-incident coding was used to allow for learning what “our research participants view as problematic and begin to treat it [the observations] analytically” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 47). I felt it was more useful to see what events and incidents were taking place in the observations, and not focus on the minute classroom routines and procedures, but rather to analyze how the teacher implemented their social studies pedagogy in various moments throughout the lesson. During the initial phases of data analysis, I wrote memos on emerging themes for each participant. These memos encouraged continual analysis of the data throughout the coding process. Seeing and working through emerging themes early on supported moving forward in analysis and interpretation of the data collected (Charmaz, 2005). For example, memos discussed themes including, “meeting the students where they are” or “creating a community of learners.”

Focused coding was the second phase of coding wherein more salient or significant (Charmaz, 2006) initial codes were selected to help sort, synthesize, and make sense of the large amount of data analyzed. Focused codes were used to begin to develop categories in the data
analyzed looking for emerging themes and moments. While these phases of coding might seem linear, I frequently went back and forth between line-by-line and focused coding as themes were emerging, to re-examine early analysis of the data. As categories emerged from the data, axial coding was used to link the categories and “to give coherence to the emerging analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). The organizational structural of the axial coding can take shape in various ways, and might include components such as conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Axial coding was used to find connective properties in emerging categories and themes. I developed various categorical codes through constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2006), wherein I compared focused codes across participants to look for connections and emerging themes. Examples of categorical codes, generated from linking focused codes, included setting context, situated context, explaining perspectives and philosophies, enacting pedagogical strategies, and building relationships. Further, core categorical codes, which act as the “hub of a wheel […] [or] the central defining aspects of the phenomenon” (Merriam, 2009, p. 200), began to emerge. For example, these emerging core categories included culture, language, and citizenship. Although I created these categorical codes, I wanted to keep the analysis open, and did not rely only on these codes when theorizing the data. I used these categorical codes as suggested by Bogdan & Biklen (2009), Charmaz (2006), and Merriam (2009) to help sort out large amounts of data.

Furthermore, I employed theoretical coding by using the developed categorical codes to think about how the various categories might link together to develop theoretical constructs. The goal of theoretical coding was to develop larger emerging themes and generate theoretical relationships within and between categories (Charmaz, 2006). Theoretical constructs included
“orientations” and “knowledge and skills” of social studies teachers’ pedagogies for Latino/a newcomer youth. These theoretical constructs supported an organization schema for developing grounded theories of teachers’ pedagogies.

Categorical codes with examples of theoretical constructs (in parentheses) and focused codes (in quotations) are stated here: 1) setting context (i.e. school mission/vision, student demographic information—“describing school mission” or “explaining student demographics”), 2) situating context (i.e. teachers’ orientations for teaching in a particular setting/context—“connecting to learning a new language” or “teaching experience”); 3) explaining perspectives and philosophies (i.e. teachers’ orientations for teaching social studies and Latino/a newcomer youth—“seeing history as controversy” or “accessing students’ linguistic backgrounds”); 4) enacting pedagogical strategies (i.e. teachers’ knowledge and skills for teaching social studies and Latino/a newcomer youth—“doing group work” or “using voice”); and 5) building relationships (i.e. teachers’ connections to students, schools, and communities—“creating community of learners” or “building confianza (mutual trust)”).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) Initial coding: Emerging themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Focused coding: Developing categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.) Axial coding: Linking developing categorical codes- i.e. contexts, philosophies, pedagogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.) Axial coding: Linking developing core categories- i.e. culture, language, citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.) Theoretical coding: Developing theoretical constructs- i.e. orientations, knowledge &amp; skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase Three: Theoretical Sorting, Diagramming, and Integrating
One of the key attributes of grounded theory is to develop theory from a naturalistic, inductive interpretation of the collected data. Theoretical sorting, diagramming, and integrating are data analysis techniques that encourage theory development by using relevant and pertinent data analyzed through coding and memo-writing to construct emerging theories from the data (Charmaz, 2006). This process includes further analysis and interpretation of the constructed categories chosen for the developing theory(ies). Theoretical sorting occurred by theorizing the interconnected properties of the categorical codes and theoretical constructs by sorting memos, comparing categories, and analyzing chunked data. For example, in theorizing the categories “situating contexts” and “explaining perspectives and philosophies,” the theoretical construct “orientations,” emerged from teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Using clustering and diagramming, I organized the categories that emerged from the data in order to develop an organizational frame to conceptualize the collected data. I did this by examining how categories formed connective properties, and explored whether new properties emerged, to help focus my analysis and encourage a coherence of the collected data to begin writing the theoretical framework.

**Phase Four: Reconstructing Theory**

Grounded theory method encourages researchers’ “persistent interaction with their data, while remaining constantly involved in their emerging analyses” (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p.1). It allows for the collected data to construct and reconstruct theory, and provide explanations about relevant theory through data analysis. In conducting constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006), I extrapolated conceptual categories from each case, compared and theorized how these categories connected and integrated with one another, and generated theoretical constructs relating to teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, ideas, and actions about social studies education.
for Latino/a newcomer youth. The goal of phase four, reconstructing theory, is to move “the particular to the more general” (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p. 15), and construct grounded theories from the emerging themes analyzed and interpreted from the teachers’ pedagogies.

Culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) (Ladson-Billings, 1994) was used as the initial theoretical framework to inform my views regarding how four social studies teachers enacted their social studies pedagogy; however, the tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy “remain[ed] in the background” until they became apparent in the data analysis phases and theorizing of categorical codes (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169). During data analysis, additional theories of pedagogies emerged to clarify how and why teachers’ constructed meanings of and actions in (Charmaz, 2006) their social studies pedagogy. The grounded theory in this study seeks to refine, extend, and challenge (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169) the theoretical concepts highlighted in the CRP framework. The cross-case discussion in Chapter V will focus on the intersection of each theoretical framework in the emerging grounded theory, culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education, and provide the various principles of the reconstructed theory of social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth emerging from this study (examples of emerging principles include: pedagogy of community, pedagogy of success, and pedagogy of building a language of social studies).

Positionality of the Researcher

As a middle-class, white, Christian, woman, who grew up in South East Asia and Virginia as well as taught in Puerto Rico, I possess multiple identities which connect not only to my “internal state,” but also to my “performance in society” (Gee, 2000, p.99). Thus, my identity is grounded in my “core,” or an intimate, visceral, and deeply personal space that is often very difficult to explain. This “core” is sometimes conflicted with how society has constructed who I
am and where I belong, often based on race and gender. These noted conflicting “states,” one that is “internal” and the other how society deems my “performance” within it, greatly affect how I enter into the research on teaching Latino/a newcomer students.

As a white woman, who identifies with so much more than “being white,” I find it difficult to explain to people how I feel when I say, “I am passionate about working with immigrant populations in urban educational environments.” People immediately say, “oh interesting, and how did that come about?” I always launch into a story about where I grew up (South East Asia), and how I felt when I moved to the “States” for the first time (Richmond, Virginia) when I was 15 years old. I felt like I didn’t fit in. I feel like I still don’t fit in. People always asked me when I moved to Virginia, “why don’t you feel like you fit in, you look and talk like us?” It wasn’t until I moved to and taught in San Juan, Puerto Rico, that I felt like things began to come together. I felt “at home” in Puerto Rico, and still do. I don’t know if it is the Latin culture, the island food and flair, the Spanish language, the incredible passion for life, or the complicated status as Commonwealth that Puerto Rico currently holds. Puerto Rico’s commonwealth status was intended to be temporary, but has a very strong grip on the island and its people. Puerto Rico’s status comes with U.S. citizenship, but it is not quite “full citizenship.” Puerto Ricans can’t vote in U.S. Presidential elections, they are not a state, and therefore, don’t reap those benefits; however, they are expected to serve in the U.S. military and use U.S. currency. Many people on the island don’t identify with the English language or North American culture – even though large U.S.-based corporations like Burger King, Walmart, and Costco have infiltrated Puerto Rico. It is this status, an in between or perhaps a dual U.S. and Puerto Rican citizen, which I have always felt strongly connected to.
I am a U.S. citizen, and always have always been, like most Puerto Ricans living on the island (as Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship in 1917 due to the Jones Act). However, I don’t fully identify with what it means to be a U.S. citizen, as I was only born here, and did not move to the “States” until I was going into 10th grade. How one identifies as a U.S. citizen intrigues me, as I saw my students and friends on the island negotiate this daily when discussing politics, the economy, and going back and forth to either New York City, Orlando, or Chicago because many of their family members lived and worked “on the mainland.” What does it mean to be a U.S. citizen and how do people identify as a citizen? Citizen of where? For whom? How? And Why? These questions guide my work with newcomer youth, as it is their experiences and journeys [like mine] that have shaped the concept of citizen, the “feeling(s)” of belonging, and/or the motivation to take action (personally, socially, or civically (Banks, 2008)). It is the feeling of having a sense of belonging to multiple spaces, places, communities, nations, cities, towns, and families that connects me to my Puerto Rican friends, transnational immigrants, and newcomer students with whom I identify on so many levels, yet look and talk differently, and am constantly asked by society, how are we similar? If only I could explain it, but I can’t. It’s a feeling within, a deep, visceral connection that I can only explain when I see it, hear it, smell it, or feel it. It is these moments where I say- “that’s it. That’s why I do what I do.” It is the small moments, like when a student who recently moved to New York City from the Dominican Republic comes up to me during an observation and says, Miss, usted puede ayudarme con esta pregunta [Miss, can you help me with this question]?” It is the connection and mutual trust that is building between the two of us, when I know this is where I need to be.

While it is these small moments that I love, it is the most difficult moments when I need to figure out how best to articulate these happenings, and find myself struggling with how to
represent the amazing students and their teachers in a way that is not essentializing and not perpetuating stereotypes about immigrant populations in New York City (Tillman, 2002). My goal, rather, is to highlight their local, social, and experiential knowledge, and articulate how important understanding and tapping into that knowledge is when developing a thriving and fluid classroom environment (Yosso, 2005). I desire to forefront teachers and students’ experiences in a way that the youth and their teachers would be proud of showcasing and want to share, but are also open to my analysis and are aware that it is constructed through who I am and my multiple and shifting identities. I want what they say, do, and how they interact to be analyzed in those particular moments. For readers to understand the context of these moments and how it is impossible to replicate them, but important to acknowledge, highlight, and take from them a way to grow and learn using one’s own experiences and understandings as a spring board toward creating their own small, large, exciting, or difficult moments. These are important negotiations in the research process and thus important to consider in my researcher positionality.

I acknowledge my own histories, experiences, and contexts will influence how I observe, recall, analyze, interpret, and represent the data collected and my participants’ experiences regarding teaching Latino/a newcomer youth. For example, as a woman who has grown up in South East Asia, I recognize that I have a global worldview and stress the notions of global citizenship in my role as a teacher, researcher, and active participant in society. Based on my experiences, I see all learners as citizens of both the U.S. and the world and through social studies education I wish to move towards a more just and equal society that promotes success and achievement for all youth encompassing race, class, gender, sexualities, religion, language, and ethnic identities.
Having taught in a highly diverse ethnic and cultural environment, I have always wanted to include my students’ perspectives, cultures, languages, and community backgrounds in my curriculum. I want to implement curricular and pedagogical material that works to empower students “intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” to move from “bridging or explaining the dominant culture” to representing diverse cultures in the “curriculum in their own right” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 18). Considering my personal perspectives, assumptions, and social constructions, I am aware that I will view the immigrant student as exceptional in how they see the world, interact with others, understand the community, conceptualize citizenship, and engage in cross-cultural experiences. In my own experiences as a third-cultural kid (or a child who lived overseas growing up), teaching Latino/a students, and observing/interacting with newcomer youth, I assume that there is an explicit cultural knowledge (Yosso, 2005) that newcomer youth embody that needs to be explored in the social studies classroom. These notions are representative of how I envision the enacted social studies curriculum and pedagogy.

In positioning my views on teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, this greatly impacts not only how I see and analyze the data collected, but also impacts my relationship with the teachers in this study. While I believe a teacher’s conceptions and implementations of their pedagogies is fluid and dynamic, rather than static and fixed, I acknowledge that they will also have a particular positionality toward teaching newcomers and I desired to learn and understand how and why these conceptions existed. In order for this opening up of teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, ideas, and actions to take place, I dedicated myself during field work to providing the space to offer moments of reflection on her/his pedagogy, particularly to wonder why she/he saw knowledge a particular way, for whom, and for what outcome(s).
This reflective space looked differently for each participant. For one of the teachers, Mr. Garrett, it included a cup of coffee and an open discussion about what he was thinking and feeling. For others, like Ms. Sanford, it was more formal and she found comfort in having structured questions to guide the discussion. Navigating these varying relationships with each of my participants was exciting, but challenging at the outset; however, I think I can confidently say I developed a positive and supportive relationship with each teacher. Having also taught secondary social studies prior to my data collection, I know what it is like to need every single moment during the day to talk with students, lesson plan, call parents, or meet with administrators. Therefore, I constantly thanked my participants for their time and energy and sincerely appreciated their honest reflections and discussions of their pedagogy.

Overall, each teacher enjoyed the process for various reasons, either because she was interested in the outcome, (as Ms. Sanford noted, “You are very welcome, and I am very interested to see how this all comes out in the end”) or because he enjoyed the process of reflecting on his teaching during the semester (as Mr. Burgos said “I’ve enjoyed it!”). This relationship building was important when collecting data, as it provided a time for teachers to talk about their practice in an open and non-judgmental environment. I often mentioned to the teachers prior to observations, “I want to learn from you, so just do your thing.” I think these notions are grounded in my desire to work towards eliminating the power that researchers have over the researched. In this case, offering an open space to talk and be observed without me interjecting or inserting my options reduced this power. I believe, if this power can be greatly reduced and rest mostly in the hands of both the researcher and the researched communities, then a more authentic or valid narrative of the participants’ responses will be visible.
The purpose of this research is grounded in the notions of culturally sensitive research (Tillman, 2002), which recognizes ethnicity and culture as fundamental to the research process. Tillman (2002) emphasized the need to acknowledge a culture’s “varied historical and contemporary experiences” (p.3) such as language, unique experiences and relationships with others, and positive contributions, and to place this knowledge at the center of the research inquiry. Moreover, as Tillman discussed, I sought to uncover and discover the multiple realities of the community’s experiences, which included an investigation and analysis of the root of various social, political, and economic injustices experienced by the researched community. Therefore, highlighted throughout this study are the diverse cultural experiences within the Latino community—historically and contemporarily. Central to culturally responsive research is reciprocity: interacting with the community for which the work is for, a discussion of why I am doing this work, and how I might give back to the community from which this work has been taken (Tillman, 2002). These items are vital to the research process, and I am continually reflecting on notions of reciprocity throughout the data collection, analysis, interpretation, and representation of the findings.

In examining my multiple and competing personal identities, my assumptions on teaching and learning for culturally and linguistically diverse groups, and my desire to practice culturally sensitive research, I must acknowledge that in the research on Latino/a immigrants I entered the study as an outsider. Collins (1986) describes Black feminist thought as situated in the Black female’s status as “outside within.” In attempting to understand Collins’ framework, it is the unique place of the Black female scholar to take the role of “outsider within” because of the historical and sociocultural experiences one has encountered. Therefore, as a white female researcher, I have not experienced being marginalized historically, culturally, academically, and
economically. Actually, quite the opposite is true; the white female has historically, as well as presently, participated in the marginalization of various groups.

Furthermore, as a conversational Spanish-speaker, I hoped to gain a different status as an “external insider,” who is not an “indigenous member to the community,” but rather has had experiences that “endorse perspectives held by those who are indigenous to the community” (Sleeter, 2000, p. 236). For example, I hoped my experiences living and teaching in Latin American, understanding and speaking conversational Spanish, and feeling deeply connected to Latino culture might blur the insider/outsider binary (Roegman, et al., 2012). My goal as an external insider, when researching Latino/a newcomers, is to challenge and interrupt the marginalization enacted by my social group, by sharing how the cultural and experiential knowledge(s) of Latino/a newcomer youth are used as assets in teachers’ social studies pedagogies.

**IRB/Human Subject Clearance**

This study is sensitive to the risks of human subjects research and followed the necessary requirements set forth by the Teachers College, Columbia University Internal Review Board and human subject clearance as required by the New York City Department of Education’s Proposal Review Committee. I informed my participants of the purposes of the study, their voluntary participation, the extent of the study, the protection of their identity, and the minimal risks to participating in the study. Furthermore, I obtained written consent from all participants and administrators prior to conducting field-based research. I ensured my subject’s confidentiality by changing the names of all people and places in field notes and transcripts, replacing original names with pseudonyms to protect their identity, and stripping all identifying markers from written documents (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).
The issues of validity in this study included protecting the identity of the participants, analyzing and interpreting observations and interviews, demonstrating that my interpretations of the data are trustworthy, and presenting the data so that it is useful for the broader community (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). In order to ensure validity, I plan to conduct a member check with my participants on how I interpreted the data, prior to sharing it with the larger social studies and research community in publications. Furthermore, I continuously reflected on my analysis and writing to ensure the participants are accurately represented and all elements of the research process are examined and critiqued (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study include a small sample size, not clearly knowing the students’ understanding and perspectives of their teacher’s enacted pedagogy, and my researcher positionality. Due to the qualitative nature of the study, centering on four teachers’ conceptualizations and implementations of social studies pedagogy, I do not intend to generalize its findings, as the study is bounded and situated in particular contexts and in particular settings (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Furthermore, I examine in-depth how teachers make sense of their pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students; therefore, generalizability of the findings is not the aim of this work. However, I offer examples, takeaways, and implications that might be considered in other contexts, communities, and schools with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Another limitation of this study is that I focus on teachers’ conceptions and implementations of social studies education and do not explore students’ perceptions and understandings of the enacted social studies curriculum. I made the choice to focus on teachers in this dissertation study to establish a foundation for and emerging grounded theory of how
teachers conceptualize and implement social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students, prior to examining how newcomer youth make sense of social studies education. Additional scholarship on newcomer youth and social studies education would benefit from interviews with Latino/a newcomer students about their understanding and experiences of the enacted social studies curriculum as well as how they conceptualize citizenship as newcomer youth. Including the voices and experiences of Latino/a newcomer youth would add to the richness of this data and potentially illuminate whether the pedagogical goals and decision-making of the enacted curricula impacted students’ learning and understanding of the material. Additionally, speaking with Latino/a students might also illuminate another limitation of this study, an analysis of the nuances of culture and difference within the Latino/a community. There is much intercultural diversity within and among the Latino/a communities in New York City, and speaking with students about this diversity might add a layer of texture to this work and further contextualize Latino/a newcomer students’ experiences and perspectives of social studies education and citizenship.

Lastly, my positionality toward culturally sensitive research and the importance of newcomer education raises a limitation on how I see and interpret the data. I acknowledge that there is a difference between the ideal and the real, and do not offer an objective stance of what I think is important and what is actually happening in the field. Furthermore, it should be clearly stated that I think the education of newcomer youth in the United States should be one of our primary educational goals. My position and attitude toward the importance of this research on the education of immigrants, and the importance of rendering how teachers conceptualize and implement teaching for and with this community, are important researcher contexts to consider and a limitation of this study.
Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the methodology employed for this qualitative, multi-site collective case study (Stake, 1995) of four teachers conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. I described the research context including case selection, school context and participations, and data collection. Collected data involved observing, interviewing, and gathering artifacts in four U.S. and Global History classrooms in various newcomer schools. Next, I explained analyzing the data collected through grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) using four phases: (1) organizing and immersion of the data, (2) coding the data and memo writing, (3) theoretical sorting, diagramming, and integrating, and (4) reconstructing theory. After describing the data analysis employed, I discussed my positionality as the researcher, IRB/Human subject clearance, limitations of the study, and concluded with a chapter summary.

In the next chapter, I will examine the contexts and findings of the four cases in this study: Ms. Linda Sanford and Mission Valley International High School; Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School; Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School; and Mr. Colin Garrett and Newbridge International High School. I will examine each case, answering the major research question for this study, how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? In Chapter V, I will present cross-case themes, based on the findings discussed in Chapter IV, which theorize the intersections of culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship.
IV: FINDINGS

In this chapter, I examine the contexts of four cases: Ms. Linda Sanford and Mission Valley International High School; Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School; Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School; and Mr. Colin Garrett and Newbridge International High School. I also answer the major research question for this study: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? The contexts I examine for each case include teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and a lesson observation vignette. In the case study findings section, I highlight two emerging themes regarding how each teacher (a) conceptualized their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth, and (b) implemented their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

The emerging themes in each case study findings section also answer the following subsidiary research questions: how does the teacher conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does the teacher implement social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does the teacher conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? To organize the case study findings, I use the theoretical underpinnings and constructions of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) (Ladson-Billings, 1995b), linguistically responsive teaching (LRT) (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), and active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billing, 2004). The broad propositions of CRP overlap and intersect with the categories developed for LRT and the conceptions of active and engaged citizenship, and are used in each theme as theoretical constructs to guide the organizational framework. The broad propositions and theoretical constructs include: “conceptions of self and others” and “conceptions of social relations” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b)
as orientations or the inclination toward “ideas and actions” (Lucas and Villegas, 2010, p. 302) influenced by teachers’ philosophical attitudes and beliefs; and “conceptions of knowledge” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) as the implementation of knowledge and skills or pedagogical ideas and actions to facilitate learning for Latino/a newcomer youth. Furthermore, I explore how the teachers’ orientations and knowledge and skills encourage Latino/a newcomer students’ to acquire and learn the civic and political knowledge, attitudes, and skills by considering youths’ cultural, linguistic, and civic assets for active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billing, 2004).

According to Ladson-Billings (1995b), the broad propositions intend to highlight commonalities of culturally relevant teachers’ “beliefs and ideologies” (p. 478) as well as identify how they exemplify principles of CRP: academic success, cultural competence, and sociopolitical consciousness. Furthermore, Lucas & Villegas (2010) posit that the orientations of linguistically responsive teaching are essential and “without attending to them, teachers are not prepared to embrace and apply the necessary knowledge and skills” (p. 302). I examine, therefore, how teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions show overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for newcomer youth. In each case’s themes, I use the theoretical constructs of orientations and knowledge and skills. Examining these constructs as they apply to culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education I will highlight how each teacher conceptualized and implemented teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer students.

In this chapter, I begin by discussing the contexts for each case, then move into the case study’s findings by answering the major and subsidiary research questions in the study. I conclude chapter IV with a summary of the chapter’s findings. In chapter V, I will highlight
cross-case themes based on the findings discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, in the next chapter, I further develop the emerging grounded theory for this study, and answer the final subsidiary question: what new theories emerge from the social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Chapter IV:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1: Ms. Linda Sanford and Mission Valley International High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Observation Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualizing Social Studies Pedagogy for Latino/a Newcomer Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Social Studies Pedagogy for Latino/a Newcomer Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2: Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same format as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3: Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same format as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4: Mr. Colin Garrett and Newbridge International High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same format as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6. Overview of Chapter IV**

**Case 1: Ms. Linda Sanford and Mission Valley International High School**

In this section, I discuss the context and findings of the case on Ms. Linda Sanford at Mission Valley International High School (MVIHS). I describe the context of the case, including teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and lesson vignette, in order to better understand how Ms. Sanford conceptualized and implemented her social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. I finish the section with a summary of case one on Ms. Linda Sanford at Mission Valley International High School.

**Ms. Linda Sanford**

Ms. Sanford, a white woman in her mid 30’s from Massachusetts, graduated from college
in Virginia where she studied social studies education. She taught for over seven years in Honduras, Paraguay, and New York City. Ms. Sanford volunteered for AmeriCorps and the Peace Corps, where she served in Paraguay as a teacher trainer for two years. During the time between serving in AmeriCorps and the Peace Corps, Ms. Sanford taught high school in New York City, was a career counselor, and taught English in Honduras. Her time as a volunteer greatly impacted her views on teaching newcomer students and social studies education, especially given her leadership positions, training opportunities, interactions with many different youth and adults, and commitment to service.

Ms. Sanford taught U.S. History at MVIHS for three years, and noted this school, “is a perfect fit for me […] I love the school- the different cultures, and where the students are from, and that aspect of it- and it is such a supportive administration, and no Regents [statewide] exams.” She described MVIHS as fitting perfectly with all of her past experiences, and felt supported at the school by other faculty, staff, and the administration. Ms. Sanford felt Mission Valley was a place where she was given the opportunity and “freedom to do whatever I want,” regarding curricular and pedagogical decision-making. She explained:

[…] basically, I follow the curriculum, roughly, that previous teachers had done before I came to this school, and it all follows the New York State Scope and Sequence and now it’s aligning to the Common Core and all of those things, but basically those- those are the things I think about afterwards, I think, because I know that what I’m doing meets some standards.

Having the “freedom” to make decisions, yet feel as though she was still meeting statewide standards, allowed her to go more in-depth into the social studies content and provided the time and space for highly scaffolded instruction and ongoing assessment of students’ linguistic levels. Ms. Sanford frequently worked one-on-one with her students to support numerous skill-based goals, including literacy skills (i.e. speaking, reading, writing, listening), historical thinking, and
gathering evidence to support opinions (these pedagogies are further discussed in the findings section).

Furthermore, these curricular and pedagogical freedoms allowed Ms. Sanford to engage in one of the most important elements of her pedagogical practice: connecting with and supporting her students. She explained her newcomer students “perform at such a high level […] because I have the time for them to really learn a lot and go in-depth into these issues.” Overall, Ms. Sanford had a sincere pride and admiration for her students and the school, noting: “it is amazing, and these kids especially- who four or five years ago couldn’t speak English […] now, they are able to get up and defend their presentations [senior portfolio].” Ms. Sanford’s prior teaching experiences, commitment to service, and admiration for her newcomer students helped create a particular context for conceptualizing and implementing social studies education for Latino/a newcomer youth.

**Mission Valley International High School**

Mission Valley International High School (MVIHS), located in a busy, urban neighborhood, shares its building with multiple elementary, middle, and high schools. Mission Valley seeks to provide quality education for recently arrived immigrants through teaching English to newcomer youth through the content areas. Their stated mission to “develop in each of our new learners of English the linguistic, cognitive, and cultural skills necessary for informed and creative participation in our diverse society” (MVIHS, 2013), has worked to create and support a community of learners for newcomers over the past twenty years.

MVIHS prides itself on a being a small learning community that is collaborative, respectful, and interdisciplinary. The school believes that its mission and pedagogy contributes to its high student attendance (90%) and low dropout rates (5%). Furthermore, the school believes
the teaching of English through a content-based English as a Second Language approach (ESL) has been proven successful, showing that students are moving toward English language proficiency (24% versus 16% at similar schools), and continues to provide evidence of making gains toward improving English language acquisition (91% versus 71% at similar schools) (MVIHS, 2013). One specific way Mission Valley supports students’ learning of English through the content areas is partaking in “language-day” once per week for all students. The purpose of language day is to focus on explicit English language instruction in all content-area classrooms.

The main pedagogical strategy used at MVIHS is cooperative learning, and one often finds students sitting at tables working on projects, reading texts, and engaging in small group discussions. Grade levels (9-12) are organized into teaching teams consisting of a faculty member from each discipline area (math, social studies, science, and English). Each team includes roughly 60-75 students. Teams are divided into three different classes of about 20-25 students (MVIHS, 2013). Teams work together to discuss curriculum, pedagogy, and student cases each week, fostering a community of collaboration focused on meeting students’ unique needs and interests.

MVIHS (along with other members of a consortium of schools) receives waivers from the state exempting their students from taking the statewide exam (in all subject areas except English). Students are required to complete a senior portfolio to graduate in lieu of the exam. The portfolio consists of various written documents from each of the subject areas: math, science, and social studies, as well as a personal writing piece and the student’s resume. Students must defend their portfolios in an hour-long presentation to a panel of teachers. Ms. Sanford described the process as “really intense, the kids prepare all year long for it. And each teacher is assigned a couple of kids that they mentor throughout the year.” Due to this requirement and preparation,
students spend the year in her U.S. History class writing and working on three papers, from
which they then choose one they would like to include in their senior portfolio. The preparation,
research, and writing of the essays greatly impacted Ms. Sanford’s instruction; however, she
appreciated this form of assessment explaining, “the ones I have seen [portfolio presentations]
are fantastic and really demonstrate what you’re supposed to demonstrate when you graduate
from high school- the idea that, ‘yes I have learned, and yes I have thought about these things in
an interesting way,’ and so I really like that aspect of the school.”

**Students at Mission Valley International High School**

Approximately 310 students, representing over 50 countries, attend MVIHS. There are
over 40 native languages spoken, including Arabic (12 students), Bengali (15), Mandarin
Chinese (28), French (32), Polish (13), and Spanish (111). Students come from various countries
including Bangladesh (15 students), China (62), Dominican Republic (43), Ecuador (16), Mexico
(13), Poland (12), Senegal (17), and Yemen (7), and many others. Students can participate in
athletic programs through the public school athletic league, playing on teams with students from
all over the city.

Ms. Linda Sanford’s U.S. History class “C” represented the demographic and linguistic
make-up of the school. Class “C” had 20 students, eight of whom were Latina. Other countries
and regions represented in this class included: Yemen, Russia, Philippines, Ecuador, Peru,
Bulgaria, Bangladesh, Poland, Dominican Republic, West Africa, Pakistan, Ethiopia, and
Mexico. Ms. Sanford organized her class into six heterogeneous (linguistic) groups of three to
four students, and changed the groups every three to four weeks, depending on how groups were
working together. The frequent re-organizing of groups also offered students a chance to work
with different peers. Students’ linguistic levels in the class varied slightly, although they were
mostly on the same level given that they were all in 11\textsuperscript{th} grade. While most students had been at Mission Valley since 9\textsuperscript{th} grade, a few students had recently arrived within the last year. When students arrive, they took English language proficiency exams to assess their grade level placement; therefore, students in the 11\textsuperscript{th} grade were required to have higher English language levels than students in the ninth or tenth grades at MVIHS.

The eight Latina students in Ms. Sanford’s class “C” included young women from Mexico (2), Ecuador (2), Peru (1), and the Dominican Republic (3). The Latina students sat in four different groups. One group consisted of three Latinas, while the other three groups had one to two Latina students. These young women often spoke both Spanish and English with one another in their groups, with their peers in other groups, or when participating in individual and group work. When given the opportunity to work freely across groups, the Latinas from the Dominican Republic usually interacted with one another, while the young women from Mexico and South America worked together or with students from other cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Overall, the students in Ms. Sanford’s class usually worked within and across linguistic backgrounds, as their higher English proficiency levels enabled them to speak, listen, and interact with one another in English during most classroom tasks.

**United States History Curriculum Goals**

Ms. Sanford’s course was centered on three themes/essential questions: (a) What does it mean to be an American? (b) Is the use of violence every justified? (c) What are the different points of view or sides in history? She began the year with mostly course introductory lessons centered on big questions/ideas including: What is history? What do we already know/want to know about U.S. History (see Appendix C)? What is bias? What is the difference between primary and secondary sources? Another key element Ms. Sanford tried to focus on at the outset
of the course was geography and building what she called a “geographic vocabulary.” She encouraged the development of this vocabulary understanding with a group project in which students created a geography brochure, and were asked to conduct research on a region of the United States, i.e. Southwest, Northeast, Midwest. This project, she explained, supported “good habits at the beginning,” which included skills like working together in groups, conducting research, and using/following a rubric. Ms. Sanford’s course centered on building students’ study skills through the content, as she felt this was an essential year, or a “bridge” year, for her newcomers going from 9th/10th grade to 12th grade. She explained:

I think junior year is a huge year in this school and for language learners, because it is kind of the idea that they have been in this school for a few years, sophomore year they are kind of just happy to be speaking and writing in English and I think junior year is really where you develop the formal language skills. Like the theories of language acquisition is you can be informal and you can converse, but to get academic language is a whole different thing, and I think junior year they really need that academic language, the academic structure of writing, and things like that, that basically gets them ready for senior year, and senior year – at this school – is like a college level class, you get 20 pages of reading, you write huge papers, and I really see my class as kind of the bridge to that. So I think it is building the study habits.

For Ms. Sanford, study habits included reading, writing, working in groups, researching, and studying individually. She hoped students would use and transfer these skills to engage with historical content as “controversy” and inquire about history by questioning what really happened and why. Ms. Sanford’s frequent questioning and challenging of the historical narrative with students was fostered through writing, speaking, and debating during the course. These practices supported moving into and developing “academic language” skills (Cummins, 2008). Each unit observed varied in structure, but included numerous pedagogies to support English language acquisition and U.S. history content. Examples of pedagogical strategies Ms. Sanford implemented include jigsaw, read-aloud, journal writing, image analysis/deconstruction, and paraphrasing. More detail about the various strategies Ms. Sanford implemented in her class
for newcomer youth are described in more depth in the findings section. The topics covered
during the course focused mostly on pre-Civil War U.S. History including human migration,
Christopher Columbus, Native Americans, Colonial America, the American Revolution, the U.S.
Constitution, U.S. Government, Early America and slavery, and the Civil War.

Lesson Observation Vignette

It was a quiet winter morning when I entered the classroom. Ms. Sanford had already
posted the aim, homework, announcements, and agenda for the lesson. The aim for the day was:
“What is written in the Declaration of Independence?” The agenda read: “(a) Quick Write (10
minutes), (b) Read Aloud (15 minutes), (c) Paraphrase (30 minutes), and (d) Discussion (5
minutes).” As students entered the room, Ms. Sanford was setting up a podcast. She tested the
volume to make sure everyone could hear, walking to different corners of the classroom while
listening to the reading of the Declaration of Independence. She told me as I prepared for the
observation that she was out sick last week, and although she felt much better, she didn’t have
much of a voice.

She waited outside for her students as they began to enter the classroom, greeting each
student as they walked in, saying, “good morning!” Students immediately sat down to prepare
for class. Each student knew to take out their homework and copy the aim and homework for the
day, which read: “Read the handout carefully and complete the three questions at the bottom.”
One student exclaimed, “oh my gosh, 20 days until Christmas!” Ms. Sanford just smiled, and
said softly, “this is your homework, so you might want to write homework number eight at the
top.” She handed out the homework, collected the previous day’s work, and re-organized
students’ groups for the lesson. She made a quick announcement about coming to afterschool
tutoring, saying, “I have seen fewer people in for tutoring the last couple of weeks […] you
should be studying your notes everyday as if there is a mini-quiz.” She seemed concerned that the study habits she tried to foster in the previous unit were seemingly slipping away this week.

Ms. Sanford transitioned students into “getting back in the mind of American history” by asking them to do a quick write on “what comes to mind when you hear the word ‘Independence?’” As some students began to write, she quickly defined independence, saying, “Independence is to be on your own.” Students continued writing. Some students wrote in narrative or paragraph form, while others made lists. Some students looked at their group members’ papers, trying to get an idea of what to write, while other students thought and looked off into space. Ms. Sanford walked around the room, checked in on students, and inquired about what they were writing. She reminded students, “Remember you are continuing to write for the entire 2 minutes, whatever comes to mind.” She whispered and leaned closer to one student, saying, “Keep going.”

She asked students to stop, and invited volunteers to speak, asking, “could someone share with us what came to mind when you heard the word ‘Independence?’” One student said “freedom.” Another student replied, “Panama gained independence from Colombia.” Students continued, saying, “the American colonies wanted independence from Britain,” “celebration,” “war,” “decision.” One student said, “Everyone needs their independence. For example, when you go out, you are independent from your parents, but then you have to start working.” Ms. Sanford replied, “yeah, absolutely, so independence is an issue for teenagers, right? Like how much control your parents have over you or how much you depend on them for money or for giving you a place to sleep, like you said...definitely.” The conversation continued and one Ecuadorian student, Natalia, explained:

When I was eight years old, I noticed, in my country, there are a lot of cats and dogs on the streets, and I wanted to take them to a shelter, but my parents said no because they
have a lot of diseases […] so I wanted to do something for these animals, so I started working for a company and we starting taking money to take care of these animals on the street, and I was taking independence.

Ms. Sanford inquired, “How were you being independent, in that example, when taking care of the cats and dogs in the street?” Natalia replied, “I had to save money on my own, because it was something that my parents didn’t agree with.” Ms. Sanford re-phrased Natalia’s statement: “so you did something on your own.” Ms. Sanford transitioned, saying, “okay, you all have a sense of what independence means, so today, we are going to talk about the Declaration of Independence.” She showed students an “authentic” copy of the document, explained what the document was, and held it up in front of the class for all to see. She helped students to visualize how the document was structured and what it might have looked like. She then asked, “What are some of the reasons why the colonies would want to be independent?” Students shared their prior knowledge and understanding of the events, explaining items including the Sugar Act, Intolerable versus Coercive Acts, Common Sense, Boycotts, First Continental Congress, and the participation of the Sons of Liberty. Ms. Sanford further set the context for the American Revolution, then asked students to take “quick notes” on the Declaration of Independence. She explained, “It is important to take note that the Declaration of Independence is a document, it is something written, you can go to Washington D.C. and see it, and it looks something like this [shows the artifact to students], and it does what it says it is going to do, it declares the independence of the colonies [emphasis added based on Ms. Sanford’s stress and tone].” Students took notes and answered intermittent questions involving information on the Second Continental Congress, Thomas Jefferson, the purposes of the document, and the various sections of the document. Throughout the mini lesson, Ms. Sanford always included students in the discussion, asking questions on things they might know, including: “Like all good essays, what
would be the sections of this paper?” “What are grievances?” After concluding her mini lesson she asked students, “so are you ready to see the actual document? Are you psyched?” Students exclaimed “yes!” Ms. Sanford passed out paper copies of the Declaration of Independence and helped students organize the document, noting the introduction, body, conclusion, and signatures.

After acquainting the class with the primary source, Ms. Sanford had students participate in a read aloud activity using a podcast from the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation narrated by an actor playing Thomas Jefferson. Before the reading began, Ms. Sanford said “as the person reads, I ask you please to follow along and highlight or circle words or phrases that are familiar to you, that are interesting to you, or that are just meaningful to you.” As the reading continued, Ms. Sanford stopped the podcast every three minutes to discuss what has been said, focusing on vocabulary that might be difficult for students. She hoped by “hearing out loud and seeing it” students really would get a “sense of the way this document was written.” Throughout the read aloud, Ms. Sanford stopped and highlighted terms/concepts including self-evident, endowed, and unalienable rights. For example, she explained, “if things are ‘endowed’ they are given, and ‘unalienable rights,’ if someone is an alien they come from somewhere far away, so alien is the idea of something being from far away. If it is ‘unalienable,’ it can’t be put far away it is part of you. So when rights are described as ‘unalienable’ they can’t be separated from you, you have to have them.” She continued to explain difficult items by re-phrasing words, concepts, and paraphrasing sections. Students continued to actively listen to the document by highlighting and writing on the text, and were paying close to attention to what Ms. Sanford said and explained in each section of the podcast reading.
Once the read aloud was finished, Ms. Sanford asked students to go back and look at one of the words or phrases that they had either highlighted or circled, and to choose one to share with the entire class. She noted that if the word or phrase they had chosen was similar to someone else, this was okay and a “good thing,” as this meant there were multiple people who found the same things meaningful and interesting. Ms. Sanford started by sharing, “we pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.” Students shared items including: “all men are created equal;” “life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness;” “desolation and tyranny have already begun;” “it is the right of the people to alter, to abolish it;” “it is their right, it is their duty.” Ms. Sanford applauded students, saying “very nice.” She proceeded by saying, “since you understand the document so well, the next task should be an easy one, I ask you please to put the Declaration of Independence in your own words. Work in groups to paraphrase each section of the Declaration in your notes.” One student asked, “every section?” She replied, “yes, but it is easier than you think.” She gave students the option of creating an outline to help organize their paraphrasing, and for the grievances section asked students to choose 5 complaints to paraphrase. Students immediately began to work. They had already covered the meaning of paraphrasing and how to paraphrase in a previous class, so students were able to build off of this prior reading and writing skill.

One table of Latinas began paraphrasing by speaking in Spanish to help make sense of the document, translating and paraphrasing first in Spanish, then in English. Students had English and native language dictionaries (i.e. Spanish, Polish, French) out at their tables to help define and make sense of some of the language used in the document. Ms. Sanford walked around the room, helping groups by asking questions and accessing students’ understanding of the document through vocabulary inquiry and content understanding, asking, for example, “who
is Jefferson talking about here?” or “what does ‘dissolve’ mean in this context?” She suggested students go line-by-line to help understand each part of the piece, encouraging students to keep working on this for homework and complete the overview questions about the Declaration of Independence. She concluded the class by noting they would continue working on the paraphrasing tomorrow, as it was important to really understand the details of the document, but asked students to please attend tutoring afterschool if they needed additional help. She thanked the students for their hard work as they departed the classroom.

Findings

This section focuses on the findings from the case of Ms. Linda Sanford at Mission Valley International High School in relation to the subsidiary research questions: How does Ms. Sanford conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does Ms. Sanford implement her social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does Ms. Sanford conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? Findings are understood in the context of two themes, Ms. Sanford’s conceptualization and implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Ms. Sanford conceptualized social studies pedagogy by orienting toward teaching history as inquiry with a literacy focus. Ms. Sanford implemented social studies pedagogy by using her knowledge and skills for teaching Latino/a newcomer youth by using students’ prior knowledge through skill-based pedagogy.

In each theme, I examine how Ms. Sanford’s attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions show overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. I examine how Ms. Sanford’s attitudes and beliefs led to the conceptualization of orientations toward teaching social studies. I also examine how Ms. Sanford’s ideas and actions led to the implementation of knowledge and
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skills for teaching social studies as they apply toward culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer students.

Conceptualizing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Orientations toward teaching history as inquiry with a literacy focus. Ms. Sanford’s past experiences and commitment to teaching at Mission Valley International High School influenced how she conceptualized social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. These conceptualizations were supported by her attitudes and beliefs toward teaching social studies for newcomer youth, attitudes and beliefs that focused on academic success and cultural competence (Ladson-Billings, 1994) through constructing historical inquiry, making connections with the content, and developing literacy skills.

“History as inquiry.” Ms. Sanford described social studies as teaching history with interdisciplinary elements of geography and government. Her orientations toward teaching history for her newcomer students were described as:

History is inquiry, and also history is controversial and uncertain. Like, I don’t really know if John Brown was a hero or a villain, I am not sure, and there are documents that show this, and documents that show that. So I like the controversial aspect, and I think it is very empowering for students, especially in this environment who have had a couple of years or 3 or 4 years of learning English, now to have to take a stand, and have to defend an opinion [...] And so the idea, that they have to take a stand, and that their stand is valid, and that they have an opinion, and we will do some debates, and out loud they will have to defend their opinion, and recognize the other side is valid too, I think that is a real focus, that is kind of unique in this school, and I think that is what this class does.

Ms. Sanford’s goal for social studies education for newcomer students was to recognize the “controversial” nature of history. She desired that students understand the “uncertain” elements of history, supporting a fluid, rather than static, view of the U.S. historical narrative. Ms. Sanford constructed an understanding of the historical narrative based on one’s personal inquiries about a moment in time or a figure in history, noting, “I don’t really know if John Brown was a hero or a
villain, I am not sure, and there are documents that show this, and documents that show that.” By participating in conversations about these developing understandings of a person or event, and engaging in “controversies,” she hoped to encourage a development of historical inquiry and thinking skills with her newcomer students. This view of history centers on the students’ perspectives, questions, and wonderings, rather than holding the dominant U.S. history narrative as truth, allowing a space for students to interpret history based on their own experiences (Epstein, 2009).

Furthermore, encouraging newcomer youth to “take a stand” and “defend their opinion” supported academic success (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Newcomer students, in this case, developed academic success by practicing and improving their research, speaking, listening, and debating skills, as Ms. Sanford noted that students “have an opinion, and we will do some debates, and out loud they will have to defend their opinion, and recognize the other side is valid too.” What Ms. Sanford hoped to do, through developing these skills, was to “empower” students to want to seek this new historical knowledge, state their opinion, feel confident in knowing what to say, how to say it, and explicitly why their opinion was important. These conceptions of history and inquiry-based pedagogy encouraged newcomer youth to have rigorous academic experiences, while also building democratic skills that worked to engage and inform students’ (Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012) various civic skills, including research and debate about controversial topics.

“Having students make connections.” Part of supporting a movement toward choosing academic success, a key characteristic of culturally relevant teachers, is “affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds” (Lee, 2010, p. 466). Ms. Sanford created opportunities for
newcomer youth to share their prior experiences by making connections with the historical content she introduced in class. Ms. Sanford explained:

I definitely think the social studies goals involve having students make connections to what they are learning […] I think also- I just want students to be excited about history. In their countries, a lot of it was the names and dates and memorization, background and so I think that, that – introducing them to history in a new way is really a goal of mine.

One way Ms. Sanford helped “make connections” to what students were learning was by tapping into their prior knowledge of the historical content, or perhaps prior understandings of the concept discussed. For example, in the second unit on Christopher Columbus, students were asked to read, discuss (in a jigsaw activity), and respond to various perspectives regarding “Christopher Columbus’s voyages and their impact.” The final project was to write a letter to the Mayor based on students’ interpretations of the readings and answer the question: “Should we celebrate Columbus Day?” She provided readings from different points of view and authors including Bartolomé de Las Casas, Howard Zinn, and the Order of the Sons of Italy in America. She constantly asked students to reflect on these readings in light of their own experiences and connections with the issues. In one instance she presented students with a statement in class, “True or False? Columbus’s voyage to the Americas was an unequivocal disaster with no positive consequences for the world.” She asked students first to define “unequivocal” by looking at its opposite (“equivocal”) and then thinking about the word within the context of the statement. Then, students responded to the question in a whole class discussion. One Latina student, Veronica, said:

It is true, we were here because of Columbus, but the consequence was that many people died, and Columbus just made something that in history is not true, it is true we are here, but the consequence of us being here is just so horrible, and it took many people’s lives that Columbus killed, we can evolve, and grow, but in other ways, but not killing or dying.

A West African student, Malik, responded:
I know in the past many people died because of Columbus, but there are a lot of new people here, and the new people invent a lot of things and make a lot of progress in the world, and when bad things happen, people are fighting for their rights. So as a result of the bad things, people are fighting for what they believe.

These two examples show students making personal connections to the material covering Christopher Columbus, as well as making connections to one another’s comments. Consider Veronica’s statement, “we were here because of Columbus […] but the consequence of us being here is just so horrible.” Her use of “we” and “us” connected her experiences as a Latina with how she, her family, and her country of origin- Ecuador were affected by Spanish colonialism. Ms. Sanford encouraged and fostered a space in her classroom for students to have discussions about how they interpreted and connected to the material presented, in a way that supported students’ personal experiences as legitimate sites of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992).

Ms. Sanford elicited further students comments by saying, “tell me more” or “okay, so what does that mean for changes in the ‘new world’?” These prompts encouraged students to also comment on one another’s responses, as Malik noted, “I know in the past many people died […] but there are a lot of new people here.” Malik acknowledged Veronica’s comment as legitimate, but also implicated himself in the conversation, as representing the “new people” or the new immigrants who have made “progress in the world,” or in his case, in the United States. This discussion is just one example of frequent conversations that took place in Ms. Sanford’s classroom. She often re-focused the historical content and inquiry on students’ cultural and experiential backgrounds, making connections that supported a “cultural competence” by acknowledging that students’ cultural values and schooling worked in harmony with one another (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Ms. Sanford further supported elements of cultural competence in her social studies pedagogy by developing literacy skills while teaching U.S. history.
“Really work literacy into it.” Ms. Sanford also believed that social studies education centered on teaching history while developing literacy skills. She had a particular orientation toward developing her newcomer students’ cognitive academic language proficiency skills or CALP (Cummins, 2008), and developing literacy skills as emphasized by the Common Core Standards including reading, writing, and speaking (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). She explained:

I think my job as a history teacher is to do the content, but to do much less of it, and to really work literacy into it, the whole entire way. That it is reading, it is writing, and I think throughout the social studies we are really the department that works with the English teachers to build those skills, because I think for these students- for all students- but especially for our students we really have to. And history is such a way in for them, like for Columbus, they will read anything I give them, they are so excited about this and interesting in backing up their opinion with evidence and those things, and because I have the time to do it, I can encourage them to go in-depth into it.

Teaching literacy skills may often vary depending on students’ prior experiences with literacy practices, contexts of teaching, current literacy skills, and literacy needs (Bartlett & García, 2011). Ms. Sanford assumed that students had varying experiences with literacy instruction, and varying skill levels (both in their native language and in English). For example, she offered supportive prompts for students, which they could either take or leave, depending on their existing needs. One way Ms. Sanford incorporated students’ literacy backgrounds was through explicit teaching of the reading and writing skill of paraphrasing. She felt teaching paraphrasing was extremely important to develop students’ academic English language skills. For example, she noted that the social studies department was beginning to incorporate the “7 habits of readers” into their curriculum because “we need to improve reading comprehension in order to understand history.”

Ms. Sanford taught how to paraphrase using a highly scaffolded pedagogical method that began by first asking her students to recall what they thought paraphrasing meant. She then had
students “use their own words” when paragraphing a quote from the Internet regarding the Statue of Liberty (a topic recently discussed). She modeled how to paraphrase first and then had students try it together in small groups. After having shared some of their examples, she said, “well when you read something, you think they said it so well, and you don’t want to copy, so here are some tips for paraphrasing.” The tips included: “(a) Read the passage carefully several times to identify its main points, then set it aside and try rewriting it in your own words without looking. Explain it to yourself; (b) Try to change the sentence structure. You can start with different words, or make sentences longer or shorter; and (c) Use a thesaurus to find synonyms.” After stating her “tips,” students practiced how to paraphrase again on their own, using a quote about the Beringia land bridge - a topic they were currently studying- and then Ms. Sanford asked students to try each of the “tips.” Ms. Sanford nicely linked the literacy strategy with the content, bringing students back to the historical topic of discussion, and supported her comment of “really working literacy into it.”

“There are really specific things that they can do.” Ms. Sanford’s explicit teaching of literacy skills further supported her attitudes toward academic success for newcomer youth. She believed setting explicit expectations for students, either through the use of study skills, working together, or critical thinking skills, fostered successful experiences in the classroom. She explained:

Because I think, with this group of students [Class “C”], their skill level is so low, you know really trying to pull out exactly what they aren’t doing, like there are really specific things that they can do, that they somehow have not internalized yet, so what can we all do to develop those skills, and really improve in their reading and writing.

She spoke further, specifically about Latino/a newcomer youth and academic success:

I think there is an element of understanding academic success in this country, in the way the schools work in this country and things like that. I think Latino students, to be specific- Dominican students […] where the school structures that they are coming form
is three hours in the morning, maybe, and copy this from the board, and that is it. So there is no development of critical thinking skills or work habits and things like that. And so I think for those students, in particular, I have noticed the importance of really focusing on developing those study skills and making it really explicit.

Ms. Sanford hoped by making academic expectations “really explicit” for her Latino/a newcomer students, they would know exactly what to expect, and be successful in the classroom. She helped students navigate their various schooling experiences and prior expectations in school by being very clear about what students needed to work on, for example, “critical thinking skills” or reading and writing skills. Ms. Sanford was keenly aware of the differences between students’ schooling backgrounds and MVIHS, noting “school structures,” three-hour school days, and expectations for group work.

Bartlett & García (2011) note that although the national curriculum in the Dominican Republic requires five hours of school each day, the average time spent in class usually ranges from 2-3 hours. Also, public school closures, teacher absenteeism, and the shift system all affect how long students spend in class per day and the type of instruction they receive. Many teachers in the Dominican Republic work multiple shifts per day in various locations, therefore, they do not have much time to plan lessons and think about classroom instruction (Bartlett & García, 2011). Depending on whether students arrived to the U.S. having attended public schools in the Dominican Republic, and/or have been affected by one or a number of these factors, a consideration of what students’ have learned, and in what context, as well as the expectations set for schooling prior to arriving to the United States, are important contexts to consider in meeting Latino/a newcomer students’ needs.

Ms. Sanford explained some additional factors regarding her Latino/a students, as well as other newcomer students, that she had taken into account to help support their academic success, explaining:
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Latin students, I think are very social, and so they see homework as time for working together- ‘oh you did get that answer? Let me help you,’ and they are very caring and loving, and just want to help everybody, and so they will copy from each others’ homework all the time, and so trying to make explicit too, ‘in this country, or at least in this classroom, the expectations are that you will do your own work and you can ask somebody for help, but you will not write down what they tell you exactly, that you will work on your own, and that is an expectation.

Taking previous schooling experiences and cultural commitments to friends and family into consideration, Ms. Sanford was able to help foster positive experiences with her students by being very clear about her expectations and notions of success. Noting the importance of doing one’s “own work” and asking for help, are acceptable practices in her classroom. She hoped these explicit expectations encouraged all her newcomer students to be successful in their new schooling environment, rather than feeling unsure about how to navigate various points of disjuncture (Rubin, 2009). Supporting students to have successful experiences, feel successful in the classroom, and choose academic success while maintaining their cultural integrity (Ladson-Billings, 1994) are essential elements for culturally relevant pedagogy, and embody the attitudes and beliefs of Ms. Sanford’s conceptualized social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

**Implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Knowledge and skills toward using students’ prior experiences through skill-based pedagogy.** Ms. Linda Sanford’s implementation of social studies pedagogy incorporated her knowledge and skills toward using students’ prior experiences to enact a skill-based pedagogy to facilitate learning experiences for Latino/a newcomer youth. This theme is organized using the three core categories: culture, language, and citizenship (see Chapter III: Methodology section for further information about the development of these categories). Within each category, an analysis of how Ms. Sanford’s pedagogical ideas and actions developed the knowledge and skills for
implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth will be discussed. The lesson vignette, as well as other pedagogical strategies, will be used to support Ms. Sanford’s implemented social studies pedagogy.

**Culture: “Setting a schema or activating prior knowledge.”** Ms. Sanford’s conception of knowledge was not static (Ladson-Billings, 1995), but rather nuanced and centered on what her newcomer students thought, their prior knowledge and experiences, and how this related to the pedagogical content knowledge she implemented in her classroom (Shulman, 1987). For Ms. Sanford, she did not see students as “empty vessels” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 87), but rather as already possessing an abundance of knowledge situated in students’ cultural backgrounds and academic curiosities. Accessing students’ cultural knowledge was purposeful, making connections to larger concepts and historical content, and grounded in students’ histories and experiences (Yosso, 2005); she articulated:

Yeah, well I think- we definitely try to use linguistic backgrounds as much as we can and the cultural things as well, in terms of kind of setting the schema or activating prior knowledge before a unit. I like doing a pre-writing activity or a quick-writing activity at the beginning of the unit where, it is like, ‘independence and what do you think about independence?’ and a lot of them will think about stuff with their parents as teenagers, and a lot of them will come up with a lot of cultural backgrounds about, ‘my country fought for independence and this is how we did it,’ and talk about that a little bit and use that to segue into, ‘well now we are going to talk about America’s independence movement’ and build those connections for them. Because I think that is a really important way in, because otherwise, it is just hard for them to connect- I think to America history without that. They are curious about it, but they don’t really understand how it is relevant, maybe, or how it connects to what they know already.

Ms. Sanford articulated a key principle of CRP, cultural competence, in which students’ cultural values and schooling worked together in her pedagogical implementation of teaching about the Declaration of Independence. She stressed the importance of “using locally situated aspects of culture that are of relevance and critical importance to the students in instructional practices” (Lee, 2010, p. 460). For example, she implemented cultural competence by attempting to
In the lesson vignette above and articulated here in a post-observation interview, Ms. Sanford asked students in a pre-writing activity to write, “what comes to mind when you hear the word ‘Independence’?” She hoped this would set a “schema” for students and “build those connections” with the U.S. History content by realizing how much they already knew about independence given their own experiences and representations of what this concept meant to them. Students responded in a whole group discussion connecting to the concept in multiple ways, including through their families, stating, “you are independent from your parents, but then you have to start working.” Students also connected the discussion to their prior historical content knowledge, explaining, “Panama gained independence from Colombia.” Notions of “independence,” therefore, varied depending on students’ cultural experiences, backgrounds, and histories, and were explicitly used by Ms. Sanford as a “vehicle” for learning about U.S. History (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Furthermore, the pre-writing activity related to elements of CRP’s conception of knowledge (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) and LRT’s principle of scaffolding ELLs’ linguistic understanding (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) of the terms “Declaration” and “Independence.” The activity facilitated learning by assessing students’ prior knowledge relating to U.S. History. The knowledge and skills implemented by Ms. Sanford of using newcomer students’ cultural assets supported a foundation for reading the document and learning about the event in her social studies pedagogy.

**Language: “Seeing the way things are really written.”** Culturally and linguistically relevant teachers “build bridges” and “scaffold” learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2010) for newcomer students by recognizing students’ linguistic backgrounds and
experience, and possess the knowledge and skills to know where ELLs need to be to “participate fully and meaningfully in the construction of knowledge” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 96). A key tenet of linguistically responsive teaching (LRT) recognizes that teachers of ELLs must “identify the linguistic demands of oral and written discourse” (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 305) in classroom tasks. Examples of these linguistic demands include identifying and conceptualizing key concepts and vocabulary needed to access the curricular content and material, and knowing and pointing out the language use expected for a particular task so students are aware and ready for learning (Bunch, 2010). Ms. Sanford implemented this tenet of LRT by using a read-aloud strategy (as seen in the lesson vignette above) to help support learning English through the content area. She described the activity, stating:

> I like read-alouds, especially for English Language Learners, the whole theory that they need to hear English words said out loud, and on occasion you can look around the room and see them mouthing the words a long, and I think that is important. I don’t often, I give them sometimes I guess, modified primary sources. I think that is really important, that they see the way things really are written and it is not always my twisting it around and making it easier for them to understand. And so I think that is important, and I think also when you read that document, it is so dense that you can’t really access it, but I think when you hear it, then it makes sense and you can kind of get the idea of it and get the flow of it.

Linguists argue that it is critical for ELLs to see, read, and hear texts in the classroom, that they are then expected to write, perhaps in a similar text format, either on class related tasks or on standardized exams (Bunch, 2010). Ms. Sanford used a read aloud to have students engage with the written text, the Declaration of Independence, while experiencing working with primary source documents. Primary source documents are often used in history coursework, and by presenting the entire document to students, they are able to work through the “density” of the document, and “access it” in multiple ways. By desiring students to “see the way things really are written,” Ms. Sanford further supported LRT by dissecting each section of the document, as
well as identifying certain vocabulary necessary for “making sense” of what the author(s) is saying, how the author is articulating her/his ideas, and what might be the purpose of the text.

In the lesson example above, Ms. Sanford used a podcast and printed out copies so students could hear the document, highlight or circle key words or phrases in the document, and read along throughout the narrated text. Further, she stopped the reading every few minutes to make sure students understood the vocabulary and key phrases in the document. Ms. Sanford then used two forms of assessment: a whip around, in which students shared one of their highlighted words or phrases, and a paraphrase, in which students put each section of the Declaration of Independence in their own words. Both formative assessments strategies had particular linguistic features, including vocabulary understanding, translating, and paraphrasing (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). She had students analyze the text line-by-line to make sure they understood the language used, as this was important for constructing an understanding of the purpose and use of the document. Ms. Sanford further explained:

I like the paraphrasing that comes after it [in the read aloud], because I think it is hard for them, but they can see- they see the results, once they translate the words, and it is like, ‘oh yeah, I do understand what this means.’ And so I think that is important for them, almost as a confidence booster, ‘I can read hard documents and understand them.’

Ms. Sanford’s reflection on the linguistic strategy implemented, paraphrasing, showed that she not only wanted the activity to support her ELLs’ English language development and “understand what this [phrase] means” through the content, but also desired to support her newcomer students’ “confidence” with positive experiences in the classroom. Her knowledge and skills for language development intersected here with orientations toward culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy as she sought to support, advocate, and foster successful experiences for her Latino/a newcomer youth in the social studies classroom.
Citizenship: “What does it mean if you are living in this country, how can you participate in it?” When asked how she conceptualized citizenship for her Latino/a newcomer students, Ms. Sanford immediately responded: “It is funny, I have actually learned not to talk about citizenship, because they think of it as papers- they think of it in that very specific way.” She continued to discuss how she conceptualized citizenship through her enacted U.S. History curriculum, explaining:

In fact, last year we had just one theme- what does it mean to be an American? And I had them write about it specifically in their journals in the beginning of the year, and so many of them wrote, ‘its papers, its once you have your citizenship, its once you have your passport.’ And then throughout the year, I had them specifically go back and answer that question, and it is so funny how their perceptions changes throughout the year. You know, that even if its being born here, it is living here, or connecting with the values, or it is believing like John Adams did- that really affects their conceptions of that: ‘Last year I technically, have my papers, but I don’t consider myself an American, I consider myself Dominican,’ like that stuff […] So I think that is interesting how that stuff plays into their own personal identities.

Interestingly, Ms. Sanford’s response began by conceptualizing what “citizenship” meant to her students, and then re-conceptualized her definition when discussing her enacted curriculum, which focused on a nuanced understanding of citizenship as “what does it meant to be an American?” This question, one of Ms. Sanford’s essential questions/themes for the course, offered intersecting and overlapping elements of citizenship understanding particular to newcomer youth, including identity, culture, language, belonging, perceptions, values, and sense of place. She seemed to move her students toward re-conceptualizing citizenship by noting, “I had them write about it specifically in their journals,” and then “specifically go back to answer that question,” as they learned about U.S. History and how it related to and connected with students’ current lived experiences and immigrant journeys. Ms. Sanford further explained:

[…] I kind of shy away from citizenship, in that sense [papers]. And more, think about ‘participation in society.’ What does it mean if you are living in this country, how can you participate in it? Do you understand who your leaders are, what they do, and how the
country came to be? So have that basic sense of history. I think having a knowledge of current events, and paying attention to the newspaper […] having opinions about what is happening […] take a stand, back it up with evidence, be able to express it, I think that is really important, and relate it, ‘that is what people do in a democracy’- or something like that.

Ms. Sanford’s participatory notions of citizenship blend both Westheimer & Kahne’s (2004) notions of “participatory citizen” and Haste & Hogan’s (2008) examination of individual motivation for civic engagement. Westheimer & Kahne (2004) argue that those who participate in “civic affairs” and the “social life of the community” (p. 4) engage in participatory citizenship, while Haste & Hogan (2008) posit that in order to understand what active citizenship looks like, we need to start with the citizen’s understanding of citizenship and her/his individual motivations for civic participation. In this case, Ms. Sanford considered her newcomer youths’ stated conceptions of citizenship, and perceptions about community-based, individual motivations for participation. She considered her newcomer students’ nuanced understandings of and identifications as “American,” and their emerging sense of belonging to multiple places and spaces. These “complex and varied contexts” (Rubin, 2007) shape and are shaping, Ms. Sanford’s newcomers’ understandings of citizenship and civic/political participation, and are important to consider when negotiating how newcomer youth are developing their civic identity.

Being a “participant in society,” for Ms. Sanford, included asking the questions: “What does it mean if you are living in this country?” “How can you participate?” For Ms. Sanford, one way of understanding how to participate, through the U.S. History content, was by implementing group work. It can be argued that Ms. Sanford’s implementation of group work is nicely tied to her notions of citizenship, as the groups are participatory in nature, and aim to develop various civic skills including deliberation and cooperation (Parker, 2003), as she explained:

[… ] I think a lot of what I do also is the idea of students gathering evidence for themselves, and […] they are really able to form an opinion about something and back it
up, and they’ve got the language skills and hopefully they’ve got the content or information to be able to do that, and I think that is really important too, and I think a lot of them need to talk it out with someone and get some ideas.

Ms. Sanford’s students were always in groups and working together. Working in groups prepared students for various skills and literacies for democratic living, i.e. providing evidence, speaking, listening, and deliberating across and within difference (Parker, 2003). Ms. Sanford explained why group work was useful for her newcomer students, noting “they are good at helping each other – I think these students are always really kind to each other, so they are really okay with asking for help, ‘what does this word mean?’ and generally they are really cooperative in that sense.” She continued to reflect that offering students supportive prompts would help them develop key skills for group work.

In one observation Ms. Sanford implemented a jigsaw activity involving reading various perspectives about whether or not we should celebrate Columbus Day (unit 2). She discussed with students prior to entering into their “expert groups” how to discuss the documents and have conversations with one another about multiple perspectives. She explained it was important to “talk like a historian.” She articulated to her students, “When historians speak, because we know historians always question, they use phrases such as: ‘The author’s main idea is ___;’ ‘A question I have is: ___;’ ‘I dis/agree with you because ___;’ ‘Where is the evidence for ___?;’ ‘Can you explain what you mean by ___?;’ ‘This is the same as/different from ___;’ ‘In my opinion, ___;’ ‘According to this document/quote, ___.’ ” She continued to explain when using evidence, “It [the quote] might be different than your opinion, but you can use the quote to support what you disagree or agree about the quote.” The idea of using evidence to support your opinion, claim, or idea is also a skill for preparing to deliberate and speak with groups who might have different ways of thinking or perhaps varying ideas from your own. Ms. Sanford’s implemented
supportive prompt, “talking like a historian,” offered students the scaffold needed for group work and further developed the skills for democratic living. This example showed how her implemented pedagogy supported participatory notions of citizenship for her Latino/a newcomer students.

**Case Summary**

Ms. Linda Sanford conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for newcomer Latino/a youth centered on building a connection and relationship with her students at Mission Valley International High School. Her social studies pedagogy was informed by her prior experiences teaching, career counseling, and serving as a volunteer in the AmeriCorps and Peace Corps. Ms. Sanford’s deep admiration for and commitment to teaching newcomer youth also informed how she enacted culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy in her U.S. History course. For example, Ms. Sanford frequently worked one-on-one with her newcomer students to support numerous skill-based goals including literacy skills, historical thinking, and gathering evidence to support opinions. Her course also focused on building student study skills through the content, as she felt this was an essential year for her newcomers transitioning from 9th/10th grade to 12th grade, and then to college, career, and beyond. She hoped students would use and transfer the skills learned in her U.S. History class to engage with history and current events as “controversy,” questioning what really happened, why, and taking a stand using their opinions and other texts as evidence.

The findings in this case study examined how Ms. Linda Sanford conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Ms. Sanford conceptualized pedagogy by orientating toward teaching history as inquiry with a literacy focus. Ms. Sanford’s knowledge and skills toward teaching social studies used students’ prior knowledge to
implement a skills-based pedagogy. Ms. Sanford’s conceptualizations were supported by her attitudes and beliefs toward teaching social studies for newcomer youth that were focused on academic success and cultural competence (Ladson-Billings, 1994) through constructing historical inquiry, making connections with the content, and developing literacy skills. Her implementation of social studies pedagogy incorporated her ideas and actions toward using students’ prior cultural knowledge, language, and citizenship experiences to enact a skill-based pedagogy to facilitate learning for her Latino/a newcomer youth. In the next case, on Mr. Jeremy Sharp at Empire International High School, similar themes of supporting historical thinking and skill-based literacy goals will be discussed. Mr. Sharp’s social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students will be discussed in the following case study.
Case 2: Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School

In this section, I discuss the context and findings of the case on Mr. Jeremy Sharp at Empire International High School (EIHS). I describe the context of the case, including teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and lesson vignette, in order to better understand how Mr. Sharp conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. I finish the section with a summary of case two on Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School.

Mr. Jeremy Sharp

Mr. Jeremy Sharp, a white male in his mid-30s, grew up in Massachusetts, where he attended a large public high school and graduated from the University of New Hampshire with a degree in History. He served in the Peace Corps, volunteering in Kazakhstan for two years. Mr. Sharp began his teaching career as a New York City Teaching Fellow. He obtained his Master of Arts in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) from Lehman College, while simultaneously teaching full-time in the fellows program. During this time, he also taught English as a Second Language (ESL) at a private language institute.

Mr. Sharp always planned to serve in the Peace Corps after college. Both his parents served in Morocco, and their experience as volunteers played an important role in Mr. Sharp’s childhood; he explained, “I mean there are pictures from Morocco and they had friends from Morocco that would come over and have dinner and stuff, and my mom cooks wonderful Moroccan food, it is delicious. So it was kind of like, it really was never a decision, like I assumed- all my life- that at some point I would go into the Peace Corps.” While serving in Kazakhstan, Mr. Sharp was an Environmental Education volunteer. He explained that as a volunteer he could relate to his students’ cultural and linguistic experiences:
[I] know how it feels to be in a different culture and to try to express yourself in a different language, is really important for the kids that we teach, and you know, I mean what I experienced is nothing compared to what some of these kids are going through, but at least there is some inkling to how hard that is.

Mr. Sharp’s rich, life-changing experiences in the Peace Corps greatly contributed to his desire and commitment to teach newcomer youth, explaining “you know, a lot of sort-of personal experience with a different culture and a different language, I think then led me to think about things, like teaching international kids.” The deeply personal and visceral experiences from his time “living it” in the Peace Corps have travelled with him to EIHS. Mr. Sharp’s global perspectives and experiences framed his orientation toward teaching newcomer students at Empire International High School.

Mr. Sharp has taught at EIHS since the school opened four years ago, and is one of the founding four faculty members. Prior to working at Empire, Mr. Sharp taught at another newcomer school, and felt that the mission of these schools and programs aligns with his beliefs regarding teaching, international experiences, and global perspectives, stating, “with being abroad and everything, I had sort of the international taste in my mouth and I liked that, and I didn’t want to lose that.” Interestingly, Mr. Sharp’s reasoning for coming to Empire is multifaceted. He transferred four years ago to Empire because of the mission and vision of the school, support of the founding principal, desire to be a founding member of a new school, and commitment to the student population. Empire was created specifically to serve over-aged newcomer ELLs. Mr. Sharp explained, “the founding of [Empire] was basically sort of, to spite a lot of people. A lot of people were like, ‘you know, oh well, immigrants who come when they are 16 and don’t speak English, they can’t graduate high school.’ And the school was like, ‘we are founding this school to prove that they can.’ ” The clear mission of Empire was “attractive” to Mr. Sharp and he wanted to “create things out of whole cloth.” He desired to support the
principal’s mission, and participate in designing the organization, structure, curriculum, and pedagogy for the school. Mr. Sharp is extremely proud of EIHS, and spoke frequently about how their mission was “becoming a reality.” Students at Empire are graduating, passing the Regents exam, learning English, being admitted to and staying in college, and becoming professionals in various careers. Mr. Sharp’s experiences, commitments, and philosophies for becoming a teacher at Empire International are critical contexts to consider when understanding how he conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students.

**Empire International High School**

Empire International High School (EIHS) is situated in an extremely large building that houses over five schools. The sprawling campus is unusual for New York City; it was once the site of a large comprehensive high school that has now been broken up into smaller, boutique schools. Each school has its own mission, student population, administrative team, and staff. Empire International occupies two floors on the east side of the campus, and students share halls and facilities throughout the building with other schools. According to Empire’s admission requirements, students must reside in the city and have lived in the U.S. for less than one year, be between ages 16-20, and have limited English proficiency (as determined by New York State) (EIHS, 2013). The school is four years old, and the classes are “inter-aged,” divided into first/second year and third/fourth year students. Students take classes as a cohort with the same group of teachers throughout the day. The demographic breakdown of Empire includes: 80% Latino, 15% Black, and 5% Asian (EIHS, 2013).

When you walk down the hallway at Empire, there are no windows, only concrete walls. The walls, however, are full of student work, art, inspirational posters, and school documents (i.e. mission, schedule, protocols). A school-made poster hanging in the main office embodies
the overall sentiment of Empire: “Many countries, one nation. Today’s immigrants, tomorrow’s future!” When you enter any classroom at Empire International High School, the dreary interior of the school building comes to life. Classrooms have large windows and wide-open classroom space where students can work and move around. In each classroom, there is a clear feeling of pride in student work and school-wide mission and policies. As an observer, one can sense that all the faculty and staff are on the same page and committed to the school and its students, and work to bring Empire’s mission to life. For example, in each classroom the school’s stated “Habits of Work” and “Habits of Mind” are displayed for all to see. The “Habits of Work” are organization, management, persistence, quality, and citizenship. Elements of “citizenship” listed include “tolerance, empathy, advocacy, and working collaboratively.” The “Habits of Mind” are reasoning, proof, social awareness, connections, and communication. Items listed for “social awareness” include making “connections to the world and personal reflections,” and items of “communication” involve writing, speaking, and making presentations in English. These school-wide goals support an alignment of EIHS’ stated mission, and inform each teacher’s enacted curriculum.

Empire International’s stated mission is to serve the academic and social needs of recently arrived young people and their families, with a particular focus on over-aged students’ English language instruction (EIHS, 2013). The language model employed at EIHS is a type of “sheltered instruction.” English is taught in the content-area classroom by providing “principled language support to ELLs” (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 20). Another way the school works to meet the academic and linguistic needs of its newcomer students is with a “language-day” every Wednesday, designed to help support first year students’ understanding of disciplinary content through explicit English language instruction. While the purpose of language day at EIHS is
similar to that of Ms. Sanford’s language day at Mission Valley International High School, the enactment is different, as only first year students at EIHS participate in the explicit English language instruction. Second, third, and fourth year students participate in an internship of their choice off campus. Furthermore, students also participate in a school-wide “defense of learning” activity four times per year, wherein students “defend” what they have learned in each discipline (English, social studies, science, and math). The materials students use to present the defense of learning are compiled into a portfolio that is turned in at the end of each year. During the defense of learning presentation, students present to a panel of four to five peers and one to two teachers. Students are assessed based on content understanding, English language skills, visuals used, overall presentation, and stated goals set for the course and school year. The language day and defense of learning school-wide activities help develop students’ academic content understanding, English language mastery, and presentation skills, working towards college and career readiness.

The school was founded with a mission intended, as Mr. Sharp noted, to “spite a lot of people,” who did not believe that students who arrived in the U.S. after the age of 16 could graduate high school. He explained:

I mean this was the first school like this, so it was a gamble, it was like ‘okay, we are going to try to do this.’ So it is nice to see that it is becoming a reality. Um, the faculty of the school, as we go through it, you know- we have to think about different things […] for example, well we say the students have a voice in the school, okay, that is a nice little idea, what does that mean? And you know, Mr. Ramon [a math teacher] is organizing the fairness committee, which is sort of like a student court or a student representational body, and it is interesting to see how that develops […] and seeing the school become a physical manifestation of ideals like that is really neat.

This quote shows Mr. Sharp’s sentiments about the school’s mission and how it is carried out in its administrative structure. Empire’s organization and structure can be attributed to the principal’s faith in and support for her faculty. Decision-making power regarding curriculum,
school-wide assessment, instruction, and student internships, among other items, is shared between the faculty and administration. The shared power and voice of faculty, staff, and students in the school’s development and daily activities affected how Mr. Sharp conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy. The freedom, support, and trust the administration has in the faculty at EIHS empower teachers to make individual decisions as “curricular-instructional gatekeepers” (Thornton, 1991) and assess how to meet the needs of their late-arrival newcomer students.

**Students at Empire International High School**

Empire International High School admits roughly 80 students every year, totaling 320 students in grades 9-12. The school is situated in a county of over 1.3 million people, where 33% of the population is foreign born, and roughly 54% is of Latino origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). The median household income from 2007-2011 was $34,744, making the county one of the poorest in the U.S. EIHS is not a selective school, but rather admits students “over the counter,” or as Mr. Sharp described, “the DOE gives us kids and we take kids, now there is some sort of you know, talking to the students, and trying to place students, but on the whole- this is who the DOE gives us and so that is who we have.” Due to the demographics of the county and Empire’s admissions “policy,” the school has a large percentage of Latino students who live in the surrounding community, particularly from the Dominican Republic. Mr. Sharp noted, however, that there are also students from Central and South American countries including Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Venezuela, El Salvador, Colombia, and Mexico.

After Latinos, the second largest group at EIHS is French speaking African students. African students at EIHS arrive from countries such as Sierra Leone, Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea, Senegal, Mali, and Togo. Mr. Sharp explained the French speaking African community “is
another community that is growing [in the area]. There are a lot of kids that are coming from
places that have had civil war and are basically, if not officially, refugees.” EIHS also has
students from Yemen, Korea, and Bangladesh. As stated in the description of the school, the
students are over-aged, and the school seeks to meet the particular needs of youth who are
arriving to the U.S. at the age of 16 years or older.

Empire has graduated over 20 students in its four years as a school, and plans graduate
more in the next year as students complete their coursework, statewide exams, and college
preparatory programs. While Mr. Sharp noted that Empire’s goal is to prepare students to attend
college, this is also:

Trying to strike a balance between having a high expectation of kids who go to this
school are preparing for college […] [but] also meeting a kid where they are […] having
20 kids, after 3 years, graduate, is an amazing number, but if we are really serving this
population, we have to think beyond that, and is it any less successful getting 20 kids in 3 ½
years into secure professions, where they speak enough English to negotiate things and
have enough work experience, and stuff like that, you know I think that is just as high as
of a goal as any college program.

The balance noted here between college and career-ready is a nation-wide push, as in the
Common Core Standards Initiative (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices,
Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010), and one that Empire is dealing with directly. Mr.
Sharp articulated that the negotiation between meeting the nation-wide standards initiative and
meeting his newcomer students’ needs and interests is based on a dedication to “meeting them
where they are” as late-arrival new immigrant youth.

Mr. Sharp’s Global History class, group “B,” mostly represented the demographic make-up
of the school. Of the 24 students in the class, 15 were first year students and 9 were second
year students. Of the 15 first year students, 11 were Latinos from the Dominican Republic,
Honduras, and Mexico. The other four students were from Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea, and
Bangladesh. The second year students also included students from the Dominican Republic and Bangladesh. Because of the inter-aged organization of the first/second year cohort, students resided in the United States for varying lengths of time. Some students had arrived within the week, while others had been in the U.S. for at least 12 months.

Students also varied in terms of academic native language proficiencies, depending on prior schooling experiences and length of time in the U.S. Furthermore, students’ English language levels varied tremendously. All of the second years, because of their time at EIHS, theoretically had higher English language levels than first years, however, their language levels still varied in terms of reading, writing, and speaking in English. Similar to Ms. Sanford’s classroom, Mr. Sharp organized his class into assigned heterogeneous linguistic groups of three to four students. Students worked in groups during each class session, and group work was the main method of instruction (this will be further discussed in the lesson observation vignette and findings of the case). Group work, for Mr. Sharp, provided the pedagogical backdrop for his goals and implementation of the Global History curriculum.

**Global History Curriculum Goals**

The social studies team at Empire International High School worked together to develop core competencies in grades 9-12. Examples of these seven core social studies competencies included making an argument, supporting the argument with evidence, enacting research, and considering multiple points of view. The competencies framed the outcomes for Mr. Sharp’s Global History curriculum, which he created with the support of a curriculum coach. Discussing the importance of creating his own curriculum, Mr. Sharp explained, “there is so much curriculum out there, that it is wonderful curriculum, and not accessible to ELLs […] if you are to do it [design curriculum] yourself, then it is automatically modified.” Mr. Sharp and his team
used understanding by design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) to construct their curricular units, and aimed to develop a two-year curriculum together. They chose themes “that told a story,” beginning “with a present day thing and going backwards and tracing it through.” In his course goals, Mr. Sharp focused on interrelating historical content with a thematic curricular design, English language objectives, and an “anti-imperialist” framework.

Mr. Sharp’s “anti-imperialist” framework for the Global History curriculum was deeply connected to his reasoning for teaching newcomer youth at Empire International High School and his political orientations. He explained:

I think these immigrants coming from former colonies of Europe; it really has a connection to their lives, talking about imperialism and the effects of that. So you can use this as something that they want to talk about, do they want to talk about the treaties of World War II, before World War I? No. They don’t want to talk about that, not that they don’t, but there are other access points into the events of World War I that might be more engaging for this specific population. For example, in one of the first years I taught, the way I chose to start World War I is we looked at stories, pictures, and biographies of Senegalese soldiers that fought for the French in World War I and were slaughtered. They were the first ones sent out. The whole was, France basically like killed all of their soldiers and were running out of French soldiers, so they went to the colonies and said, if you fight for us, at the end of the war, we will give you independence. And Senegal was like, ‘okay,’ so they did, and at the end of the war the Treaty of Versailles, France didn’t give them independence. Telling that story, you get the attention from pretty much anybody in the room that comes from a former colony, about WWI. That is so much more effective than, ‘there was a web of alliances, and when Germany went to war that meant that everyone had to go,’ they don’t, that is not relevant to their lives, and you can still talk about that after you hooked them.

Mr. Sharp’s description of how he enacted his curricular goals in a unit on the World Wars through his “anti-imperialist” framework related specifically to his desire to “engage” his newcomer students in global history content. By examining various historical moments from “other access points” or perspectives, he was able to make a “connection to their lives.” The thematic nature of Mr. Sharp’s Global History course began with a contemporary topic on global climate change and ended the year with the Cold War. Mr. Sharp described the climate change
unit as a “lens unit,” in which the class discussed a contemporary event with “threads” that could be followed to other units throughout the year. For example, these threads, or “enduring understandings,” included “countries competing for resources,” “the developing world versus the developed world,” and these countries’ interactions, impacts, and histories. The constructed Global History curriculum included the following unit themes/topics: Climate Change; the Encounter and Spanish Colonialism; Industrialization: Economics and Class Struggle; British Imperialism; Revolutions and Resistance to Imperialism; the World Wars; and the Cold War. Evidence that the intended outcomes and goals for each unit above were met included class work (participation and stations documents), final projects, social studies binders, and homework.

Each unit was organized into four parts: (a) introduction, (b) discussion, (c) learning stations, and (d) assessment. Part one, the introduction, usually lasted anywhere from two to four days. The goals of the introduction were to provide background information and context for the content of the unit by unpacking concepts and enacting an experiential exercise (more discussion about the concept understanding and experiential exercises will be discussed in the findings section). Part two, the discussion, took place before and after the stations, to further set the context for understanding the content by developing inquiry questions in small and large group discussions. Mr. Sharp described the purpose of the discussion as, “to see what they know about things and start asking questions.” The follow-up discussion, employed after the stations, was used to see what students learned, what they found out, and whether their inquiry questions were answered with various pieces of evidence provided in the stations.

Part four, the learning stations, lasted anywhere from five to seven days. There were three to four stations, each with different documents and evidence. Students participated in station activities to construct an understanding of the historical people, places, and events that
encompassed the unit. Lastly, the unit wrapped up with a summative assessment that was project-based and authentic in nature. For example, projects included letter writing, dramatizations, and a debate. Mr. Sharp paired the project-based assessment with an end of unit test that documented understanding of the content by having students read texts presented in class (either documents, student-constructed paragraphs, or teacher-created materials) and write responses, using images to create a narrative about the history learned. The content and organizational goals of Mr. Sharp’s Global History curriculum were paired with specific language and skill goals. These goals included: English language development, social/group skills, and “creating” and “maintaining confidence” in all of the course objectives (content, language, and group work) for his newcomer students. Further discussion about how Mr. Sharp conceptualized and implemented this “confidence” building in his social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth will be discussed in the findings section of this case.

**Lesson Observation Vignette**

I arrived early to Mr. Sharp’s first period class, around 8:00 A.M., to find two students working quietly while jazz music played in the background. It was a welcoming and calming environment. Mr. Sharp had recently “planted” some ivy and other plants in an old sink in the classroom, turning an awkward, non-workable item into something quite beautiful and natural. He had mounted new posters and quotes on the walls. These posters displayed Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, a quote from Howard Zinn (“In a world where justice is maldistributed, there is no such thing as a neutral or representative recapitulation of the facts”), and a quote from G Love and Special Sauce (“Dig da eyes, cause that’s where it all goes down”). Mr. Sharp had just brought in an artifact from his travels overseas, a carpet, which he placed underneath a rocking
chair, a side table, and two shelves full of books, in order to create a reading nook in the back corner of the classroom.

While it was a beautiful, sunny fall day, it was warm in the classroom. Thankfully, there were windows that lined the rear wall, which Mr. Sharp began to open, as the A/C was not working that day. Students worked together, chatting and helping one another prior to the start of class. Mr. Sharp posted the agenda on the SMART board and began to write it on the white board as well. Items on the agenda included: (a) central question: how can you get information about resources from maps?, (b) binder review, (c) home group check-in, (d) resources worksheet, (e) *An Inconvenient Truth* Trailer, (f) resource word web, (g) resource word scroll, and (h) debrief. As students arrived, Mr. Sharp continued to get ready for class, he mentioned to me that one of the social studies curriculum team goals was that students understand concept vocabulary for the unit, and one of the concepts that they would be discussing today was “resource.” He planned to spend some time really working with students to help them understand what this concept meant.

At 8:30 A.M. Mr. Sharp posted the home groups on the SMART board, and students shuffled around to their designated groups. He thanked students for being early and on time, saying, “it is very professional” (professional, along with community and safe place, was a central vocabulary term used to create Mr. Sharp’s community of learners. Students had just defined what each of these terms meant in the first two weeks of class). After thanking the entire class, Mr. Sharp walked quietly over to one group and mentioned that one of their group members was late, and because of that the group would have less time to discuss what was happening in the class. He recommend that “you talk to your group member about coming on time, because when teachers say it, it is just like, ‘come on time,’ but when you say it, they will
listen to you.” One student replied, “When you don’t come on time, you bother by time.” Mr. Sharp then began the class by asking, “who will present the agenda for today?” One Latino student, Juan Carlos, volunteered and began introducing the lesson agenda. He asked, “Today, what is the day?” Students in the class helped Juan Carlos to re-phrase his question as “Who wants to read the date?” Juan Carlos repeated, “Who wants to read the date?” Another student read the date, and Juan Carlos continued, “Who wants to read the central question?” After a student read the central question in English, he asked his peers to translate the question in French, Spanish, and Bengali. He continued with the same format for each part of the lesson agenda. After Juan Carlos completed the presentation of the lesson, Mr. Sharp thanked him, and all the students clapped.

Mr. Sharp transitioned to the second part of the agenda, “binder review,” by asking students to “go in your binder and get your homework log.” He noticed one student, Edmundo, was a bit confused. Mr. Sharp walked over to Edmundo, and explained the instructions in Spanish. Edmundo nodded and immediately started the task. Mr. Sharp made his way around the room, checking to make sure students were following along. After Mr. Sharp noticed all students had their homework logs out on their desk, he asked students to “discuss and check-in with your group about what you did for homework and then you will share out to the whole group.” Mr. Sharp asked Juan Carlos to read the “home group check-in” protocol, which included: “(a) you assigned yourself homework last night, (b) tell your home group what you learned from your homework, (c) each person in the group must check-in, (d) record your homework in your binder.” He gave students roughly ten minutes to complete the home group check-in. He walked around to each group checking in and asking, “qué has hecho para hacer la tarea?” (what have you done for homework?) or stating, “tu no tiene evidencia de que tu hizo su tarea” (you do not
have evidence that you did the homework). After time was up, he brought students’ attention back to the front of the class by exclaiming “eyes here please, ojos aquí, regarde” (a phrase he often used to get students attention, which literally translates to “eyes here please, eyes here, look!”). Mr. Sharp said to the class, “So we are looking at the homework. Many people did the homework, and I saw evidence, thank you. Many people said they did the homework, but they did not have evidence. If you did the homework, good, if you did not do the homework, be honest and do it tomorrow.” He emphasized, “It is okay if you did not do your homework, the homework is for you, for you to be prepared.” After completing the home group check-in regarding homework completion, Mr. Sharp checked in on a previous activity analyzing world resource maps (resource maps that showed natural forest cover, minerals, and fresh water) and comparing the resources in the United States with those in the students’ home countries. Most of the students had completed the activity, and Mr. Sharp continued onto the lesson of the day (part one of the curricular unit, “introduction” lesson number four). The lesson asked students to further unpack the concept “resource” and how resources, specifically the use or depletion of renewable and non-renewable resources, connected to global climate change and the crisis of global warming.

Mr. Sharp projected an image from An Inconvenient Truth (see Appendix D), and asked, “what do you see in this picture?” Students answered: “smoke, a chimenea [chimney] for a fabrícia [factory]… smoke is a contamination…[it] looks like a hurricane.” Mr. Sharp re-stated students’ initial responses: “okay, so there is a factory, and the smoke that comes out of the factory is a hurricane? What does that mean?” Juan Carlos answered “the factory made the smoke, it is dangerous, and the hurricane is mayor…un problema mayor [big…is a bigger problem].” Another student, Toni, responded, “el humo contamine el ambiente y poco a poco se
reduce la capa de ozono.” Students agreed with Toni, nodding and saying “yes,” and Mr. Sharp translated: “the smoke contaminates the environment and little by little it decreases the ozone layer. Okay, and then what happens?” Someone responded, “then the sun is stronger.” Mr. Sharp replied, “great, you are correct, there is contamination from factories, and this destroys the environment, el ambiente, right, and we have problems in our bodies and other things, this is all true, yes, but we are talking about resources so how is resources connected to this?” Students said, “the smoke goes into the atmosphere…there is a connection to petroleum.” Mr. Sharp supported his multilingual classroom by helping to translate a Spanish-speaking student’s response to a French-speaking student. He explained the connection to the image and resources, stating, “Lamine, tell me if you agree, he [Juan Carlos] says, when they use or make petroleum in the factory, that will produce smoke and contamination, and that destroys the environment, do you agree with that? [noticing the student shaking his head] No, you don’t agree with that?” Lamine responded, “I think, taking out petroleum out of the ground, and you make something, gasoline.” Mr. Sharp said, “and then what? When you use gasoline, what comes out of the car, smoke right?” Juan Carlos explained and Mr. Sharp translated for the class, “when the smoke affects the atmosphere, it also affects the forest and the trees, and the resources, alright good.”

Mr. Sharp transitioned: “we are going to watch a trailer. You know an introduction to a movie. And the movie is this movie, An Inconvenient Truth [pointing to the image], and you are right, it is about petroleum, it is about industry and factories, it is about hurricanes, it is about pollution and problems in the environment, all of this you are correct.” He asked students to answer three questions when they watched the trailer: (a) what did you see in the trailer? (b) What is happening in the trailer? (c) What questions do you have about this? Mr. Sharp called on second year students to help translate the questions into Spanish, French, and Bengali. He
suggested that students write the questions and their answers in their binders. As students wrote the guiding questions in their binders, Mr. Sharp wrote the discussion items on the board, and prompted students by saying, “so when we looked at this picture, we talked about smoke- *el humo*, we talked about factories, we talked about petroleum, hurricanes, resources, pollution-*contaminación*, the environment- *el ambiente*, and the atmosphere, so these are things that you said, let’s see what is happening.” He began the trailer, and students watched intently, taking notes and engaging in the film clip.

After the film clip, Mr. Sharp asked, “what did you see?” Students responded in Spanish and English with: “a crisis…the sun…the North Pole and South Pole are warming.” Students together responded (in Spanish and translated/paraphrased here), “there is ice, in the North and South Pole, and when it gets hotter, the ice melts, and the water goes up and the land is flooded.” Mr. Sharp, notably impressed, said, “wow- good.” Another student, Abri, said, “the cause of this are the factories.” Mr. Sharp began to put the conceptualizations from Abri’s response and other students’ ideas together by re-stating, “okay, so the factories and cars are making this problem? So when the factories and cars, they run, and use petroleum, and make smoke, that smoke is making the temperature warm, and that warming is making the ice melt, and that will flood the world? So the factories and the cars use petroleum, and that is what does it.” Students acknowledged this response, and added, “because the atmosphere is warmer, that means the hurricanes are bigger.” Mr. Sharp, seemingly excited about the incredible responses and connections students were making between the image, trailer, and prior knowledge of global warming, ran over to the white board and began connecting the items discussed. He wrote the items on the board together and drew lines to show the cause and effect of the ideas.
Wrapping up the lesson, Mr. Sharp had students watch the trailer one more time, then when it was finished, he debriefed by asking, “Does anyone know the name of this crisis? What is the problem called?” Students responded by discussing factories and hurricanes, and Mr. Sharp scaffolded students’ responses, saying, “the name of this crisis is global warming.” He asked students to translate global warming into Spanish, French, and Bengali. He wrapped up by explaining, “this is what we will study in this class […] so this month we are studying the problem of global warming, the crisis of global warming, and one thing that is very important in global warming is resources, like petroleum.” Students, still very engaged in the discussion, followed along with Mr. Sharp’s explanation. He led them into a debrief with their home groups on the homework they would do that night, to “prepare for the topic.” Students’ homework included examining the cause and effect of global warming, understanding pollution and global warming, and reorganizing answers to questions from the trailer. Mr. Sharp thanked students for a great class, and said tomorrow they would be talking about the connection between global warming and resources.

Findings

This section focuses on the findings from the case of Mr. Jeremy Sharp at Empire International High School, in relation to the subsidiary research questions: How does Mr. Sharp conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does Mr. Sharp implement his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does Mr. Sharp conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? Findings are understood in the context of two themes, Mr. Sharp’s conceptualization and implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Mr. Sharp conceptualized social studies pedagogy by orienting toward teaching history using everyday occurrences and exercising student voice. Mr.
Sharp implemented social studies pedagogy by using his knowledge of and skills for teaching Latino/a newcomer youth by accessing students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds through group work, experiential learning, and inquiry.

In each theme, I examine how Mr. Sharp’s attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions show overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. I examine how Mr. Sharp’s attitudes and beliefs led to the conceptualization of orientations toward teaching social studies. I also examine how Ms. Sharp’s ideas and actions led to the implementation of knowledge and skills for teaching social studies as they apply toward culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer students.

**Conceptualizing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Orientations toward teaching history using everyday occurrences and exercising student voice.** Mr. Sharp’s commitment to his newcomer students, international experiences, “anti-imperialist” notions of Global History, and certification/background in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) established a foundation for how he conceptualized social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth. His attitudes and beliefs supported an orientation toward teaching history from the perspective of everyday people, with a focus on living and experiencing everyday occurrences. Furthermore, Mr. Sharp believed his social studies pedagogy needed to support his newcomer students to exercise their voices and opinions in classroom activities (i.e. speaking, writing, presenting) for transfer to participating in political and civic-related activities in the larger U.S. and global society.

“My interpretation of history is pretty leftists.” Mr. Sharp conceptualized teaching social studies content through a “leftist” orientation toward history. He explained his orientations: “So,
when I say leftist I guess I basically mean populist, meaning it is about the people and sort of the
different groups of people and populations that are involved […] as opposed to sort of heroes of
history of great people.” When asked to further describe “leftist” and how this intersects with his
“populist” notions of history, he explained:

Really, in my experience with talking with people, my ability to question stuff that is
happening in society right now, puts me in the leftist camp automatically, which I don’t
think is necessarily correct, but that is where people put me, because I’m saying, ‘maybe
there is something wrong with capitalism?’ So that makes me a leftist. But basically, I
think it is really about populism and you know, what are the experiences of regular
people, and of course- who are the people who make these big actions, but then those
actions are big because they affect large amounts of people, or societies over time.

Mr. Sharp’s questioning of the status quo and critique of U.S. and global economic and political
systems in history, place him to the left (liberal) on the political spectrum, when examining U.S.
and global societies and various institutional structures. Epstein (2009) describes this stance as
the “critical perspectives on teaching history,” or teaching history “as a means to enable young
people to develop skills to disrupt oppressive hierarchies and work towards a more equitable
society” (p. 14). Racism, sexism, classicism, and other manifestations of social oppression are
forefronted in the historical narrative to display how powerful groups have oppressed
marginalized groups, and how marginalized groups have worked to interrupt and overcome
oppressive forces. These are key elements of the critical perspective of teaching history, and Mr.
Sharp embodied this perspective, by analyzing how reading and interpreting history through the
lens of “regular people” can support taking action for a more just and equitable U.S. and global
society.

Furthermore, Mr. Sharp placed himself to the left on the spectrum based on his
understanding of what other people thought of him, noting when “talking with people […] that is
where people put me,” but he did not necessarily agree with this perception. His disagreement
with where people place him on the political spectrum supported his questioning of societal norms and procedures, as he wasn’t interested in being placed into a certain category or within certain political confines. For example, he explained why his orientation toward teaching history was important, stating:

A lot of it I think is balancing, it is like you have this rhetoric that comes over the media and comes through in the textbooks of the United States, and that is like- you know- pushing this way, with this amount of force, and at the very least, I need to push back with the equal amount of force, to balance that out […] There are other opinions and lets look at them all and see what works, you know.

Mr. Sharp hoped that by forefronting the experiences of “regular people” and how their actions interacted, or did not interact, with “the people who make these big actions,” he could “push back” on and “balance” the dominant narrative that centers on the “heroes of history.” By discussing, examining, and critiquing “other opinions” and perspectives, and looking deeply at “what works” in regards to taking action, and the impact of those actions, he hoped to give students an opportunity to examine how they might react to certain situations. Centering on the perspectives and experiences of “regular people,” who are often marginalized from the historical narrative, in his Global History curriculum, enabled his newcomer students to see the curriculum as “window and mirror” (Style, 1998), and reflect on what decisions they might have made in particular historical moments or issues.

Mr. Sharp, for example, asked students to reflect on their attitudes and ideas regarding global warming in the climate change unit, stating, “describe how climate change affected your lives and the lives of people around the world.” Students analyzed how climate change affected their lives through the following unit outcomes: (a) explain the cause and effect of the global warming crisis; (b) explain how competing for resources effects countries differently; and (c) describe how countries should balance the use of natural resources with the protection of the
environment. These outcomes were further examined using various forms of evidence including film clips, resource map analyses, graphs/charts of country’s share of CO2 emissions, and current event articles from multiple perspectives of the global warming crisis. Following these activities, students wrote letters to President Obama explaining their understanding of each outcome and proposing solutions to the global warming crisis; therefore, directly reflecting on their experiences and ideas and how they might take action to reduce the United States’ carbon footprint. Mr. Sharp’s desire to share the populist message, or the voices and experiences of “regular people,” is even further framed by his belief that historical thinking was an important skill to develop for his newcomer youth.

“You can approach anything in life with that historical thinking.” Mr. Sharp conceptualized social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth by emphasizing how historical thinking skills are useful for more than analyzing and interpreting history. He conceived of historical thinking as connected to social science notions of social studies, as well as social action perceptions of citizenship (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; Grant, 2003). Mr. Sharp’s supported social science notions of social studies through inquiry, research, gathering evidence, analysis, and formulating conclusions about history. He supported social action perceptions of citizenship (connected to his views above on “populist” notions of history) by emphasizing taking action on historical and contemporary issues involving equity and justice. Mr. Sharp explained:

A historical way of thinking, I would say, there is a lot of cause and effect thinking, sequencing, kind of connecting things […] and what are these connections and these happenings in these events, that is kind of historical thinking. Another part of historical thinking, is what are all of the different opinions and viewpoint and looking at all of them equally, or at least starting with them all equally. So that, I think, is a historical way of approaching the world. And that is, that is what is valuable about history.
Mr. Sharp’s conception of history went beyond the content taught, where the content is taught (i.e. in the U.S. or in other countries), and why the content is taught. Mr. Sharp emphasized, rather, how the content is taught and for whom it is taught as essential components for teaching historical thinking to newcomer youth. He focused on historical thinking skills, including understanding cause and effect, providing evidence for a historical argument, and analyzing the perspectives emphasized in a narrative. He believed these historical thinking skills were valuable for “a historical way of approaching the world,” and “approaching anything in life.” Mr. Sharp further explained:

[...] teaching kids how to use evidence and making arguments and this and that, and it is like you get something that happened in the lunch room – somebody said something bad to somebody else and somebody hit somebody. And you sit them down, and you have them talk about it, they are doing that [historical thinking], ‘well he said this, and she said that, and that’s not true, I know that because of this’ – they are making an argument, they are using sources, they are backing those sources up with evidence- that is a natural, human thought process. And in the right situation, these kids do that automatically, because humans do that automatically. And what it is, is getting them to do that in the academic style that is preferred and almost sort of naming what they are doing, ‘okay, I am going to give you evidence now,’ you know, and ‘now I am going to say my thesis statement.’ They are already doing it, they are just naming it.

Mr. Sharp used students’ everyday “historical” moments by “naming what they are doing” as sites for locating historical thinking. He believed that building historical thinking skills occurred through the use of the skills students already possessed and employed, explaining, “they are making an argument, they are using sources” when describing an event that recently took place (i.e. in the lunch room). He blurred the boundaries between disciplinary notions of history (developing the skills used by historians), and participatory notions of history (developing the skills for active and engaged citizenship) (Epstein, 2009) by accessing students’ prior experiences and knowledge about various ways of historical thinking. Interestingly, Mr. Sharp also challenged assumptions about what history is, as students often see the past as something
strange that took place long ago, and is disconnected from students’ current lived experiences (Wineburg, 2001). Mr. Sharp bridged this temporal gap by developing an understanding of the everyday sites of historical thinking when discussing the example of an event in the lunchroom. Even so, while Mr. Sharp desired to make these connections for students, he wanted students to be clear about what he was doing and how he was teaching history, explaining,

…) students can do it consciously and intentionally, not just by accident because that is what people do, but like they have their tool box and they are selecting a tool consciously because that is the right tool for the job, as opposed to just sticking your hand in there and whatever comes out, comes out and you make do.

Mr. Sharp explained that he was not “giving them a new tool,” but rather helping students’ figure out which tool to select when navigating historical thinking and understanding history. He wanted his newcomer students to know why they selected that tool, and supported the transfer process for analyzing and interpreting history. He hoped students would then take this historical thinking skill, “how to use evidence and making arguments,” and understand how they would transfer these ideas to choosing a particular tool for another activity.

Mr. Sharp embodied the role of a facilitator, rather than transmitter of knowledge, in his Global History classroom. As a facilitator, he supported and scaffolded his students’ understanding of historical content and social issues, rather than following a “banking” model in which he “filled” students with historical content knowledge (Freire, 1970, p. 71). Mr. Sharp worked with students to challenge what could be considered static, lifeless narratives in Global History by pulling out knowledge and skills they already possessed, and using these strengths and qualities in his pedagogy. These characteristics of Mr. Sharp’s pedagogy support the theoretical underpinnings of culturally relevant pedagogy’s conceptions of self and others, social relations, and knowledge. His pedagogy used students’ cultural and experiential knowledge(s) to support their developing historical thinking skills (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). Mr. Sharp
accessed these assets (Yosso, 2005) in various ways, depending on newcomers’ current linguistic, social, and political contexts.

“Provide a space where students have a voice.” Mr. Sharp conceptualized building on students’ cultural assets (Yosso, 2005) by providing students with the space and opportunity to exercise their “voice” in the classroom. He desired that students use their voice in all elements of his classroom pedagogy, from discussions, to presentations, to writing activities. Mr. Sharp explained:

My job as a teacher is to empower students, and the way that I can do that is to provide a place where students have a voice, and that is something that a lot of teachers talk about, and that is all well and good, but its like- okay well, if you want the kids to have a voice then let them talk. It’s like if you want kids to improve writing, then they should write. If you want kids to improve reading, then they should read. If you want kids to improve speaking in English, then they should speak in English […]

Mr. Sharp supported students’ voices in the classroom through linguistic and non-linguistic forms. At the beginning of the year, many of the 9th grade (or first year) students were still in the very beginning stages of learning English, so many of the opportunities to exercise their voices were enacted through gesturing or physical activities. For example, in the first two weeks of class, the entire school dedicated class time to developing a common understanding of what a supportive and cohesive community looked like. In Mr. Sharp’s class, students participated in a dramatization where they acted out (non-verbally is most cases) what various elements of “comunidad” (community) looked like. For example, students showed working together, helping one another, or supporting school rules (i.e. wearing a uniform, picking up trash).

After participating in a dramatization during the first week of school, Mr. Sharp had students experience a “community net” in which they created a web out of yarn based on their connections with peers in the class. Mr. Sharp asked, “who are you connected to?” One student responded, “I connect to Maria because she gives me help,” another student responded, “porque
esta aprendiendo con ella y practicar Inglés” (because I am learning with her and practicing English). After creating a web of connections with one another as a class, students constructed a co-written paragraph on their definition of community. Writing a paragraph as a group offered opportunities to not only make sense of their experiences in the dramatization and web activities, but also supported students’ voices as an essential element in determining what a community in Mr. Sharp’s classroom looked, sounded, and felt like. The definition of community constructed by Mr. Sharp’s class “B” read:

A community is a group of people working and discussing together. If you are in a community you have to respect other people. It’s safe when you are in a community. We have a heavy, strong connection with other people. We listen to each other’s advice and we have freedom. Every person sustains the connection and helps the other people. If one person disconnects then the community changes. If the community is missing one person everyone falls.

In addition to this particular example of exercising voice by developing an understanding of community, Mr. Sharp’s newcomer students participated in a daily presentation of the agenda (as seen in the lesson vignette). When describing why he had students present the agenda for the day, he explained:

[…] that is a place where kids can do that, it is very – there is a very clear format to it, so what it also does is allows students with lower levels of English language to be the presenter and kind of feel like they are speaking in English and running the class in English, even though they don’t have a lot of English. So it is really about giving voice to the kids because at least in the beginning, they are not going to take it unless you provide them with an opportunity. Eventually, they have to take it themselves, you can’t really give anybody a voice, they have to take it themselves.”

A different student presented the lesson agenda to the class every day at the start of each period. The student volunteer called on her/his peers to read and translate each part of the agenda (date, central question, lesson items, and homework). After each part of the agenda was read and translated into the languages spoken in the room, Mr. Sharp would then begin his lesson for the day. The goal for the presentation of the lesson agenda was three-fold: establishing the lesson’s
context so students would know exactly what to expect during the lesson; becoming familiar with the items on the agenda; and providing students with the opportunity to enact their voice in the classroom.

Mr. Sharp negotiated “giving voice” to his students, as this was something one can’t necessarily do, but must rather “provide them with an opportunity” to use their voice and then they must “take it themselves.” These conceptions of his social studies pedagogy were explicitly used in other activities as well, for example, supporting one’s opinions with evidence and developing an argument in essay writing. He explained that as students learned to “express themselves in English” they began to gain the confidence to question and critique perceived elements of authority in the classroom, like texts and the teacher. The goal for Mr. Sharp’s newcomer students was to build the confidence to use and exercise their voice in the classroom in a highly scaffolded setting, like “running the agenda.” Once students were comfortable speaking English in class, they would begin to express their ideas and disagreements about the content, and discuss their opinions in class activities. Mr. Sharp hoped, however, students would experience these “concrete ways” of “taking your voice,” and “hearing your voice” in discussion and writing, and moved toward explicitly explaining to students how to use their voice in the larger society. These notions of voice are intimately tied to Mr. Sharp’s conceptualizations of history and social studies as grounded in a “populist,” or everyday lived experiences of “regular people,” as he desired that his students enact their voice, expressing experiences involving issues and actions taking place in their daily lives.

“Language as a political act.” Mr. Sharp believed that using language (native language, English, or other languages) through writing, speaking, reading, and listening was critical to not only exercising students’ voice, but also supported the elements of an active and engaged citizen
(i.e. being involved in “politics” at the local and national levels). Mr. Sharp articulated that his background in teaching English as a second language greatly influenced his sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) for his Latino/a newcomer students. He stated:

> My experience with TESOL, Teaching English as a Second Language, and going through a Masters in that, definitely has sort of focused me on that, you know language as a political act, like speaking as a political act, and political I don’t mean with a large “P” I mean more of a small “p,” but um and a large “P” too.

Mr. Sharp further defined politics as “the interaction between people to make decisions that affect them […] So that can exist on a national scale, which is the big ‘P’ […] But there are politics, you know, inter-office politics, there are inter-group politics, like in my class, and that is sort of the little ‘p.’ ” Mr. Sharp supported an orientation toward linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) wherein his attitude of “speaking as a political act” influenced his belief in the importance of language to interact and “make decisions that affect them.” These notions particularly support the tenets of a sociolinguistic consciousness, whereby he displayed knowledge of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use, given that he articulated wanting students to “find your voice in another language” as critical to actively participating in one’s community and society.

Mr. Sharp’s reasoning for using language, teaching English, and exercising voice supported the foundation of why he was committed to the mission and vision of Empire International High School and dedicated to meeting the needs of his “over-aged” newcomers. He expressed that “in the more general political sense, these are downtrodden people who are not enfranchised by our system and that is why I am teaching in this school […] you know because other people can give voice to people who already have a voice, I don’t need to do that.” Mr. Sharp’s conceptualizations of teaching Latino/a newcomer youth supported notions of culturally relevant pedagogy through his orientations toward teaching history from everyday experiences.
by having students exercise their voice in all aspects of his classroom pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994). He implemented these pedagogical conceptions through various strategies, including experiential learning, writing and revision, inquiry-based learning, discussion, group work, and social studies concept formation. These pedagogical strategies will be discussed further in the next theme regarding Mr. Sharp’s implementation of social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth.

**Implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Knowledge and Skills toward accessing students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds through group work, experiential learning, and inquiry.** Mr. Sharp’s implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth highlighted the knowledge and skills toward accessing students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds by using a variety of methods including group work, experiential learning, and inquiry. This theme will be organized using the three core categories: culture, language, and citizenship (see Chapter III: Methodology section for further information about the development of these categories). Within each category, an analysis of how Mr. Sharp’s pedagogical ideas and actions developed the knowledge and skills for implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth will be discussed.

**Culture: “There are connections that I can make.”** Mr. Sharp’s implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth supported notions of culture based in shared knowledge, experiences, and histories. Culture, for Mr. Sharp, was open and manifested itself differently depending on his students’ prior schooling experiences, immigrant journeys, identities, and communities. Mr. Sharp’s focus on culture in his implemented pedagogy supported Lee’s (2010) notion that culturally relevant pedagogy “is about making connections as opposed to identifying, assessing, and generalizing cultural traits” of immigrant children and
ELLs (p. 456). Mr. Sharp’s knowledge of accessing students’ cultural backgrounds was implemented through his pedagogical ideas toward making connections for students. He re-conceptualized accessing prior knowledge in his pedagogy, explaining:

I think it has taken a semester to see, ‘oh, the stuff that I know has a connection’ […] at the beginning we start with Columbus, and it is like, all of the Dominican kids eat, breath, and sleep Columbus, so that wasn’t prior knowledge, that was they’ve done this before. And that is different, they just regurgitated what they knew […] And now they are realizing that experiences like, some of them work in minimum wage jobs- like McDonalds- and that experience of being a worker today, has a connection to what we are talking about in the Industrial Revolution. And actually, those experiences and that prior knowledge is actually more valid than ‘I read about Columbus in a text book in my country,’ so that is - we are getting to a point where we have enough connections where they can see, ‘my experience in a former colony of France in Africa, is pertinent to what I am talking about in India. Even though the names are different, and the culture is different, and the situations are different, there are connections that I can make.’

Prior knowledge, for Mr. Sharp, was not based on “regurgitating what they knew,” with regards to historical facts and figures, but rather, based on students’ shared experiences with the content.

Mr. Sharp implemented a pedagogy that involved making connections explicitly for immigrant youth. For example, stating, “that experience of being a worker today, has a connection to what we are talking about in the Industrial Revolution.” These experiences were explicitly discussed in an introductory lesson on the Industrial Revolution (unit 3), in which students were asked to grapple with the central question, “Was the Industrial Revolution positive or negative and for whom?”

Guided by the central question, Mr. Sharp first asked students to respond to the journal prompt, “What does a family need to pay for each month?” After spending five minutes to respond to the prompt, students participated in a discussion about their personal family budgets. One Bengali student, Tania, responded: “$1,500 - goes to rent, cable TV/Internet, the lights, and water.” Mr. Sharp replied, “good, and we say electricity for lights, what else?” Tania added, “gas, telephone, clothes, and food.” After responding, Tania passed the “discussion ball” to a
Latino student, Kevin, who replied, “laundry - every week - parking or the train, and fuel.” Mr. Sharp led the class into a discussion of how the items they pay for each month might be similar to what workers and factory owners during the Industrial Revolution may have needed. He used images of workers and factory owners to guide the discussion. Students brought in their personal experiences, saying, “workers need money to survive,” or “they [workers] need more space” (referring to tight living quarters), and “they [factory owners] want to make their house bigger, they want more money…to have more power.” Using these ideas and their constructed experiences of workers and factory owners, students were asked to create a “family budget.” The directions read “(a) your group is a working class family, (b) your entire family are workers in the factory, (c) complete the budget in you group.” Mr. Sharp explained, “I want you to put the real amount, that you have for your family today, Tania, you said ‘1,000 for rent,’ put that in your budget.” Mr. Sharp then moved to a small group of students and said, “you are the factory owners, so you need to figure out your budget for the factory.”

Students worked on their budget for the remainder of the lesson, and towards the end of the class Mr. Sharp discussed how the “worker” groups might need to be prepared in the following lesson to negotiate their budget, as “the factory owners, need to make money from their factory and they need to pay you less money.” This lesson showed how Mr. Sharp engaged students in building connections based on their experiences with work and their personal family budgets, as well as including the perspectives of the factory owners. Mr. Sharp continually engaged students in the Global History content by using students’ experiences, knowledge, and assets to make sense of the material. Furthermore, he used group work in his social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth to also access students’ cultural backgrounds and make connections with each other and the Global History content they were learning.
Group work in Mr. Sharp’s class was a daily occurrence. Students were placed in “home groups” in which they worked with the same heterogeneous (linguistically and ethnically) group for daily class activities, including goal-setting and stations-organizing. During the learning stations segment of the unit (see section on “Global History Curriculum Goals” above for unit organization structure), Mr. Sharp’s students would move to different stations and “home groups” would split up into new groups to support, what he explained “as language development, interacting with other kids in that language [in this case, English] in a group.” Group work supported language learning and interactions with students from various backgrounds (linguistically, culturally, experientially), creating “real life experiences” of working with a team, leading to growth as a community member (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Mr. Sharp reflected on and challenged the implementation of using group work in his classroom for his newcomer students, and his Dominican students particularly. When considering whether this sort of pedagogy supported students’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll, et al., 1992) or generalized the social and academic characteristics of Dominican youth, he explained:

I think a lot of the Latino kids are used to mixing social interaction and academic interaction, and I think a lot of the West African kids and especially the Bengali kids have come from this place where when you are in school, you do school, and when you’re out of school you do other things. But school is not a place to have friends; it is a place to study […] if we are asking kids to do group work, and to talk to each other about concepts, to some degree that encourages participation among the Latino kids, because they would be participating anyway or something like that. While some of the other kids from the other cultures, deep down don’t feel like that is a good thing to do in class, cause’ they have been taught that […] So that might be something that the Latino, or the Dominican kids bring, is a willingness to kind of hash it out, um I don’t know where it comes from, does it come from culturally, or just the schools they were in [i.e. public or private schools], or are the schools they were in, is cultural?

Interestingly, Mr. Sharp navigated the “mixing” of students’ schooling experiences from West Africa, Bangladesh, and the Dominican Republic by implementing group work that incorporated both individual and cooperative work. For example, some Dominican students bring a
“willingness to hash it out,” and some West African and Bengali students see school as “a place to study,” meaning they are not as familiar with social and participatory forms of pedagogy. Mr. Sharp took action to modify group work (incorporating various tasks) so as to cater to students’ previous schooling and learning experiences. These pedagogical ideas and actions were implemented through Mr. Sharp’s use of learning stations. While the learning stations required students to work in groups (as described above), they were still expected to produce individual pieces of evidence to support their understanding of the content presented in each of the stations.

For example, in the same unit from the example used above on creating a worker and factory owner’s family budget, Mr. Sharp implemented a stations lesson on the Industrial Revolution. He explained to students that, “In the documents section- there are also photos so that not everyone has to do the same thing- some students read the interview, others look at the images- and answer the questions from the pictures and the written document.” The evidence students gathered had to be turned in individually to Mr. Sharp. There were three items students were responsible for once they completed the stations: (a) primary source document station handout - students read and viewed five documents, discussed the documents with the group, and answered questions; (b) video station handout - students watched four short videos on the steam engine, machines and factories, factory work, and the development of cities, and answered questions; and (c) textbook station handout - students read the textbook and answered questions. Each of these activities, while they required working together as a group to navigate the texts, images, videos, and questions, also required students to work individually to construct their own understanding of the material presented. As Mr. Sharp noted, enacting the stations activities supported his idea that “group work is valuable if people are going off and doing independent work and bringing it back to the group […] that motion is what makes both the independent
work and the group work more authentic.” The stations supported “authentic” work, avoiding copying, offered students a chance to reflect individually on the activity, and provided a space for students with varying academic experiences and linguistic levels to work together to meet their desired goals; therefore, leading to stations work that was “differentiated within,” and providing “different entry points” for his newcomer students.

Language: “The experience doesn’t have to be linguistic, in fact, it shouldn’t be, it should be experiential.” Mr. Sharp’s implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a students always incorporated a language objective. Given that Mr. Sharp was a certified TESOL and social studies teacher, he had a particular orientation that supported the knowledge and skills toward English language development for his newcomer youth. While most of his implemented pedagogy supported English language development, the way he went about this development was unique to Mr. Sharp’s pedagogy. For example, explicit English language instruction occurred through the Global History content, using experiential learning activities and a language experience approach to support the understanding of difficult social studies concepts and the writing process. Mr. Sharp implemented an assembly line experiential learning activity during the Industrial Revolution unit to build a context for understanding three essential concepts: production, industry, and urbanization. At the outset of the activity, students were divided into two groups, the family/cottage industry and the factory industry. Their task was to compare the “old factory system versus the new system” by creating paper airplanes. He divided the classroom into 4 “houses,” or groups of three to four students who worked with their “families” to create the paper airplanes, and an “assembly line” of about ten students who were “factory workers” responsible for one part of the paper airplane construction (i.e. folding the wing). Mr. Sharp took the role of the factory owner, and explained to students in the lesson:
This is the paper airplane factory. I am the businessman. I sell airplanes for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. I want to see if the factories or the families are better. Now, the U.S. wants perfect airplanes- like this [he showed the students an airplane he had created] - if you give me an airplane like this [he showed another airplane that looked very similar, then crumbled it into a ball]- I don’t buy that. The U.S. government wants perfect airplanes.

During the activity, students experienced what the production of paper airplanes looked and felt like in two different industries. As a group, after the experiential exercise, they discussed how much each industry produced, why, and what this meant for generating a profit in the old and new factory systems. Students concluded that while the new factory system made more airplanes in a shorter amount of time, it used more resources (paper, humans, machines), produced more pollution and waste (fuel, by products), and treated its workers worse (no break, fired if they did not produce, and felt tired). The resources, production/waste, and treatment of workers were all items students saw and experienced in the activity; therefore, this simulation gave students a physical and emotional connection to the concepts of “industry” and “production.” After the exercise, Mr. Sharp transitioned into an understanding of “urbanization,” and an explanation of why workers began to move into cities due to high demand for labor and the abundance of resources. Mr. Sharp described his goals for implementing experiential learning activities, explaining:

[…] the experience doesn’t have to be linguistic, in fact, it shouldn’t be, it should be experiential […] You know, that understanding is something that can be understood from the experience, it doesn’t have to be written, or read, or spoken, it can be experienced, and that is something they have […] they are going into the business of reading text and listening to videos with that understanding that comes from the experience. So that is something really important at the end to bring everything together.

Working in the cottage and factory industries during the simulation offered students an experiential connection to the three essential social studies concepts for the unit: production, industry, and urbanization. As Mr. Sharp explained, “they remember that experience [and] they
This lesson gave students a different understanding of history, one that they could connect to “real life experiences.” Mr. Sharp reflected that “every interaction that you have in this simulation has a corollary to what happens in real life.” These experiences are deep, visceral, and not only relate to students’ lives, but also give newcomer youth a non-linguistic context for the essential social studies concepts and Global History content. Providing background information and context for the historical content through experiential learning activities supported the tenet of linguistically responsive teaching, in which teachers scaffold instruction to promote ELL students’ learning (Lucas & Villegas, 2010).

Specifically, Mr. Sharp developed his ELL students’ understanding of the academic and linguistic tasks associated with concept formation. Furthermore, he considered the relationship between his students’ linguistic capabilities and the academic tasks when implementing a language experience approach based on the context established from the experiential learning activity.

Mr. Sharp implemented a language experience approach (LEA) as part of his enacted Global History curriculum. He described this approach as the use of “experiences [that] are not necessarily based on language […] [and] now we are going to write those.” He continued to describe the LEA pedagogical process, explaining:

So we’ve done all of this stuff, we looked at all of this data and information, we’ve done the stations, we did the thing-a-ma-bob game which is sort of this experience game about competition between countries, resources, and the environment and stuff like that [experiential learning activity employed during unit 1]. So they have these experiences, and those experiences are not necessarily based on language, they are just experiences and so now we are going to write about those. And we are going to extrapolate from those experiences how it is in the real world […] a lot of it is talking about, ‘well what happened in that game?’ and ‘explain to me, just write what happened in the game.’ So there is this whole thing of them kind of collecting their ideas, talking about it in their group, and then bringing it out to the class. Collecting ideas, talking it out, basically like a grandeurs sort of think-pair-share. And as they bring it out to the class, we write it together on the board, and now they have this part of a paragraph, which is student ideas
and words- student language- that is filtered a little through me because I am writing it, so I am not going to write obvious grammatical mistakes, but I am going to follow what they are saying pretty well [...] So they have that, then they have to go home and complete that [the paragraph].

Mr. Sharp used students’ experiences in the experiential activity to construct an understanding of its larger purpose in relationship to the unit topic, themes, and concepts. By “extrapolate[ing] from those experiences” students were asked to “collect ideas,” “talk it out,” and “bring it out to the class” through a group thinking and writing exercise focused on students’ “ideas” and “words” from the experience. He further explained, “so separating those three processes out [collecting evidence, explaining connections between evidence, and organizing evidence] and then slowly, slowly put them together,” was all part of the LEA. The goal of the LEA was to use “student language” to make meaning of the experience so they would have a starting point for writing a paragraph (and later essay) about the concepts. In this case, Mr. Sharp helped students make sense of the thing-a-ma-bob game in which countries [i.e. France, Japan, and India] competed for resources and encountered problems, and students had to come up with solutions and results to the problems. Based on this experience, students responded together to outcome 2 for the unit, “how does competing for resources effect countries differently?” Students also participated in a LEA paragraph writing exercise for outcomes 1 and 3 to scaffold their writing process, and ultimately create the foundations for a letter they would write to President Obama about climate change.

The LEA supported students’ writing process, in English, by accessing their experiences, ideas, and understandings from classroom activities. When it came time to turn in their letters, Mr. Sharp had an unprecedented 80% pass-in rate from his newcomer students. He attributed this high rate to the fact that:
the kids felt like they had something to write, and there are a lot of kids who - again- are looking for the answer, and I am telling them I just need your opinion, and then we’ll work with it, and they are like- well what is the answer, and I don’t necessarily want the answer, I want your opinion. When 80% of my class writes something, even if half of it is what we wrote together as a class from the screen, if they write something, I can then take that and sit with them and say, ‘this is great, how can we add to this?’

Working together as a class to construct an understanding of the content, outcomes, and concepts proved to be successful with Mr. Sharp’s newcomer students, as they “had something to write,” and most turned in a draft of their essays. Students were able to put together a draft that included all or most of the elements Mr. Sharp desired his newcomer students to obtain during the unit. He was especially excited that he now had something to work from, as the revision process was just as important as the creation process in writing an essay. He further exclaimed, “now I can have the conversation about how we can improve this, and of course that is where kids learn how to write. So I am excited about that!” Mr. Sharp was thrilled with the outcome of the LEA and was excited to continue meeting his students’ linguistic and social studies content needs in the classroom.

Citizenship: “A close-knit community, like the school or the classroom.” Mr. Sharp conceptualized citizenship in multi-faced ways, explaining: “a close-knit community, like the school or the classroom or world citizenship or humanity citizenship.” These conceptions support culturally relevant notions of citizenship, given that Mr. Sharp re-conceptualized citizenship based on his students’ experiences, their current social studies classroom space, and “encouraging a community of learners” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 69). He continued:

So, I think enough people have talked about cosmopolitanism and world citizenship, so I’ll talk about the classroom. So, I mean you know one of the things that we start off the year with is we’re a community and there are three things that this place needs to be- we need to be professional here, it has to be a safe place, and we have to feel like a community. Basically, I would say actions that support that are the actions of a citizen. A place that people are exchanging things of equal value, like in a community, so there is sort of a lose economy going on. An economy of emotion, or help, or whatever- not
money, obviously. So in this community there is a reason that we are together, we are together as a community because we give and receive value from the other members. Creating a community and the feeling of belonging to that community were two key elements of Mr. Sharp’s notions of citizenship. He implemented these notions at the outset of his course, encouraging an understanding of each element of “a close-knit community:” being professional, creating a safe space, and feeling like a community. For example, students constructed an understanding of each element by creating a class-wide definition of each term (as explained above regarding “community”). These foundational activities provided explicit examples of what “actions” would “support” these elements, and thus were “actions of a citizen” in Mr. Sharp’s class. Actions included respecting other people, working with other people, being on time, sharing your ideas, using professional language, paying attention, studying hard, being friendly, and telling the truth. Mr. Sharp’s newcomer students expressed these examples of actions when defining “professional” as a class. Professionalism, for Mr. Sharp, was intertwined with notions of citizenship. He explained: “I use the word professional because for them, a lot of it [is] […] they are thinking of it as a job. I mean it also means responsible […] you know responsibility, citizenship, being a responsible citizen is what professionalism is all about.” This shows how Mr. Sharp implemented his notions of citizenship in class, by having students create examples of what actions they would take to demonstrate active and engaged citizenship in their classroom community.

Mr. Sharp further explained that citizenship in a “close-knit community” was important when thinking about newcomer youths’ social, political, and economic contexts in the U.S. and world. These conceptions supported a foundation for developing a critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995a) in the social studies classroom, and developing civic and political norms and values, stating:
I would say those small- citizenship of those small community- that they’ll be in in- their work place, their neighborhood, other classes that they’ll be in- I think are much more important day to day to them and to me, than national citizenship or even world citizenship. I don’t think you can have world citizenship without having the smaller, community citizenship. Having said that, I am speaking from a very privileged, well-documented [in terms of status] position, and there are kids who are undocumented, and you know, is it right for me to be telling them that citizenship in my classroom is more important than their undocumented status? [...] But I do believe that- I still think that, you know, what is the use of getting documented in a place that you don’t feel you have community and have a vested interest, you know, why would you do that? [...] So they have reasons to be here, and I think they are more related to the small communities that they are a part of than anything about the federal government.

Mr. Sharp negotiated his students’ citizenship status, explaining that his conceptions of community-based citizenship were “more related” to what his students engaged in “day to day.” He acknowledged his positionality regarding his conceptions, stating, “I am speaking from a very privileged, well-documented position;” however, documentation was not something he could particularly control from his position of social studies teacher. What he could do is support students’ consideration of being an active and engaged citizen in re-conceptualized ways, and challenge normative notions of citizenship by offering multiple spaces for his newcomer youth to “feel [they] have community and have a vested interest.” He hoped these actions, attitudes, and commitments would translate into pursuing other political or civic activities, if they were interested. Documented citizenship was more of “a hurdle that they have to go through, it is a hoop that they have to jump through, it will get them certain things, and it will help them to do that, but really it is not about that, it is about the small things.” Mr. Sharp recognized his newcomer students’ social and political positionality in U.S. society, and worked to help students recognize the numerous ways they are, and can be, active and engaged citizens.

Creating a community, for Mr. Sharp, was the foundation for developing students’ “willing[ness] to push or be pushed,” and to then “respond positively” to being a citizen in his classroom, and “a member of this community.” He explained to his students, “and that is how
you are a citizen for now, and later there is more of a personal push, ‘okay I’m in this society, what am I going to do to further this society, what kind of direction am I going to take?’ and that is a little bit later.” Students needed to feel like they were a part of the community first, for Mr. Sharp, before they would engage as active members of the larger community. An active and engaged citizen in Mr. Sharp’s Global History class for newcomer youth, therefore, involved the following attributes: an understanding of what it looks like to be a member of a community; knowledge of what actions are associated with being a citizen; and the ability to take these experiences and transfer them into action-taking in society at large. Mr. Sharp’s notions of citizenship were further supported by one of his main roles as a social studies teacher for newcomer youth, which was to “empower students” by providing “a place where students have a voice.” This “space” occurred in numerous ways, and was implemented by developing an opinion about the items presented in class using speech, debate, writing, and presentation.

Exercising “voice” was an action associated with citizenship in Mr. Sharp’s social studies class. Mr. Sharp generated students’ inquires in class discussions and used those inquiries to guide students into learning stations work by asking them to gather evidence using documents in each station. Generating inquiries and gathering evidence, established a foundation for newcomer students to exercise their “voice.” Mr. Sharp introduced his unit content outcomes (or objectives) using students’ inquiries regarding the concepts and topics (entering part “c”- stations days- see “Global History Curriculum Goal” above for more detail about unit organization). Students generated inquires during class-wide discussions (part “b”- discussion days), providing the “research questions” to enter into the learning stations activities.

During the stations students would gather evidence based on their inquiries and interests in the material. Mr. Sharp explained to his students on the first stations day of the climate change
Mr. Sharp further supported the tenets of CRP, developing a critical consciousness, by having students “engage the world and others critically” (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 162) beginning with students’ questions about the topic and how their actions might affect and/or transform it. Once students arrived to the learning stations, they were asked to gather evidence to answer their inquiry questions using various documents at each station. Supporting answers with evidence provided students with the information to backup their opinions with evidence.

Providing evidence for opinions further supported exercising students’ voice by building a confidence for knowing what to say when sharing their ideas with the class.

Mr. Sharp not only supported the skills for thinking critically about a topic through discussion and developing inquiry questions, but he also encouraged his newcomer students to implicate themselves and what they might do to take action on global warming, such as looking for possible solutions and writing a letter to President Obama regarding ideas for implementing these various solutions. Furthermore, Mr. Sharp also took steps to challenge the dominant
narratives in Global History by foregrounding the Native American perspective when teaching about the encounter between Christopher Columbus and the Native Americans. In a similar manner, Mr. Sharp foregrounded the experiences of factory workers when teaching about industrialization and class struggle. These examples of Mr. Sharp’s implementation of his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth emphasize his desire that students feel as though they are part of a community in his classroom, and take action in that community to support notions of “small-citizenship” experiences. Engaging in inquiry, searching for evidence, preparing for speaking/presenting/writing/debating, researching how best to take action, and challenging dominant narratives are all examples of Mr. Sharp’s knowledge and skills for developing notions of active and engaged citizenship for his newcomer students at Empire International High School.

Case Summary

Mr. Sharp’s commitment and dedication to Empire International High School and his late-arrival newcomer students, international experiences in the Peace Corps, “anti-imperialist”/“leftist” notions of Global History, and certification/background in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) all established a foundation for how he conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Mr. Sharp’s Global History curriculum focused on historical themes that “told a story” and was implemented with specific English language objectives and instructional goals. Mr. Sharp embodied the role of a facilitator, rather than transmitter of knowledge, and supported his newcomer students’ learning of historical content and social issues by creating a community of learners. He conceptualized citizenship as a “close-knit community,” and used students’ cultural
and experiential knowledge to re-conceptualize active and engaged citizenship that was particular to new immigrant youth’s positionality and experiences in U.S. and global society.

The findings in this case examined how Mr. Sharp conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Mr. Sharp’s conceptualized social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth showed an attitude and belief toward teaching history from the perspective of everyday people. Mr. Sharp believed his social studies pedagogy needed to support his newcomer students’ to exercise their voice and opinions in classroom activities, in order to develop English language skills and create/maintain the confidence to question and critique items in the classroom and society that might be seen as authoritative. Mr. Sharp implemented these pedagogical ideas and actions by using various strategies, including experiential learning, writing and revision, inquiry-based learning, discussion, group work, and social studies concept formation. The next case study, on Mr. Burgos at Pacific International High School, also shows a dedication to using students’ voice by enacting bilingual practices in group work, presentations, and multiple discussion-based models. Mr. Burgos’s enacted social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth will be discussed in the following case study.
Case 3: Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School

In this section, I discuss the context and findings of the case on Mr. Rafael Burgos at Pacific International High School. I will describe the context of the case, including teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and a lesson observation vignette, in order to better understand how Mr. Burgos conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. I finish the section with a summary of case three on Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School (PIHS).

Mr. Rafael Burgos

Mr. Rafael Burgos, a Mexican American man in his early 30s, was born in Tecate, Mexico and moved to Gary, Indiana when he was eight years old. Mr. Burgos came from a family of six children, three boys and three girls. Mr. Burgos was the only teacher in this study that identified ethnically, racially, and linguistically with his students. He identified as “Brown,” an ethnic identity that he believed included all Spanish-speaking Latinos. This ethnic identity framed how he conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a students, as he frequently talked about “we” and “our” experiences as Brown people. He identified as Brown, rather than Hispanic or Chicano, as it encompassed all languages, experiences, movements, communities, and cultures, stating, “It is like one thing we all have in common.” He continued by sharing an example: “It doesn’t matter if your mom makes tamales in corn husks or banana leaves, you know? They are tamales.” He was proud that he shared this ethnic identity with his students, and frequently referred back to this connection throughout the study.

Mr. Burgos studied history and Spanish as an undergraduate in Indiana. After graduating from Purdue University, he worked for a year at a grocery store and then joined the Peace Corps.
Following his service in the Peace Corps, he received a Master of Arts degree and certification in Social Studies Education while simultaneously teaching at Pacific International High School.

Prior to entering the Peace Corps, Mr. Burgos obtained his U.S. citizenship, swearing in on July 4, 2006, when he was 24 years old. He served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Sarapiqui, Costa Rica for two years and three months. He described the town and his job in the Peace Corps:

It is one of the least populated provinces or states, which is Heredia, [...] a small town about 300 people, one main road going through the entire town. Basically my job was, rural community development, which pretty much consisted of everything, you know, teaching, environmental stuff, social work, so basically everything. It is one of the widest, most broad programs they have. So basically I did a little bit of everything: I taught English, did a reforestation project, I briefly taught- for like 2 months- math and science, I did an environmental camp for a week- it was pretty good.

Mr. Burgos had a wide range of responsibilities as a rural community developer, and became close friends with many people in his town. He has a deep connection and admiration for his time in Costa Rica, and returns as often as he can (at least 2 times per year) to visit with his friends and “family” there. Mr. Burgos had some teaching experience in the Peace Corps, and he knew he wanted to become a teacher when he returned to the United States, and decided to pursue a career in social studies education.

Mr. Burgos explained that he “wanted to be a teacher for a long time.” He reflected that his teachers while growing up supported his initial interest in becoming a teacher, explaining, “I’ve always been lucky enough to have a teacher that showed some interest [in me], starting with my 2nd grade teacher, and then in middle school- or junior high as we called it- that is when I think I really started getting into social studies.” While he thinks fondly of the teachers that influenced his decision to become an educator, it was really teaching newcomer Latino/a youth that drew him to education. More specifically the connection he felt with students because of his personal experiences; “I just kept thinking about myself when I came, and I knew somebody had
to help those kids.” When pursuing a job as a social studies teacher at Pacific International High School, he knew this was the reason he had come to New York City. He reflected:

I was so excited to work with these kids […] seeing some of the kids in 11th grade now, and seeing their progression is amazing, and to think what they could do in four years […] it really goes more to their focus and determination than anything else.

Mr. Burgos has a profound pride in his students; he could not imagine teaching at any other school or with any other students. He has been a Global History teacher at PIHS for over two years, and is dedicated to meeting the cultural, linguistic, and social studies needs and interests of his Latino/a newcomer students.

**Pacific International High School**

Pacific International High School is located in a highly diverse neighborhood that acts as a main thoroughfare for people moving from North to South and West to East in the city. The district in which the school is housed is considered one of the poorest congressional districts in the U.S. Roughly 30% of the district’s population is African American and over 60% is Latino. When walking from the subway station to the school, there is a mixture of local establishments and national chains, including restaurants, doctors’ offices, bodegas, and retail stores. On the main avenue as you enter into the school’s neighborhood, there are always vendors selling local fruits and vegetables, as well as a variety of jewelry, handbags, and scarves. When you enter the school’s surrounding neighborhood, most of the homes are single- and multi-family attached town houses. It is a very quiet neighborhood with a few small parks, a public library, small stores, and multiple schools (including one brand new charter school next door). Like Empire and Mission Valley International High Schools, PIHS is housed in a large, historic building that used to be a comprehensive high school and has now been divided into a number of different, smaller schools.
Pacific International High School occupies one floor in the western part of the school building. Unlike Empire International, Pacific does not share its hallways with other schools. However, PIHS shares common spaces with other schools, including the cafeteria, gymnasium, and auditorium. There is a beautiful, fully equipped library in the building that goes unused. There is no librarian, and teachers do not use the library. It serves as a meeting place for students, who occasionally wander into the room during lunch, and for others to find a quiet space to do work, read, or sit quietly. PIHS serves roughly 420 students in grades 9-12. The school has been open for four years, and is focused on meeting the social, academic, cultural, and professional needs of Spanish-speaking newcomer students (PIHS, 2013). PIHS admits students who are residents of New York City, and have been in the U.S. for four years or less. PIHS requires that students are native Spanish speakers and identified as needing English as a Second Language support by the Department of Education. Additionally, 100% of the students at PIHS receive free lunch, and the school has a high annual attendance rate of 88% (PIHS, 2013).

Pacific International High School’s mission statement incorporates developing students’ social, academic, and leadership skills through a collaborative, project-based curriculum, and experiential learning opportunities (PIHS, 2013). The school emphasizes implementing these curricular and pedagogical goals to support its Latino/a newcomer students, developing English language skills and building on current Spanish language proficiencies. The language model employed at PIHS is a combination of a “sheltered instruction” and “maintenance bilingual” program where ELLs receive “language and content instruction in the home language along with English” while also providing “principled [English] language support” in the content-area classroom (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 20-21). This language model is different than the other three schools in this study as PIHS is linguistically homogenous. PIHS is committed to preparing
its students for college and professional careers, and desires to create “an environment that values students’ cultures, native language, and individual differences, while preparing them for academic and professional success in a changing world” (PIHS, 2012a). Examples of Pacific International High School’s stated core beliefs include: English and native language proficiency developed in content-based and collaborative instructional learning environments; support for ELLs’ need to understand, speak, read, and write in English; technological literacy; experiential learning inside and outside of the classroom (i.e. project-based activities, internships, and community service); the differentiation of instruction and assessments; and the creation of learning communities that set high expectations for students and their families (PIHS, 2012b). Teachers, administrators, and staff work together to incorporate these core beliefs throughout the school day.

The hallways at Pacific International High School are wide and well lit. Student work is displayed in the school’s hallways on bulletin boards for all to see. Every classroom is equipped with technology access, either through a media cart with a computer and LCD projector, a SMART board, or a laptop cart with MAC computers. Classrooms at PIHS are large, spacious and welcoming to students interested in a collaborative working environment. Students work at tables of four to five students, facing one another, rather than the front of the classroom. Like Empire and Mission Valley International High Schools, PIHS also has school-wide portfolio assessments for students. Portfolios are presented to a panel of two faculty members and student peers after each six-week unit. Disciplinary subjects rotate when students present, and each portfolio presentation lasts one full academic day. Unlike MVIHS, students at Pacific International are required to take the statewide Regents exam in the four core disciplinary subjects, including the Global and U.S. History exams.
Students at Pacific International High School are all recent Spanish-speaking immigrants. All students at PIHS have been in the United States for four years or less. 100% of the students are Latino: 85% Dominican and 15% Mexican, Ecuadorian, and Colombian. The Colombian population is very small, but growing steadily at the school. Students’ English language levels vary, due to an increasing number of students enrolling in PIHS who have been in the U.S. for at least one year. Many of the incoming 9th grade students completed their 8th grade school year in the United States. Theoretically, some of these students may have arrived to PIHS with some English language instruction in the U.S. from their previous school. The administration at Pacific International High School has decided that all students will enter the school in 9th grade, and stay through 12th grade. No student is allowed to enter the school at 10th or 11th grade; they need to have completed 9th grade at the school first. 2012 was the first year PIHS graduated a group of students, and they had 27 seniors graduate and most went on to attend college.

PIHS’s mission includes a college preparatory emphasis. The school has hired two college counselors and appointed one of the 12th grade teachers to allocate 1/3 of his preparation and instructional time to working with students on college preparation. PIHS received a grant to fund their college advisors for two years, and they hope to take advantage of the advisor expertise as PIHS entered into their first graduating year. Mr. Burgos noted, “there is definitely a push for that [going to college], and I think that is something not that is expected of them, but there is definitely a, ‘if you want to do this, there is help and you should do it.’ ” He explained that recently students have approached him inquiring, “Can I go to college? […] What is there to help them go to college? […] Should they go to college, and where?” Mr. Burgos was happy and
proud that the teachers, staff, and administration supported college access and preparation for his Latino/a newcomer students, and thought this was a “benefit they have at this school.”

Mr. Burgos noted that in previous years at PIHS, there were spouts of “inter-country” conflict in the school. He explained:

Last year we had a little bit of a problem with inter-country problems, I mean it wasn’t really drastic, but it was obvious that Dominican kids were hanging out with Dominican kids, Ecuadorian kids were hanging out with Ecuadorian kids, Mexican kids with Mexican kids, so last year- we tried- and I don’t know how well we did, and I don’t know how we tried- but to make that less of an issue, and I mean basically- so far this year, I have given two speeches about nationalism and how it is detrimental, especially to us. The inter-country conflict is something that the school and students are still negotiating, and Mr. Burgos had made it a point to identify and relate to his students’ experiences, saying, “especially to us,” to work together to develop a community of learners within the classroom and school. He often mentioned to his students that they needed to work together and be aware of issues within the school and in their communities; therefore, how students interacted with one another in the school greatly influenced his social studies pedagogy and conceptions of citizenship for his Latino/a newcomer students (further discussion of these conceptions and pedagogical implementations will be explored in the case findings section below).

Mr. Burgos’s group “A” was demographically somewhat similar to the student body at PIHS. Of the 25 students in the class, the majority of students were from the Dominican Republic, followed by Mexico and Ecuador. Interestingly, 17 of the students in class “A” were female and eight were male. These numbers differed from the school’s gender demographic, which was 54% male and 46% female. Mr. Burgos’s Global History class was inter-aged, similar to Empire International High School, including both 9th and 10th grade students. Students varied in terms of academic Spanish-language proficiencies, prior schooling experiences, and English language levels. All of the 10th grade students had been at Pacific International for at least 1 year,
so theoretically had higher English language levels. However, the comfort (or discomfort) of students when speaking, writing, and presenting in English, made it clear that their length of time in the school did not determine their level of English language proficiency (see Appendix E for English proficiency levels chart posted in Mr. Burgos’s classroom). Instruction in Mr. Burgos’s class focused on a project-curriculum in which students worked together in groups to produce a final project for a content-based unit (further description of this model will be explained in the next section on “Global History Curriculum Goals”). These student and classroom contexts greatly influenced Mr. Burgos’s conceptions and implementations of his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students, and will be explored in the following sections of this case study.

Global History Curriculum Goals

Mr. Burgos’s Global History course centered on the essential goal of encouraging his Latino/a newcomer students to “question things.” He further described this goal as a desire that his students look “past what they see, like what is the obvious, and trying to learn more about it or just not accept every fact that is given to them.” For example, in class discussions Mr. Burgos pushed students to inquire about and critically examine various texts, including news media, current events, and images. He explained that he believed one of his roles was to prompt and “provoke” students with questions about bias and perspective presented in various texts because he felt “they are not aware that, that is a good thing [to question things].” Mr. Burgos envisioned the need for students to “question things” as an essential theme interwoven throughout his curriculum and pedagogy, and implemented through unit outcomes, organization, and pedagogical strategies. Developing positive relationships with students supported this overall goal (further discussion about developing relationships with student will be discussed in the case study findings).
The Global History course was separated into two academic years. Students took the course in both 9th and 10th grade, and were expected to take the New York State Regents exam at the end of the 10th grade year. The social studies team, which included Mr. Burgos, other members of the social studies department, and the Assistant Principal, decided as a group on the overall themes for the year. The themes for the 2011 - 2012 academic year included: (a) geography; (b) patterns of population; (c) wealth and power; (d) economics; (e) beliefs and identity; and (f) science, technology, and environment. During the first half of the year (September - February), Mr. Burgos focused on themes (a) – (d). Each theme was taught using historical case studies as the lens for the unit. For example, unit one, geography, focused on geographic regions, and used case studies of various groups and civilizations living in differing regions. Students examined the arctic, desert, valley, island, and mountain regions, and explored how varying groups lived in different areas, such as the Incas in a mountainous region, or the Anasazi in a desert region. The themes of unit two focused on patterns of population, and wealth and power. Unit two used classical Greece and Rome and the rise of empires as historical examples. During unit three (the final unit observed), students studied economics by examining China and the Silk Road.

During the 2011 - 2012 academic school year, PIHS went through a curricular change. The Global History course included three different classes: a humanities project, a history seminar, and a history workshop. The humanities project was the “core” of the three classes, lasting for two periods, or 95 minutes of class time. All 9th and 10th grade students took the humanities project class, which employed a collaborative, project-based curriculum, co-taught by a social studies and Spanish teacher. All 9th and 10th grade students also took the history workshop class, which was taught only by the social studies teacher, and focused on current
events. Only “advanced” social studies students took the history seminar class. The seminar class was taught by the social studies teacher, and focused on direct instruction of the content introduced in the project class. At the beginning of the year, Mr. Burgos was a bit unclear on the specific aims and goals of the seminar and workshop courses, as the course focus shifted about four weeks into school. Due to the uncertainty of class goals in the history seminar, inclusive of all academic levels of students observed, and my desire to see an implemented Global History curriculum, I focused my observations and attention on the humanities project class. While the course was technically co-taught, Mr. Burgos did the majority of the curricular design and implementation, as it was a social studies course, and the co-teacher (Ms. Rosario) offered linguistic support (primarily in group work and class discussion) and pedagogical scaffolding (providing hand-outs, readings, and questions in Spanish) in each lesson.

The humanities project class was organized into six, “modules” or units. Each unit covered six weeks, and included: (a) introductory days, (b) activities, (c) project preparation, and (d) project presentation. Every unit focused on aligning the activities to support the completion of the final project. Using unit one as an example, the overall goal was to “begin the study of the world.” The unit centered on two essential questions: (a) how do civilizations develop? (b) How does geography affect the rise of civilizations? Students were asked to explain the following content outcomes: how did civilizations utilize resources in their geographic regions and deal with scarcity and abundance of resources (i.e. food and water)? What impact did the geographic region have on the types of protection utilized? What various types of transportation did different civilizations find necessary in their geographic regions and how did that influence them? How did the geographic region lend itself to the creation of different roles in society? The introductory days presented students with the above essential questions and content outcomes, and also
notified students of skill outcomes including: writing informative and explanatory texts; identifying main ideas of pictures, artifacts, and texts; and reading and interpreting symbols on maps. Furthermore, the introductory days introduced students to the final unit project and the project guidelines.

In unit one, students were divided into five groups. Each group was assigned one of five geographic regions: arctic, desert, valley, island, or mountain. One of the introductory days asked students to create a poster about the region based on their prior knowledge and experiences with their assigned region (see Appendix F for poster example). After the introduction, the majority of the unit was spent participating in various activities to guide students’ learning of the content and skill outcomes. Activities in unit one were separated based on the four main content outcomes: food and water, protection, transportation & trade, and roles in society. For example, the mountain region group was presented with a short narrative on the Incas, and they were asked to create a graphic organizer on resources (i.e. food and water) the Incas possessed while living in a mountain region. Other activities included using images to understand what types of protection people might have used (i.e. knife, shovel, axe, sling shot), or analyzing maps of the transportation used in each region’s civilization (i.e. Inuit’s in the arctic region used snow dogs and Egyptians in the valley region used canoes). All of the activities and materials presented to students were created by the social studies team, and were frequently re-assessed and changed throughout the implementation of the unit.

The final two segments of the unit module included preparing and presenting the unit project. In unit one, students created a survival guide for the group’s region. The project was differentiated within, giving each person in the group a role. The guidelines presented the roles to students by stating, “In a civilization, it is important to split up the work. In your civilization,
discuss what role each group member will take for this project. Then decide who will be the page leader and responsible for each page in your group’s Survival Guide.” The roles and designated “page leaders” included: (a) pictures and captions, (b) key vocabulary & definitions, (c) full sentence bullet points, and (d) paragraph. Each role supported a different English language level, starting with level one, pictures and captions, and reaching to level four, paragraph. Students were required to decide, with their group members, what role they felt most comfortable leading. Students had two, sometimes three, weeks to complete their project and present it to the class. The final project for unit one involved a survival guide booklet for each region, including: an introduction; information about the four elements needed to survive in the region—food & water, protection, transportation, and jobs; and a conclusion. Each survival element was divided into quadrants, including pictures, important vocabulary, sentences, and a paragraph, supporting various English language levels in each group.

**Lesson Observation Vignette**

Mr. Burgos’s class was beginning its 7th week of the fall semester. Students in class “A” had just completed their projects from unit one and first semester portfolio presentations on Physics. Today, the class entered unit two with an introductory lesson on the thematic strands “patterns of population” and “wealth and power,” using classical Greece and Rome and the rise of empires as historical case studies. As I walked into the classroom at 9:00 A.M., students were energetic, joyful, and hanging out/joking with Mr. Burgos prior to the start of second period. The classroom walls were decorated with student posters and projects from unit one. I noticed a few students in the front of the room posting the new content and skills outcomes for unit two. Each outcome was printed on a different piece of paper and read: (a) how did Hellenistic and Roman culture spread through art and architecture? (b) How did Hellenization and Romanization spread
through war and conquest? (c) What were the causes and effects of Hellenization and Romanization? (d) Write a paragraph about historical events. (e) How can you use maps, graphs, and images to explain the spread of Greek and Roman culture?

Ms. Rosario, Mr. Burgos’s co-teacher, entered the classroom just as the class was about to begin. Ms. Rosario immediately began putting students into different groups. She called out the names of each student as Mr. Burgos wrote the groups on big paper for the class to see. Students sat quietly, listening for their name. After Ms. Rosario finished calling out each student’s name, she asked students to move into their new groups (all of the instruction and organizing of new groups took place in Spanish). Students moved to their new tables, quietly and quickly, and Ms. Rosario looked at me, smiled, and said, “good news for us, they just came from gym.” Ms. Rosario thanked students for moving into their new groups quietly and made a few announcements about school ending a bit earlier today due to parent teacher conferences.

Mr. Burgos asked students to take ten minutes to talk amongst themselves and write down two things about each member of their new group. He informed them, “you will be with these groups for five weeks.” Students began to talk to their new group members. Mr. Burgos walked around to each group and made a quick announcement to students in Spanish: “last night many of your parents came, about 18 parents, and I have about 80 plus students. So today, when you go home, tell your parents to come between 1 - 3 P.M. if you want your grade.” Mr. Burgos approached one of the groups and asked them if they would please introduce themselves to the class. Each group began to introduce their classmates. Mr. Burgos commented after one group’s presentation, “see we learned something new, Ramón estudia mucho [Ramón studies a lot].” Students giggled and Ms. Rosario explained in English, “you need to learn how to work in a group and how your group’s work, and get accustomed to working with groups.” She continued
by telling a story about how they, as teachers, have to work in groups and on different teams. She continued, “in jobs, you need to work in groups with different people, so you need to take this opportunity to get accustomed to working in groups.” Students listened intently, and continued to introduce their new group members.

Students noted their peers’ favorite colors, sports, TV shows, and animals. They also mentioned if group members liked to talk, study, or if they were shy. Some students liked to play video games, while others preferred playing sports. Some students were noticeably embarrassed when their group members presented their likes/dislikes to the group. Mr. Burgos sat down with one of the groups to help keep them on task and listening while other groups were presenting. Students in the class really enjoyed the activity; they got to know their peers even more that they already did, and frequently asked follow up questions when something interested them. Ms. Rosario thanked students again for their engagement in the introduction activity, and Mr. Burgos stood up, made his way to the front of the room, and began the new social studies unit.

Mr. Burgos explained, in Spanish, that the final project would involve computers, cameras, and music to study the Greeks and the Romans. He continued in English, “for your final project, you are going to make a video in your group.” He informed students that it would be a lot of work, but they would have time to work in class on the video and a lot of freedom to be creative. Mr. Burgos moved to the media cart in the classroom and began to set up a computer and projector. Meanwhile, Ms. Rosario asked students in Spanish, “what do you already know about the Greeks and the Romans?” One student immediately responded by calling out, “tenían reyes [they had kings].” Mr. Rosario said, “okay, in the Roman Empire, Imperio Romano, porqué era un Imperio [why was it an Empire]?” One student, Axel, walked over to the bookshelf, grabbed a Spanish dictionary, and looked up the word “Imperio.” Mr. Burgos noticed
what Axel was doing, and said, “Axel, what does it [the word] mean to you?” Together, they constructed an understanding of the term Empire, using Axel’s prior knowledge with Mr. Burgos’s support, as “a country that has a lot of money, a strong economy, and power.” Mr. Burgos, pleased with the short introduction on Greece and Rome, pulled up the video, which was an example of a desktop documentary he had created. The video was six minutes long and titled “Are All Men Created Equal?” He played the video, as the fast paced, musically rich, short film immediately captivated students.

After watching the video, Mr. Burgos discussed with students the importance of including music, movies, images, words, or other items when creating their short films. He explained “tenga la mente abierta [keep an open mind], tu tiene la libertad para incluir cualquier cosa de representar la información [you have the freedom to include anything to represent the information].” He made sure to highlight that students should, however, respect the culture of the Greeks and Romans, but it was up to them regarding what form their films would take to represent these cultures. He assured students that it wasn’t complicated, but it would take a while, using his example as a reference for creating a short film. Mr. Burgos was very excited about his students creating films for their final project, and couldn’t wait to have his students present this project for portfolio presentations in five weeks. Students used iMovie software to create their films on MAC laptops provided by the school.

Mr. Burgos transitioned from discussing the film and final project for unit two, to building on students’ prior knowledge and understanding of Greece and Rome by using a “K-W-L” graphic organizer (the title of the graphic organizer read, “Greeks and Romans,” and each column stated, “What I know, What I want to know, What I learned”). Ms. Rosario distributed the “K-W-L” chart to students, while Mr. Burgos gathered new folders for each group. The
folders were used in Mr. Burgos’s class to organize students’ handouts and documents completed for each unit. Students compiled their work as a group at the end of each class period, and kept their work in the classroom with Mr. Burgos. Mr. Burgos explained to the students in English, “first, I want you to write what you know about the Greeks,” he pointed to the “K” column in the chart, and translated what he said into Spanish, then added, “¿tal vez, desde películas [Maybe from movies]?”

Students began filling out the “K” column and writing their names on the group’s unit two folder. A few students seemed confused about the graphic organizer. One student used a Spanish-English dictionary to help her complete the first column. Another student asked Ms. Rosario what the first column said, she replied, “¿qué tu sabes?” Some students asked Mr. Burgos if they could write their ideas in Spanish, and he consented, while other students spent their time trying to write/translate what they “knew” in English. For the remainder of the class, students worked diligently on writing what they knew about the ancient Greeks. Meanwhile, Mr. Burgos and Ms. Rosario talked quietly in the front of the room, pointing at groups, perhaps reflecting on their organization of the new groups and whether they thought students were working well together. Mr. Burgos gave his students a three-minute warning and asked them to finish what they were doing, put their papers in the folder, and start to clean up. As students compiled their charts, one student from each group brought their folder to Mr. Burgos. He thanked students as they left the class, and reminded them to ask their parents to attend the afternoon parent-teacher conferences.

Findings

This section focuses on the findings from the case of Mr. Rafael Burgos at Pacific International High School in relation to the subsidiary research questions: how does Mr. Burgos
conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does Mr. Burgos implement his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does Mr. Burgos conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? Findings are understood in the context of two themes, Mr. Burgos’s conceptualization and implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Mr. Burgos conceptualized social studies pedagogy by orienting toward building a community of learners to foster civic engagement. Mr. Burgos implemented social studies pedagogy by using his knowledge and skills for teaching Latino/a newcomer youth by engaging in bilingual practices to enact a project-based curriculum.

In each theme, I examine how Mr. Burgos’s attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions show overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. I examine how Mr. Burgos’s attitudes and ideas led to the conceptualization of orientations toward teaching social studies. I also examine how Mr. Burgos’s ideas and actions led to the implementation of knowledge and skills for teaching social studies as they apply to culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer students.

**Conceptualizing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Orientations toward building a community of learners to foster civic engagement.** Mr. Burgos’s identification with and admiration for his Latino/a newcomer students, experiences in the Peace Corps, and passion for teaching social studies influenced his attitudes, beliefs, and conceptualizations of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. These attitudes and beliefs, for example using “we” and “our” when discussing his students’ experiences as newcomers, blurred the line between self and others (Ladson-Billings, 1994). These conceptions supported an orientation toward developing a community of learners in the classroom by
building relationships with individual students. The foundations established when building a community in Mr. Burgos’s classroom fostered and encouraged an enacted social studies pedagogy that focused on active civic engagement.

“Civic engagement […] it is not just an individual thing, it is a community.” Mr. Burgos conceptualized teaching social studies as “building civic engagement” for his Latino/a newcomer students. He defined civic engagement as:

[…] being aware of what is going on […] being aware of issues, problems that we encounter- as not only individuals, but groups, society as a whole […] I think I would define it more about being involved in your community, understanding what each group- if you belong to a certain group- just trying to make things better.

Mr. Burgos desired to move away from normative notions of civic engagement, or, as he noted, “what I feel some people would define civic engagement as participating in, you know- voting, and stuff like that.” He emphasized civic engagement that was specific to his Latino/a newcomer students’ experiences (and his experiences as well); a civic engagement focused more on community issues, and issues that involved “a certain group:” your community. The goal for civic engagement, according to Mr. Burgos, was “to make things better” by understanding what the issues are in your community or “problems we encounter,” understanding how to take actions on these issues, and beginning to take action to improve “society as a whole.”

These notions of civic engagement are deeply personal and connected to what Mr. Burgos experienced growing up. He doesn’t necessarily see himself as “civically engaged” in the political sense, but does see himself engaged with his community through teaching and acting as an ally for his Latino/a students (this will be discussed further in the following section). He explained where these conceptions of civic engagement come from, stating, “I don’t remember my parents being involved politically. But, I know communally, locally, my dad was- I wouldn’t say involved- but he was aware of what was going on, and he would definitely try to make things
better.” Awareness, and a desire to “make things better” were two elements of civic engagement that Mr. Burgos thought were critical to his decision to teach social studies and Latino/s newcomer youth. He wanted to provide a civic education that made students feel like “it is something that I [they] can see.” Civic education, for Mr. Burgos, should be attainable, not hypothetical or theoretical, but include examples of actual civic activities that students can participate in. He explained that, pedagogically, this involved:

Having them, at least, know part of what it means to be civically engaged. I think a lot of them don’t see any obligations with the fact that they’re here and trying to make everything better. I think some of them are just like, ‘okay, I’m here, and I am here because I want a better future.’ If you ask any of the kids, 90% of the time, that is what they’ll say, they want a better future. But then they don’t make the leap that, for me to have a better future, things have to change- like my community has to improve, they think it is an individual thing. So maybe the social studies, in having them realize that it is not an individual thing, it is a community.

Mr. Burgos desired to help his students “make the leap” from already knowing that it was important that they were “here” in school because they “want[ed] a better future,” to using their new experiences and knowledge to “mak[e] things better” and learn that “things have to change.” What is critical for students to achieve in Mr. Burgos’s conception of social studies as “civic engagement” is the ability to bridge one’s individual inclinations, and a desire to make things better for themselves and their family, with a commitment to changing their communities and perhaps larger society(ies). These conceptions supported culturally relevant notions of encouraging a community of learners in which “students work against the norm of competitive individualism,” and “teachers believe that the students have to care, not only about their own achievement but also their classmates’ achievement” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 69). It is these notions that influenced Mr. Burgos to conceptualize a social studies pedagogy that was built on a foundation of creating a community of learners for his Latino/a newcomer students.
“You do have to build that relationship before you can actually question their work ethic.” Mr. Burgos was committed to building a community of learners in his social studies classroom through his enacted social studies pedagogy. He focused on developing individual relationships with his newcomer Latino/a students, demonstrating a “connectedness” with each of his students, and assuring “each student of his/her individual importance” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 66). When asked to reflect on what positive outcomes he had seen early on in the school year, he noted:

[…] the atmosphere of the school is far more positive. We have, students are more engaged - maybe - they are more willing to be part of the positive school environment. So, last week when they were presenting […] I think it went really well! Especially this early on in the year, last year- I didn’t see that happening. I mean, I don’t think that was happening halfway through the year. So the fact that kids got up there and presented and other kids were attentive, that to me was the thing that stood out the most.

Mr. Burgos felt that there was a “positive school environment” and students were “willing to be a part” of this environment. He noticed that students were committed to and engaged with his pedagogy in the classroom. Mr. Burgos noted students’ unit one presentations as examples of how they engaged with the material. Groups presented the posters they had created on their assigned geographic region and how civilizations utilized resources (like food and water) in their region (see Global History Curriculum Goals for further explanation of unit one). Students presented their posters confidently and enthusiastically, while their classmates listened attentively and asked questions about the presentations. Mr. Burgos attributed this positive energy in his classroom to “having a relationship with most of the students.” He reflected further:

I think this year I am a little more, patient, I guess would be the word […] maybe I am more vocal about it, about when they are not doing something right or how I am feeling at a particular moment […] So this year, I think, that would be the difference. The fact that I have a relationship with most of the students, that when I disciplining them for what they are doing, I will let them know, and I think just the interactions between me and the students […] I am more approachable, I guess.
Being patient, vocal, and more approachable are notable assets of Mr. Burgos’s pedagogy. For example, in almost every lesson observed, Mr. Burgos would take the time to sit down with individual students and work with them on classroom tasks. He would work in both Spanish and English, helping with translating texts and activities, and working with students to understand the content. Often times, he would ask students about other things going on in school or in their lives, learning how best to support each individual student. For example, with one student, Leonel, he noted:

> A lot of it is knowing when to push them and when to not. Like Leonel, there are times when he will come in, and just by the way he is acting or what he said, I know whether I can say things to him that day or not- because it is very, it is a very fragile relationship with the students [...] you do have to build that relationship before you can actually question their work ethic, I guess [...] But it is definitely still a very cautious approach, I think.

The teacher-student relationship, for Mr. Burgos, was something he constantly reflected on. It was important for him that he took the time to learn what was *really* going on in his students’ lives so that he knew “when to push them and when to not.” As in the case of Leonel, there were many other students with whom I noticed him taking a “very cautious approach,” or really pushing students when he knew it was their time to shine. These relationships were “fluid” and really depended on larger contexts that Mr. Burgos was aware of on a daily basis. He knew what his students were going through, and cared deeply for their social, emotional, and academic success.

Mr. Burgos felt it was important to “have a relationship with most of his students,” but he also encouraged students’ relationships with one another. As noted in the lesson vignette above, Mr. Burgos allotted class time for students to get to know one another, both personally as well as academically, so they could figure out how best to work together as a group. This example showed a commitment to cultivating relationships amongst students in order to offer the best
possible classroom environment for all of his newcomer students to succeed academically. At the end of the semester, I asked him to reflect back on some of the items he thought worked well, and interestingly he discussed developing a community of learners, noting:

I think building that community, and that might have been my only major success, but I am definitely okay with that. I think there is definitely a lot to be said for getting the kids to feel comfortable in the class, and hopefully we will be able to build on that a little more [...] So, I am really optimistic about the second half of the year.

Mr. Burgos worked to develop comunidad (community) by building mutual trust or confianza between himself and his Latino/a newcomers students, as well as between the students themselves. “Getting the kids to feel comfortable in the class,” as he noted, developed a community in his classroom. For Mr. Burgos, “building [a] community” was “a major success,” and critically important to encouraging a “positive” and comfortable classroom environment. This environment developed a mutual trust between all students in which difficult and challenging conversations would take place, and pushing students to achieve academic success. Furthermore, building relationships with individual students also fostered a particular orientation toward becoming an advocate educator (Salinas & Reyes, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999) for his Mexican students at Pacific International High School. “Oh yeah, this is Mr. Burgos, he is Mexican.” Mr. Burgos was deeply committed to the education of his newcomer Latino/a students, however, he had a particular orientation toward caring and advocating for Mexican students at Pacific International High School. He noted the context of this orientation as:

[...] so basically being [the school] 90% Dominican, there is that, on purpose or not, there is a sense that the school is Dominican, right, so I think we – our second highest population at the school would be Ecuadorian and Mexican - those 2 and 3, so definitely amongst those groups there is a, I don’t want to say a pushback, to remind everyone else that they are still here.
Mr. Burgos identified, as stated here, with the smaller population of Mexican and Ecuadorian students at PIHS. He took a stance as someone who would “articulate the needs and demands” of his Mexican and Ecuadorian students, and advocate for their “collective recognition” in the school and the community (Salinas & Reyes, 2004, p. 55), “to remind everyone else that they are still here.” These qualities possessed by Mr. Burgos supported notions of an advocate educator, or as Reyes, Scibner, & Paredes described, one who understands the needs of the community and works to move the community “beyond the margins of the status quo” (as cited in Salinas & Reyes, 2004, p. 55). He discussed his growing role as an advocate educator, particularly for his Mexican students, explaining,

I mean it is kind of funny, last year- I had maybe three or four Mexican kids, and then the rest of them I just got to know through the kids that I did know, and so I remember last year, throughout the year, it would be like, ‘oh yeah, this is Mr. Burgos he is Mexican,’ so there is definitely something.

Mr. Burgos took his role as an advocate educator beyond the classroom, as many of the Mexican students he worked with were not his “social studies” students. That being said, the issues and problems he discussed with the Mexican students involved citizenship, civic engagement, and cultural knowledge, which supported Mr. Burgos’s conceptions of social studies pedagogy for all Latino/a newcomer youth.

Mr. Burgos’s role as an advocate educator for Mexican newcomer students possessed qualities of a caring teacher, or one who embodies the word educación (Valenzuela, 1999). Educación, according to Valenzuela (1999), is a cultural construct foundational for Mexican culture that “provides instructions on how one should live in the world” (p. 21). It emphasizes “respect, responsibility, and sociality” and is the foundation for Mexican youths’ school-based relationships (p. 21-22). Educación does not solely refer to learning, academically, but also includes family and community based “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez,
1992) involving moral, social, and personal goals, as well as responsibilities and competencies.

Mr. Burgos articulated his caring for the educación of his newcomer Mexican youth, stating:

I mean I think lately we have had, it has been brought to my attention that I am definitely, I focus more on our small Mexican population. I know what they’re going through, I know what difficulties they are facing. So I guess, I think for some of them, there is—maybe not outright- but there is a spark that they’re thinking of, like when I talk to them and we try to go over what is going on with them, I think to make it less personal, that it is more than a third person. A lot of it is like, ‘well we are,’ not ‘well, I am.’ So, I think that- they do kind of start thinking about- it is not only them that is going through this problem, so I think realizing that when, a lot of our conversations focus on immigration and where they are in their immigration status, knowing that there are other people going through the same thing, but also there are people dedicated to helping people go through these things. You know, becoming a citizen, stuff like that, with that I think they are definitely heading in the right direction. I wouldn’t say that they are civically engaged, at the moment, but there is definitely that glimmer of hope.

Mr. Burgos embodied the various elements of educación, particularly those pertaining to sociality, noting, “when I talk to them and we try to go over what is going on with them.” He felt that conversations, as a group and about the group, were important for considering civic-related issues and how to engage in those issues. Furthermore, this attitude led into notions of respect, when he noticed his students wanting to “make it less personal” so he would talk about issues that “we are going through” together. Mr. Burgos desired to support students by listening to what they were “thinking about,” and offering the space for students to see their concerns as community-based issues, and that there are people who are trained to help support what they are experiencing. Therefore, his discussions with Mexican students helped offer human resources (Salinas & Reyes, 2004) including “conversations focused on immigration,” knowing “that there are other people going through the same thing,” and seeking those “dedicated to helping people go through these things.”

Initiating conversations, taking responsibility, and being respectful were all ways that Mr. Burgos acted as an advocate educator for his newcomer Mexican students and supported their
educación, while also discussing with them how to be active and engaged citizens. He noted that “other people [are] going through the same thing,” and they could work to navigate issues together, further supporting his notions of building a community of learners. One particular moment stands out that represents Mr. Burgos’s incredible relationship with his Mexican students. I was leaving PIHS after an observation one afternoon, and I saw Mr. Burgos with about five students walking out of the school together. The students and Mr. Burgos were talking, laughing, and overall very excited to be together. He looked at me and said, “these are my Mexican students. I promised I would take them out to eat.” They looked so excited to be leaving school with their favorite teacher, and off they went to enjoy each other’s company, chat about life, and eat some good food.

**Implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Knowledge and skills toward using bilingual practices to enact a project-based curriculum.** Mr. Burgos’s implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth highlighted his knowledge and skills toward using bilingual practices to enact a project-based curriculum that supported students’ construction of social studies content knowledge and fostered academic success. This theme will be organized using the three core categories of culture, language, and citizenship (see Chapter III: Methodology section for further information about the development of these categories). Each category contains an analysis of how Mr. Burgos’s pedagogical ideas and actions developed the knowledge and skills for implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

**Culture: “Giving them something that they can do.”** The humanities class taught by Mr. Burgos focused on a project-based curriculum. This meant that all of the activities and strategies implemented in Mr. Burgos’s social studies class focused on acquiring and understanding
content to prepare for the final project. Mr. Burgos commented on why he implemented a

curriculum that focused on project preparation and creation:

I think a project is a good way to end the unit for our students, because I think it is more-
it is not just here is a test, take it, and it is over. It is more, I don’t know how you would
call that, it is over a longer period of time […] it is ongoing, that is the word I’m looking
for- and it does put- I mean some of our kids are not used to being in school, but the fact
that they see the project and they know what they are trying to get to, rather than doing a
worksheet, or short answer, yeah- you know, I know this stuff, but what it is for? I think
the project gives them something concrete to try to work for.

Implementing a project-based curriculum gave Mr. Burgos’s students “something concrete to
work for,” knowing explicitly that the purpose of each activity worked toward creating a final
project. He explained that his newcomer students, many of whom “are not used to being in
school” due to interrupted formal schooling or varying prior schooling contexts, felt supported
by an “ongoing” project because they “know what they are trying to get to.” The project gave
students a purpose and a structure for the unit, and promoted successful student opportunities in
the classroom (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Mr. Burgos further explained that the pedagogical action
needed to create the project was group work. Group work supported his Latino/a newcomer
students’ social interactions, explaining:

[…] we do take advantage of the fact that they are always talking, everyone. So getting
them into groups, and if we can give them something interesting I think that they do have
that open conversation about things. And the great thing is if you have a discussion, they
are not shy about telling you what they are thinking, so that is really good.

Mr. Burgos, like Ms. Sanford and Mr. Sharp, drew from his Latino/a students’ social and
academic assets, stating, they are “always talking,” are willing to have “open conversations about
things,” and “not shy about telling you what they are thinking.” That being said, enacting group
work did not always happen easily, and many times it was notably difficult for Mr. Burgos to use
these assets as a “vehicle for learning” (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Students in his class often
struggled with how best to work with their group, and how to best support one another while also
contributing individually to the group. While reflecting on how best to negotiate the group work needed to enact his curriculum, Mr. Burgos discussed how he tried to support student engagement:

I don’t know, especially if it is just about getting a student involved, it might be a lot of different things, it might be just that he doesn’t get along with the people in his group, or the stuff is too difficult, so each thing is different and you just deal with it as it comes up. So moving a particular student to a different group, taking the time to explain what it is – explicitly - what you want from them, then just getting them involved and giving them something that they can do, you know, not see something and say, ‘yeah, I don’t know how to do this,’ give them something that they can see that they can do, or at least think that they might be able to do, it is not making it too difficult I guess.

Rather than focus on what his students could not do, or on the difficulties they faced in group work, instead Mr. Burgos focused on what he could do to foster a successful experience for his students. For example, “moving a particular student to a different group,” “taking the time to explain what you want from them,” or “give them something that they can see that they can do.” He wanted to provide an environment in which students felt welcomed, safe, and open to working with one another toward a common goal of creating a final product. For example, using the lesson vignette above, unit two’s final project was to create a short video on Greece and Rome answering the following content outcomes: (a) how did Hellenistic and Roman culture spread through art and architecture? (b) How did Hellenization and Romanization spread through war and conquest? (c) What were the causes and effects of Hellenization and Romanization? Mr. Burgos implemented various activities to support his content outcomes, including a web quest of Greek and Roman architecture, a role-play on Greek and Roman expansion, graphic organizers on Greek and Roman social hierarchies, and readings with questions on Greek and Roman government. Through these activities, students investigated the content, and constructed an understanding of the material learned. Mr. Burgos rarely conducted teacher-directed mini lessons; he mostly facilitated discussions and worked one-on-one with students or in groups to
make sense of the Global History content. While enacting the project-based curriculum, he
desired that learners (a) construct knowledge and (b) build on what they already knew about the
content, two key elements of a culturally relevant educator (Lee, 2010). Mr. Burgos explained
the goals for the unit 2 project, stating:

I think it would be a good way for the students to interact more with the information,
whereas with the last one [project] it was a lot of; this is the information, but with the
video I think it really allows them to interpret it and actually have to understand what it is
they are presenting or talking about as opposed to just copying some of the information.

Mr. Burgos really strived for greater interaction with the social studies content, and felt that
students should engage further with the material. He also hoped students would remember the
information because they felt connected to what they were doing in the classroom. He explained
that “[the video] really allows them to interpret it and actually have to understand what it is they
are presenting or talking about.” This implementation of the curriculum showed Mr. Burgos’s
knowledge of and skills for having students make connections with the material and critically
analyze the information.

In one lesson, Mr. Burgos had students begin working on what they wanted to include in
their final video. He gave each group a storyboard to organize how they would sequence various
parts of their film. The storyboard allowed students to visualize each part of the video through
images and drawings of the video’s segments or frames. The storyboard graphic organizer
included 12 “frames” for students, and suggested students create a film about “going back in
time, using a time machine.” Each frame included a caption that prompted students to think
about what they might include and how they might consider sequencing their film. For example,
captions included: “This new invention is so exciting! I cannot wait to go to Greece and Rome! It
is going to be so much fun to share our adventures with everyone!” and “suddenly, we found
ourselves at … and we started thinking about the reasons for Greece and Rome’s expansion.”
One group’s storyboard included a map of Greece, images of the Parthenon, information about Spartan soldiers, and a quote from Alexander the Great. Once the storyboard was completed, each group began to create their video. They spent over a week researching images, texts, maps, and quotes for inclusion in their film, and spent time developing a narrative (which was either read verbally or written as captions in the film) that tied all of their documents together. Once the film was completed, students presented their projects to the class, other peers, and teachers during portfolio presentations.

Mr. Burgos’s enacted group work and students’ presentations of the final unit projects also supported English language development. Students were encouraged to speak in English during group work and presentations, providing a supportive opportunity to practice their communicative English language skills or basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) (Cummings, 2008). Mr. Burgos reflected that group work supported “language acquisition, ideally, in groups there is communication […] Where in a normal school there is very little opportunity to practice language.” Furthermore, while the presentations provided a space for students to practice using English, they also moved students toward academic English language skills or cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) (Cummings, 2008).

Mr. Burgos noted that the presentations also supported some students who really loved to be in front of the classroom, speaking and showcasing their ability to be “on stage.” He had quite a few students who really thrived when presenting and loved speaking in front of a group. Often these students would become the presentation leaders. He explained, “we had students who maybe didn’t have the strongest study skills, but when they were presenting, it was like- they were in a concert or something, they were the one’s on stage, [and] really thrive in that moment in front of everyone.” These examples of Mr. Burgos’s ideas and actions when implementing his
project-based social studies curriculum showed a commitment to supporting his Latino/a newcomer students’ cultural and linguistic assets as a central element of his instruction.

Language: “Spanish gets them the information, and English is for them to aspire to.”

Mr. Burgos created English language learning opportunities in his social studies classroom through pedagogical experiences that accessed his English Language Learners’ linguistic knowledge and proficiencies (Lee, 2010). For example, Mr. Burgos conducted his class in both Spanish and English – given that he and all of his students were Spanish speakers – to facilitate new knowledge and material taught in the social studies classroom. In describing the role that Spanish and English play in his classroom, Mr. Burgos said, “Spanish gets them the information, and English is for them to aspire to.” Spanish is used in a translation process to gather content and acquire English; Mr. Burgos explained:

If I don’t understand a word in English in particular, I think what is it in Spanish, and what does it look like in Spanish […] so I ask [students] from what you do know […] to actually thinking about what they are saying, what the word is, what the translation is, and what it means, I’m hoping that helps connect the dots for them.

The translation process Mr. Burgos used incorporated students’ home language, Spanish, to understand social studies concepts, vocabulary, and skills. Mr. Burgos’s use of bilingual practices supported notions of a sociolinguistically conscious pedagogy (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) and García, Flores, & Chu’s (2011) notion of “translanguaging,” wherein students make meaning of content through communicative bilingual practices in both English and their native language. Mr. Burgos liked using translanguaging practices, explaining:

I think it is mostly because there are always a couple of kids who want to hear it in English, so I say it in English for those kids and I say it in Spanish for the other kids, and then I’m hoping that it is helping in some way. Hopeing that – sometimes it is that I want them to get the words, so I will say it a couple of times, and sometimes I can’t think of the word in one or the other language so I say it in the other [language] where I do know the word.
Enacted translanguaging in Mr. Burgos’s pedagogy was particularly clear in one lesson in which he pushed students to define economic concepts in relation to a reading on the Silk Road. First, students participated in a read aloud of a text in English on China and the Silk Road. He wanted students to explore certain economic concepts that emerged from the reading. For example, after one student, Mariana, read an excerpt from the text, he asked her to pause and said to the class, “So what are different factors of production? *Qué significa esa palabra*, factors of production? What does that mean?” One student, Claudia, began to respond, “*Factor de producción,*” and he interrupted her, “I didn’t ask for a translation, I asked, what does it mean?” She replied, in English, “the thing that is needed to produce something.” He replied, “such as?” and she replied, “such as, for silk, they had those…[she gestured with her hands],” and Mr. Burgos helped her, “cocoons?” Claudia nodded, and Mr. Burgos continued, “okay, and what else?” Another student, Ramon, replied, “the silk worm.” Mr. Burgos said, “Okay, good, the silk worm, so factors of production are *cualquier cosa se usan para producir algo*, right? So, *sigamos.*” This short dialogue is just one example of how Mr. Burgos enacted translanguaging in his pedagogy; he used this practice throughout this lesson and in almost every lesson I observed. Another key item referenced in this example was Mr. Burgos’s desire to have students explain the concepts, rather than solely translate the concept as the definition. When asked about the difference between translating and explaining social studies concepts, Mr. Burgos reflected:

[…when I am asking for a definition, it happened a lot in this unit [on China and the Silk Road] that we’re doing a lot of vocabulary, I would say, ‘okay, give me a definition,’ and they would just say a translation. And I would said, ‘I didn’t ask for a translation, give me a definition,’ and sometimes they will think about it and sometimes they don’t- if they know the translation, they kind of know the word, but they can’t articulate it.

Based on this reflection, translation and explanation are equally important to learning social studies concepts for English Language Learners. Pushing students to explain terms while
implementing bilingual practices helped students acquire an understanding of the concept. Students used Spanish to *identify* and *locate* the term they might “kind of know” in their native language, and used English to encourage a more in-depth explanation of what the term *means*, to promote English language development.

Furthermore, Mr. Burgos created opportunities to improve students’ confidence in speaking English in the classroom, as he believed this was an important first step when developing students’ academic language proficiencies. In his explanation of using role-play to teach about the expansion of the Greek and Roman empires, Mr. Burgos highlighted principles of second language learning (Lucas & Villegas, 2010):

> I think this is going to be a good opportunity for them to have something in front of them, at least just reading. To start building up their confidence, the biggest thing is that, the kids see English and it is just this- like they are climbing Mount Everest or something. So I think something like this, is going to help them, just to get them started in the right direction.

The role-play activity provided students with a script of conversations between various Greek and Roman military expansionists, and students were asked to read and translate the dialogue to Spanish then deliver the role-play in English. Building upon the less cognitive language demands or BICS (by using the role-play activity) developed a confidence Mr. Burgos thought students needed as they acquired “cognitive academic language proficiency” (CALP) (by translating and understanding the vocabulary/historical narrative presented in the script) (Cummings, 2008). For Mr. Burgos, giving students the roles and an already written script in English helped him assess and build on his students’ linguistic proficiencies in both Spanish and English, gain an understanding of the events portrayed, and gauge students’ confidence in speaking English in the classroom. He explained, “it is not really their words, it is roles they have to play, so that I think will make it easier for the kids to participate.” Mr. Burgos created a supportive English language
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experience inside the classroom to get his students “started in the right direction,” and intended to build on these experiences as the semester continued.

   Citizenship: “Community understanding and involvement.” Mr. Burgos defined active and engaged citizenship for his Latino/a newcomer students as “community understanding and involvement.” He explained that community understanding included, “Being aware of what is going on around you, whether it be your community, like you school, and stuff like that.” Along with an awareness of issues in the community, school, or family, he also felt that active citizens were involved in other issues “going on around you,” perhaps an expanded awareness of not just community issues but also national and/or global issues. He further explained that involvement in community understanding “goes into being aware.” Mr. Burgos described involvement as taking action on this awareness, by saying:

   I think if you’re aware of the problems, it doesn’t necessarily mean you need to be out protesting. I think discussions, like if you’re talking about- in the hallway- all of the trash that is out on the street and I think that is to some degree, community involvement. You are aware of what is going on. And ideally you would go a little bit further and actually address the issue, but I don’t think that is possible for everyone.

For Mr. Burgos, awareness was a form of civic action and engagement towards improving one’s community. He felt being aware was a stepping-stone to realizing and identifying oneself as a citizen, further stating, “whether being aware of issues, problems that we encounter- as not only individuals, but [also as] groups, society as a whole.” Mr. Burgos conceived of action on these issues and problems as located on a continuum. He believed that not everyone could go out and protest or be involved in community organizations and draft letters to political figures. However, he believed there were a number of other ways his newcomer Latino/a students could engage in active citizenship. Awareness was equally important to involvement, and he made sure to stress that this was a form of active and engaged citizenship, stating:
especially in New York—where everyone lives in their own neighborhood, I think it might be the highest that some people can strive, or reach for [noting awareness]. Which is not a bad thing, there is a lot to be said for your being aware of your community and trying to help out, even if you don’t reach— even if it is not city-wide— as long as you’re helping make things better, you know, that is enough, I think.

He believed that awareness of issues in one’s community and working at “making things better,” in response to the problems one faced and encountered, was a key element of his implemented social studies pedagogy. He felt that the culture of his classroom was one that worked to develop a community of learners, and hoped the skills learned in his classroom would transfer to the skills needed for engagement in larger, neighborhood-wide community involvement.

Furthermore, Mr. Burgos felt that his classroom community was best exemplified by how students’ interacted with one another, explaining:

[…] we have this relationship where the kids feel comfortable enough to say things that are on their mind. Sometimes somebody will say something and maybe somebody is completely opposed to that, and of course they will start yelling at each other, but once they get quiet I think we can have a discussion, we can talk about it.

Having a discussion about issues in the social studies classroom was an example of the implementation of Mr. Burgos’s conceptions of citizenship as understanding and involvement. He frequently employed various classroom-based discussion models in his social studies pedagogy. Discussions implemented in Mr. Burgos’s classroom ranged from class-wide discussions on conflicting viewpoints drawn from the social studies content or other student generated issues, to pair shares and group discussions about project items or concept understanding. For example, in one classroom observation, Mr. Burgos related the content on the Silk Road and cultural diffusion to students’ current lives and experiences. He enacted a discussion with his students on whether paper or gunpowder was a more important invention from China. He asked his students, “so which do you think is more important? Paper or gunpowder?” The conversation continued with talk of issues involving students’ experiences in
school and their communities, for example, one student responded to the question saying, it depends, “do we want a person that is intellectual or a person that is ready for war?” Another replied, “it is not what is important, but rather why [we use these items].” Students agreed that paper was more important, as it was used to facilitate learning and an education, something students felt was important to them and to the critical choice they were making to attend school everyday.

Mr. Burgos’s implemented social studies pedagogy showed that he possessed the knowledge and skills toward teaching for social justice and developing a critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995a) by supporting students’ interrogation of current community and society issues. He desired that students critically inquire about what it meant to be part of a community and the decisions that you have to make while living in that society. It was particularly interesting to hear Mr. Burgos say in the discussion of paper versus gunpowder, “you have the choice, relatively speaking, in New York City to either come to school, use paper and learn, or go out into the streets […] and use guns.” Implementing critical discussions with his students showed a passion for their learning, decision-making regarding school attendance, and engagement with their education. It was noticeable, in this discussion, that students were also enthusiastic about this issue, as there was much discussion about how and why learning was important for them at this moment in their lives, and they were clearly trying to forefront how their newly learned knowledge was a powerful weapon.

**Case Summary**

Mr. Burgos identified as “Brown,” an ethnic identity that he believed included all Spanish-speaking Latinos. He was the only teacher in this study that identified ethnically, racially, and linguistically, with his students. This ethnic identity framed how he conceptualized
and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a students as he frequently talked about “we” and “our” experiences as Brown people. He was proud that he shared this ethnic identity with his students, and frequently referred back to this connection throughout the findings in the case study. Mr. Burgos’s identification with and admiration for his Latino/a newcomer students, experiences in Costa Rica as a volunteer in the Peace Corps, and passion for teaching social studies influenced his attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions in his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Mr. Burgos’s Global History course centered on the essential goal of encouraging his Latino/a newcomer students to “question things,” and this goal was an essential theme interwoven throughout his curriculum and pedagogy, and implemented through unit outcomes, organization, and pedagogical strategies. Students in Mr. Burgos’s class worked toward questioning things through a project-based curriculum that enacted group work focused on creating and constructing a final project at the end of each content-based unit. Developing positive relationships with individual students and supporting a community of learners also influenced his conceptualizations and implementations of social studies education.

The findings in this case examined how Mr. Burgos conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Mr. Burgos’ conceptions of teaching social studies supported an orientation toward developing a community of learners in the classroom by building relationships with individual students, and becoming an advocate educator for his Latino/a newcomer students (Salinas & Reyes, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999). The foundations established when building a community in his classroom fostered and encouraged an enacted social studies pedagogy that focused on active civic engagement. Mr. Burgos’s implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth highlighted his knowledge and skills toward using bilingual practices to enact a project-based curriculum that supported students’
construction of social studies content knowledge and fostered academic success. He used pedagogical activities including group work, project creation and presentation, role-play, read aloud, and small/large group discussions to implement his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Mr. Garrett also focused on civic engagement as a central theme in his social studies pedagogy, and fostered this by building cross-cultural connections within and across his newcomer students. Mr. Garrett’s social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students will be discussed in the following case study.
Case 4: Mr. Colin Garrett and Newbridge International High School

In this section, I discuss the context and findings of the case on Mr. Colin Garrett at Newbridge International High School. I describe the context of the case, including teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and a lesson vignette, in order to better understand how Mr. Garrett conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. I finish the section with a summary of case four on Mr. Colin Garrett at Newbridge International High School (NIHS).

Mr. Colin Garrett

Mr. Garrett, a white man in his late 20s from Long Island, New York, graduated with a Bachelors degree in history and received his state certification in social studies at a local city college. Mr. Garrett also received his Master of Arts degree in Liberal Studies from a state university and has been teaching at Newbridge for over seven years. While at NIHS, Mr. Garrett has been involved in a number of professional development and service opportunities outside of school in local, state, and national teaching and social studies organizations. He has been awarded numerous grants and fellowships to attend conferences on teaching U.S. History and the Constitution. He has also presented on teaching social studies for English Language Learners, and often discussed his love for sharing with and learning from others at professional conferences.

Mr. Garrett taught one section of Advanced Placement United States Government and Politics and four sections of United States History. NIHS was his first full-time teaching position, after substituting and coaching in Long Island, NY for one year. Mr. Garrett’s experience teaching on Long Island was one of the reasons he wanted to teach at Newbridge International High School; explaining:
The school I was at was very shallow, you know— it was every man for himself kind of thing [...] and I wanted something different. I wanted some place where the kids were going to be different, maybe demographically, maybe religiously, or other things.

Upon further reflection on his reasons for coming to NIHS, Mr. Garrett shared how his mother, a Cuban immigrant, came to the United States when she was 16 years old. When she first arrived, he explained “she sat at the back of the classroom with no English,” but there was one ESL teacher when she first arrived to New York who cared about her and worked one-on-one with her to make sure she was successful. He felt that it was his job now to “give back” to the teacher who made an impact on his mother’s life, and “be part of something” for his newcomer students.

Mr. Garrett further articulated:

> You know not just in the classroom, but citizenship, with their lives and the struggles that they have coming here, and I think that is where I need to be. It just is. [...] You feel like you are making a difference in their lives, and they are so appreciative of it, and their parents— for the most part are appreciative of it— and you know, I want to make these kids into what my mother was made into, by that one ESL teacher: successful, having a family, having a career where you do what you want to do, and maybe it was education and maybe it was support.

Mr. Garrett desired to encourage and support his newcomer students beyond the classroom (Ladson-Billings, 1994), particularly with regards to being an active and engaged citizen. He wanted students to take what they experienced and learned in his class, and use it to support their communities, families, and friends. “Making a difference in their lives” was Mr. Garrett’s way of giving back to the teacher who supported his mother and provided such meaningful educational experiences when she first arrived in the U.S.

Mr. Garrett’s notions of success were based on his personal experiences, and what he felt were successful experiences for his mother, including career choice and supporting a family. He hoped these experiences might model for students how his mother, a first generation Cuban immigrant, was able to achieve the success she strived for when she first arrived to the United States.
States. Mr. Garrett’s personal and professional commitment to teaching social studies for ELLs, desire to participate in multiple professional development opportunities, and service-oriented dedication to teaching at NIHS, strongly influenced his conceptualizations and implementations for teaching social studies to Latino/a newcomer youth.

**Newbridge International High School**

Newbridge International High School (NIHS), located in a highly diverse urban neighborhood, shares its historic building with one other school. NIHS is the largest school in this study, with over 1,000 students in grades 9 - 12. 100% of the students at NIHS are English Language Learners. Students, teachers, staff, and administration occupy the majority of the school building, which spans one block and is four stories tall. Classrooms are large with high ceilings and windows on all walls, making for an open and inviting space for students to learn.

As you enter NIHS the office and security personnel immediately welcome you into the building. The office staff includes speakers of many languages including Spanish, Arabic, and Chinese. Flyers and posters for community organizations, health care information, employment guidelines, local/state documents, and school-based announcements are displayed on the walls. The school supports the needs of the community, as parents/guardians often speak to administration and staff about a multitude of items.

Admission to Newbridge International High School is based on residence of the borough and new immigrant status in the United States (less than 1 year). The primary mission of the school is to “provide immigrant students with an academic program geared to achieve excellence by responding to their unique needs” (NIHS, 2013). Newbridge received an overall score of an “A” on the Department of Education Progress Report and an “Outstanding” in the Quality review; these scores are based on student progress, student performance, and school environment
The highest score within the category of school environment was safety and respect, and when entering Newbridge, one can immediately sense the high level of respect and community support in the school by watching students, teachers, staff, and administrators greet one another in the hallways. NIHS is over 15 years old and has been consistently ranked as one of the top newcomer high schools in the area. Language and learning English plays an important role at Newbridge International High School, and all students are required to take the New York State Regents exam in all subjects (English, History, Science, Math).

NIHS seeks to promote both the academic and athletic excellence of their students and offers a variety of programs to best meet their newcomers’ needs. Their instructional programs support content learning outcomes while also developing “the acquisition of English with an intensive English as a Second Language Program, the development of native language skills, and the appreciation of cultural diversity” (NIHS, 2013). Unique to the other three schools in this study, Newbridge International has both Spanish and Chinese transitional bilingual programs, also called early exit programs, in the social studies. Students in these classes learn social studies content in their native language and switch to English as the year progresses. The ultimate goal of a transitional bilingual program is to provide ELLs with full proficiency in their home language, providing a “solid linguistic foundation” as students transition to learning English (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 20).

The social studies department at Newbridge includes eight teachers. Mr. Garrett teaches content-based English as a Second Language social studies classes (Advanced Placement United States Government & Politics and United States History). Students in his classes have, theoretically, transitioned “out of” the bilingual program and entered his class when they are linguistically “ready.” Once students reach a certain level in English proficiency (ranging
anywhere from one to three years, this process is fairly unclear) students move into Mr. Garrett’s class, where social studies is taught in an English-only or “sheltered instruction” (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 20) environment. The movement from bilingual to English-only social studies classes is done subjectively, and based on the teachers’ and administrators’ assessment of students’ linguistic levels. Furthermore, there is a large guidance program that supports students overall well being in the school (i.e. attendance, discipline, health/physical education, graduation requirements), college and career readiness, and scholarship information/support. Students often ask Mr. Garrett for college recommendation letters, as there is a strong emphasis on students attending college when they graduate from NIHS.

**Students at Newbridge International High School**

The demographic make-up of students at Newbridge International High School includes 5% Black, 57% Hispanic, 6% White, and 32% Asian students. Male students account for 55% of those enrolled and female students account for 45%. The average attendance rate for the school year 2008 - 2009 was 89.2 % (NIHS, 2013). Students attending NIHS come from a variety of countries, including Colombia, Honduras, El Salvador, Mexico, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Algeria, Poland, Haiti, Tibet, Portugal, Russia, China, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Bangladesh (among many others). Of the four schools observed in this study, NIHS is the most culturally and linguistically diverse.

Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History class, “H5 – 07,” included 34 students: 13 females and 21 males. The demographic make-up of the class included students from Haiti, Mexico, Algeria, Ecuador, Pakistan, Dominican Republic, Russia, Saudi Arabia, China, Yugoslavia, Nepal, Suriname, and Bangladesh. There were ten Latino students, making the Latino/a population roughly 30% of the class. Of the ten Latino students, five were female and five were male. The
Latino students’ countries of origin included Ecuador (7), Mexico (1), and the Dominican Republic (2). All ten Latino/a students in Mr. Garrett’s class were English Language Learners. However, English proficiency levels varied among the ten students, depending on prior schooling and bilingual course experiences at NIHS. Spanish-speaking, recently arrived (0-1 years) students at NIHS are required to take a bilingual social studies class (Global History) prior to entering Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History course. The bilingual class is a transitional bilingual course, in which Spanish is spoken primarily at the beginning of the year, and as the year progresses and students become increasingly proficient in English, more English instruction is used (see explanation above for further information).

Students in Mr. Garrett’s class interacted across and within different countries of origin. This was similar to the classroom dynamics at Ms. Sanford’s school, where groups were culturally and linguistically heterogeneous. While Ms. Sanford organized the groups for her students, Mr. Garrett let students choose their own groups for group projects. Often times, students created groups with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds, rather than group solely with peers from similar native language backgrounds. In contrast to the other three teachers in this study, Mr. Garrett did not use group work as the primary method of instruction. Students in his class sat in rows, unless there was a group project or presentation. That being said, the class was highly interactive and students participated throughout the lecture-discussions. While Mr. Garrett often used teacher-centered methods of instruction, the pedagogical strategies employed were differentiated using images, videos, graphic organizers, and small group work (more information about Mr. Garrett’s implemented pedagogy will be discussed in the findings section below).

**United State History Curriculum Goals**
Mr. Garrett’s United States History course focused on developing an understanding of major themes, events, and developments in U.S. History and government (Garrett, 2011a). The course centered on cultivating an appreciation and enjoyment for history through the following course goals and objectives: (a) understanding how the past has shaped the present; (b) understanding the U.S. Constitution and U.S. Government; and (c) developing English language acquisition through studying U.S. History. Mr. Garrett stressed that students must “keep up with the pace of the class” and “pay close attention to due dates” as this was a rigorous course in the 11th grade year for his newcomer students.

The “H5” course was taught chronologically, and covered the first half of the New York State U.S. History and Geography curriculum, beginning in September with Native Americans and European Exploration, and ending in February with the Civil War. Course unit topics included: U.S. Geography and Climate, the New World, 13 Colonies, American Revolution, Birth of American Government, U.S. Constitution, Early Republic, Technology and a Growing Country, and Sectionalism and the Civil War. Mr. Garrett ultimately wanted students to walk away from H5 with a fundamental understanding of U.S. government structure and functions, saying, “if you don’t know how the machine works, you can’t fix the machine.” For example, the U.S. Constitution unit established a framework for students that they would carry over to the following semester’s U.S. History “H6” course. This framework was composed of the six principles of the U.S. Constitution: limited government, popular sovereignty, checks and balances, separation of powers, implied power of judicial review, and federalism. He used these six principles as “major themes in American History,” explaining:

[…] to organize the information more clearly so it is not just a bunch of jumbled up facts that, even though most of them will know it, it is not organized. This way it will be something that is coherent, and if they think hard enough, at the end of the year, in June when we are reviewing for the test, they sit down with their 6 basic principles, they can
write them all out, and if they think hard enough they should be able to think about 3 or 4 examples of each one in American History.

Creating an overarching organizational scheme, Mr. Garrett structured the second half of his U.S. History H5 course using the six principles of the U.S. Constitution as a foundation for content learning and understanding of the U.S. History curriculum. NIHS was on a semester rotation, therefore, the second half of the curriculum would be covered in the “H6” course during the spring term. The H6 course was an entirely new class, with a different group of students and different schedule. The semester system provided difficulty for Mr. Garrett, as some of his students had taken H5 with other teachers; however, he was willing to take the risk, as this was an important goal for his curricular implementation.

In addition to content goals, Mr. Garrett hoped his newcomer students would be well prepared for and achieve good grades on the New York State Regents exam. He was not always proud to say that “doing well on the Regents” was one of his main goals for the course, but he felt that it was important for his students to pass the exam and thus, extremely important for him as well. He explained:

I tell this to them all of the time, you know scholarships- and these kids need scholarships- these kids need to pump up their grades. And I don’t like teaching to the test, but at the same time that’s got to be on the backburner at all times. Especially with ESL kids, it would be a disservice for me, it will be selfish of me to say, ‘I’m going to teach you what I think you need to know,’ my version would be a very [Howard] Zinn type of U.S. history, but that is not how the Regents frames it. So my goal is to get them a good grade on the Regents, but also to be critical thinkers, question things, and there are a lot of things and overarching goals.

Mr. Garrett struggled with depth versus breadth of U.S. History content coverage. He often spoke about how much content he needed to cover in such a short amount of time. He was able to navigate this tension by providing students with extensive vocabulary lists. The lists acted as a
skeleton for the course, and he used a word wall to support students’ learning of social studies concepts/terms. He required students to define all of the vocabulary words on their own, noting:

So giving them this to do at home, it shows them what path we are on in class, and they can relate the words into the lessons- we see the words in the readings a lot or documents, but at the same time they aren’t depending on me [to teach vocabulary], and I am not depending on them to know it [the U.S. History content], so it is a mutual kind of thing.

By using the vocabulary as a backdrop for U.S. History content and skills learned, Mr. Garrett hoped his newcomer students would be able to go more in-depth into particular topics. He felt confident they were getting the breadth of U.S. History content needed for the Regents exam by understanding the vocabulary (more information about vocabulary understanding will be discussed further in the findings section). A description of Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History curriculum goals offers further contextual information about how he conceptualized and implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

**Lesson Observation Vignette**

Mr. Garrett greeted students as they entered the classroom, stating, “welcome to another fun filled day in H5.” He joked with some students as they arrived, saying “good morning,” even though it was 1:45 PM (the class was 1 hour long, ending at 2:45). Students perked up when they saw Mr. Garrett, smiling, laughing, and excited to enter his classroom. He asked students to come in quickly and immediately “get to work.” Mr. Garrett prompted students to write down the aim and language objectives for the lesson: (a) Aim: How does the organization of the U.S. Constitution prove to us the intentions of the founding fathers? (b) Language Objectives: reading, writing, and analyzing primary documents. As students began to write the aim and language objectives, Mr. Garrett wrote the “Do Now” on the board: (a) Test, (b) 5W/1H U.S. Constitution. He noticed students were a little bit off task and whistled, then yelled, “let’s go!” He explained to the class, “I do for you, but you have to do for me. I have your tests and final
grades, if you don’t want them, you don’t have to, you know…” Students quieted down and got to work. Mr. Garrett noted, “Good, thank you very much. I know you’re excited and I understand it is Monday and the day is nearly over,” and continued making a few announcements before transitioning to the lesson.

Mr. Garrett introduced the class as a pre-U.S. Constitution lesson, which would be followed in the next two and half weeks by lessons about the U.S. Constitution itself because, “I personally feel that if you understand the Constitution, the end of H5 and the rest of H6 will be much easier for you to understand, who the President is and what the Supreme Court does, etc. I think you really need that as a solid foundation before we really get into historic presidents.” Students listened intently, and continued to copy down their lesson aim, objectives, and Do Now. Mr. Garrett continued with the Do Now, and described what students would see on their tests: their multiple-choice grade, DBQ grade, and total grade. He joked with students that they would have to learn how to lobby, because they were going to see their grades before their parents did, and might have to explain why their grade was or was not where it is supposed to be, “that is called lobbying,” he explained. While students were called up one-by-one to look at their test and final grades for the marking period, Mr. Garrett asked the rest of the class to work in groups, pairs, or individually on the Do Now, “5 W/H on the U.S. Constitution.” Together as a class, they reviewed what each of the “W’s” and “H” meant: who, what, where, when, why, and how? To explain each of the 5W’s and H, he used an example of students talking about a fight while at lunch, saying, “who was there? What were they doing? Where was the fight? Why were they fighting? When? Why? Someone was arrested? How?” Students laughed at Mr. Garrett’s animated example, and wrote down the graphic organizer he created on the board. The graphic organizer was a spider diagram. The U.S. Constitution took the place of the body in the middle,
and each “W” and “H” was attached as a leg. Mr. Garrett asked each student to use a textbook and look in the index first for the “U.S. Constitution,” and complete the graphic organizer by asking various questions about the document.

Mr. Garrett solicited students’ ideas about various questions they might ask when completing the diagram. Students responded: “who created the U.S. Constitution? Who supported the U.S. Constitution? Who ratified the U.S. Constitution?” Mr. Garrett complimented students on their great “who” questions and said, “you could also do the opposite, ‘who did not support the Constitution?’ ” He continued, explaining, “Great, I want you to be an active reader. What are some ‘what’ questions?” One student, Mario, said, “What is the U.S. Constitution?” Mr. Garrett teased him about the simplicity of the question, but noted its importance. He asked students to continue “thinking along these lines,” and to be prepared for the possibility that they might be required to write their responses on the board and complete the graphic organizer “for all to see.” Students immediately got to work. Many students walked over to the bookshelf for a textbook, and Mr. Garrett prepared his notebook to share test and final grades with each student.

Mr. Garrett called up students individually to see their grades. Students were very concerned about their grades, and many talked to their classmates about what they received. After each student met with Mr. Garrett, he asked the class, “how many of you are happy with your grade?” About six to seven students raised their hands and about five or so said they wanted to try to do better next time. He acknowledged the five students who said they would try to do better and said, “the rest of you must be waiting for me to ask, ‘who will do better next time?’ ” Students went back to work on their questions as Mr. Garrett walked around, checking in on students. His proximity to some students immediately silenced them and they returned back to the task. Some student-written Do Now questions about the U.S. Constitution included: (a) when
was the Constitution created? (b) Why was the Constitution created? (c) How did the
Constitution help the citizens? As the class finished up the Do Now, Mr. Garrett asked students
to make sure they noted from where, in the text, they obtained their information. This detail was
necessary to check the accuracy of the gathered information when they put their responses on the
board, and to assess whether they had interpreted the information in the textbook correctly.

Twenty minutes into the lesson, Mr. Garrett began handing out white board markers to
various students. Students with a marker began to write on the board, filling out the spider
diagram with answers to their questions on the Constitution. Mr. Garrett interrupted students as
they were writing on the board: “Remember please write your source. Where is this coming
from? Your notes, your brain, your text? Tell us!” Students wrote under the “who:” “delegates
from 12 states assemble in Philadelphia; nine states ratified the Constitution.” Under the “where”
a student wrote, “in Philadelphia.” In the “how” box, one student wrote, “is organized in:
preamble, articles, and amendments.” The “what” included “the second system of government
after the Articles of Confederation.” The “when” noted that the Constitution was “written in
1787” and “ratified in 1791.” Students wrote that “why” was “to protect the rights of the
people;” this particular comment’s noted source was “Jose’s brain.” After the first set of students
wrote their comments on the board, they handed their markers to other students, who would then
write more comments for the class to see. When the written responses were completed, Mr.
Garrett asked the class, “if it is on the board, is it correct?” Students said in unison, “no,” and he
responded, “tienen cuidado [be careful.]” Mr. Garrett made his way to the “why” question and
asked Jose to explain his comment to the question “Why did they need to create the U.S.
Constitution.” Jose responded, “to provide a more perfect union, to provide for the common
defense, to promote the general welfare.” Mr. Garrett replied, “okay, well I don’t want you to
read the document, I want you to tell me why it was written. Go back to your notes.” Jose went back to his notes, and Mr. Garrett asked, “a more perfect union, what does that mean?” Jose said, “only one country.” Mr. Garrett responded, “right, we are going to form a union.” Another student, Lorna, chimed in, “to take their own responsibilities, because they are free from the British.” Mr. Garrett supported their comments by noting, “Perfect, because they created a system of government that did not work, the Articles of Confederation.” He continued to review the Articles of Confederation and other preceding historical documents to set the context for understanding the organization of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Garrett handed out a graphic organizer titled, “the 5 Steps of American Government.” He asked students to follow along with him using the guiding question “What was the first step toward American Government?” Students filled out the step chart as a class, including the date and main idea/themes for each of the five “steps,” including the Declaration of Independence, Articles of Confederation, Constitution, Bill of Rights/Amendments, and Changes to the Constitution. Once he got to the fifth step he noted, “it is very important that you realize that every President will change the Constitution somehow, and many of these changes can affect your life in one way or another.” He explained that it was important for them to be aware of these changes and the people we elect who make these changes “in our society.” After completing the “5 Steps” graphic organizer, Mr. Garrett went back to the 5 W’s and 1 H, making sure that all of the responses on the board were accurate and connected their ideas to the five steps toward American Government. Mr. Garrett was passionate and lively when talking about the Constitution; he clearly loved discussing the document with his newcomer students. Posted on his wall was a large “authentic” Constitution. He took it down and walked around the room so
students could see the document up close. As he walked around the room, he continued to explain a bit more about the organization of the U.S. Constitution as students listened quietly.

In the remaining eight minutes of class, he asked students to take out their U.S. Constitutions. Every student in the class pulled out a red, pocket-sized Constitution. He wrote on the board “Organization of the U.S. Constitution” followed by numbers one through eight, with a rectangular box for each number. He asked students to take notes, follow along with the document, and begin writing down each section of the Constitution. As he wrote each section, he explained what the section included, and wrote some key items on the board for students to copy.

After writing the section headings (1) Preamble, (2) Article 1: Legislative, (3) Article 2: Executive, and (4) Article 3: Judicial, he asked students, “What three Constitutional principles do we see here?” Students remained quiet, and then he asked, “Are you studying? You really need to review your notes.” He paused, then re-phrased the question, “the branches are…or do…what?” He encouraged students to respond, but still after no one volunteered answers, he wrote down: “separation of powers, checks and balances, and judicial review.” With only a few minutes remaining in class he quickly rushed through the last few sections of the Constitution, writing: (5) Article IV: Relationships between the States; (6) Article V: Amending the Constitution; (7) Article VI: General Provisions, Supremacy of Constitution; and (8) Ratification. He asked students to complete the “Organization of the U.S. Constitution” graphic organizer, and include any six Constitutional principles that might relate to each section.

Students quickly packed up their bags, and Mr. Garrett thanked students for staying a few extra minutes. Students rushed out of the class to make it on time to their next class period.

Findings
This section focuses on the findings of Mr. Colin Garrett at Newbridge International High School in relation to the following subsidiary research questions: how does Mr. Garrett conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does Mr. Garrett implement his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does Mr. Garrett conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? Findings are understood in the context of two themes, Mr. Garrett’s conceptualization and implementation of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students. Mr. Garrett conceptualized social studies pedagogy by orienting toward developing an educated citizenry of all newcomers by infusing politics into U.S. History. Mr. Garrett implemented social studies pedagogy by using his knowledge and skills for teaching Latino/a newcomer youth by storying U.S. History to make cross-cultural connections and build a common language.

In each theme, I examine how Mr. Garrett’s attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions show overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. I examine how Mr. Garrett’s attitudes and ideas led to the conceptualization of orientations toward teaching social studies. I also examine how Mr. Garrett’s ideas and actions led to the implementation of knowledge and skills for teaching social studies as they apply to culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer students.

**Conceptualizing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Orientations toward developing an educated citizenry of all newcomers by infusing politics into U.S. History.** Mr. Garrett’s personal and professional commitment to teaching social studies for ELLs, dedication to teaching students about the U.S. Government, and service-oriented devotion to teaching newcomer youth all strongly influenced his conceptualizations for teaching social
studies for Latino/a newcomer youth. These commitments and dedications established a
foundation for and greatly influenced his attitudes and beliefs about how he conceptualized
social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth. These attitudes and beliefs supported an orientation
toward developing an educated citizenry of all newcomers by infusing politics into U.S. History.

“I have them all leave their playing fields and come to my hometown.” Mr. Garrett
conceptualized teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer students as teaching U.S. History
and Government for all his newcomer youth. He differentiated his curriculum and instruction for
all students in his class, and did not necessarily focus on individual countries of origin or
linguistic backgrounds. When asked his thoughts on teaching social studies for Latino/a
newcomer students, Mr. Garrett noted:

I think to me, it is more general, because I want to make sure I differentiate enough for
everyone, and I have to think about all of the different languages that all of the kids in the
class speak. So in order to make it fair, I have them all leave their playing fields and
come to my hometown, as far as vocabulary and everything, so in this way I am not
favoring one group over another, for example we have these red reading books and we
have them in Spanish. We have the option to give them to the Spanish-speaking students
because they have the option to take the Regents in Spanish, technically, but I don’t take
that option, I don’t think that is fair to everybody else.

Mr. Garrett’s classroom was incredibly diverse, including students from at least ten different
countries and over eight languages spoken; therefore, focusing particularly on the linguistic
needs of Latino/a students seemed unfair to Mr. Garrett. He stressed that he wanted students to
come to a new “playing field,” that included diverse cultural and linguistic “team” members.
This team, which included his newcomer students, arrived to his “hometown,” or classroom, to
learn and “play” the game of social studies, which included U.S. History content and vocabulary,
while engaging in key skills for democratic living. While Mr. Garrett appreciated “the
differences between the kids,” he wanted to “put everybody on the same playing field as far as
language, and culture, and all of these things.” That being said, when it came to content of which
he knew his students had extensive prior knowledge, i.e. colonization, imperialism, geography, and revolutions, he would be sure to engage students with their knowledge of these concepts in relation to the history of their home countries and the United States.

Once students entered Mr. Garrett’s “home field,” he provided the space for students to choose their own groups and with whom they wanted to sit in the classroom. The freedom to talk, interact, and cooperate with their culturally and linguistically diverse classmates provided an open environment in which students could “learn collaboratively” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 55). Interestingly, students often chose to work with classmates from different linguistic groups and usually formed heterogeneous groups on their own. Mr. Garrett commented, “I do let them choose their own groups […] so this way they feel like they have that support- linguistically, but they don’t have to rely on that support if they don’t want too, so that is another thing I kind of take into account.” Stating that “they don’t have to rely on that support,” Mr. Garrett encouraged students to use his classroom space to speak and interact with one another in English, engage cross-culturally in classroom activities, and focus on unifying characteristics amongst all newcomer students to build his classroom “team.”

Mr. Garrett hoped students would “be comfortable in their groups so they can act and they can do things that are uncomfortable.” This was particularly apparent in the groups students created for the classroom project on the Declaration of Independence. The project asked students to create groups of four and “complete three small projects dealing with the actual text of the Declaration of Independence.” Students focused on the list of grievances section of the Declaration in their project by creating a poster, screenplay, and dramatic performance. Each group member was assigned a specific role or position to make sure that the group was “staying
on task and working together” (Garrett, 2011b). The roles included director, head writer, creative/art director, and scholarly director.

Students created their own groups, and interestingly, three of the seven groups consisted of students with different native languages. One multilingual group included students from Haiti and Mexico. Another group included students from Algeria, Haiti, Yugoslavia, and Ecuador. And the third multilingual group included Farsi, Urdu, Arabic, and Russian speakers. The monolingual groups included Chinese, Spanish, and Bengali speakers. The creation of groups within the enacted group project showed Mr. Garrett’s support for students’ comfort in the classroom, while simultaneously emphasizing learning English when coming to the “same playing field.” This project emphasized how Mr. Garrett differentiated his social studies curriculum for all his newcomer students and conceptualized a pedagogy that supported the individual and collective needs of the students in his classroom.

“An educated citizenry is probably the biggest thing for me.” Mr. Garrett conceptualized teaching social studies for newcomer youth as developing and supporting notions of active and engaged democratic citizenship. He desired his newcomer students to not only understand what it meant and what it looked like to be a participant in U.S. democratic society, but also participate in U.S. civic and political society. For Mr. Garrett, active citizenship required that newcomer youth:

[…] appreciate citizenship, you know not be a blind citizen. Saying and thinking that everything our country does is necessarily the best thing, but to debate those things, we have the ability to debate those things, that actions in this country or that country, or this law or tax policy, they can be debated and they can be influenced by individuals.

Actions for democratic citizenship enacted by Mr. Garrett included debating, questioning, and thinking critically about issues. These actions support Parker’s (2003) conception of a democratic citizen as someone who is “capable of democratic living, who wants it, and who are
determined to achieve it…” (p. 1). Mr. Garrett’s “educated citizenry” describes one who “appreciate[s] citizenship” and is not a “blind citizen,” signifying a citizen who “wants” to achieve democratic living. Additionally, Mr. Garrett stressed that his newcomer students also be involved with various issues that they can influence individually, thus supporting them as citizens “determined to achieve” democratic living (Parker, 2003, p. 1). Mr. Garrett supported students’ engagement in civic and political activities beyond the classroom that have the potential to influence governmental action (Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012) by stating:

[…] when I show them that just by volunteering they could A- make a career out of working for an interest group or working on a campaign or whatever, or B- they could actually touch government, you know, in some shape, form, or fashion and it shows them that- how difficult it is to get this changed, but how possible it is at the same time […] and they learn in class that in our system money is a huge thing, lobbying, is a huge thing, but you still don’t have to have money to change things or even to state your opinion, no matter what it may be, so I think that is the most important thing.

Mr. Garrett conceptualized civic and political engagement for his newcomer students as something that was attainable, worthwhile, and important for sustaining the health of U.S. democratic society (CIRCLE, 2003). He hoped that by providing the opportunities to learn about what active and engaged democratic citizenship explicitly looked like, he would encourage civic engagement. He wanted to “show them that just by volunteering,” students could make active citizenship “possible.” He explained that it does not always require money and power to change things, but by participating in civic and political organizations in one’s local community, students could work from the ground up to make changes in society.

Mr. Garrett’s foundations for teaching social studies for newcomer youth supported elements of democratic citizenship education (Parker, 2003) by fostering notions of active and engaged citizenship in his classroom; however, he also wanted to make sure students knew the fragility of U.S. democratic society; explaining:
[...] democracy is a transitional kind of government, that is not permanent that could lead to eventually- aristocracy or tyranny, because people will take for granted what they have in a democracy [...] The people are what is supposed to run the country, and if people are uneducated and people cannot have opinions based on facts or debates based on opinions without screaming or going crazy, then that is not good for our country. An educated citizenry is probably the biggest thing for me personally.

Explaining how U.S. democratic society functions and what it takes to “run the country” framed Mr. Garrett’s attitudes and beliefs toward teaching U.S. History. Mr. Garrett hoped his newcomer students would become “an educated citizen” and “if there are things that you want to change,” he noted, “I would love to teach you how to change them.” However, knowledge of the structures of the U.S. governmental system was key to fostering active and engaged citizenship. By focusing on historical “steps” and foundations of the U.S. Government (see activity in lesson vignette above), Mr. Garrett conceptualized teaching U.S. History through the lens of the “structure of the system.”

“I take the politics and infuse it into the history and vice versa.” Mr. Garrett’s orientation toward teaching U.S. History for newcomer students involved intersecting elements of both historic and contemporary U.S. politics. He felt understanding politics was an important part of teaching social studies, as it was interconnected to the themes, events, and developments in U.S. History, explaining: “I take the politics and infuse it into the history and vice versa, sometimes it is more history, sometimes it is more politics, but they are both so intertwined that it is hard to separate them.” When defining politics for his newcomer students in the U.S. History course, Mr. Garrett explained:

I try to convey it to the kids that politics is government run, but influenced by the people. [...] I use the analogy of gasoline. If you have a nice car, you have the greatest car in the world, but if you don’t have gasoline in that car, it will never run. And that is our system, if we don’t have people who go and vote and who are active participants in their society, then you know the car doesn’t function, the Constitution won’t function, the way it should or the way it was meant to run. So, to me the people push everything, but people can’t do everything alone.
By conceptualizing politics as “influenced by the people” but controlled by the government, Mr. Garrett wanted to show students how everyday people in U.S. History have influenced government and society. Through dynamic and interactive lecture-discussions, Mr. Garrett showed the intersections between politics and history, building student empathy for various historical figures and events. The intersections of politics and U.S. history focused mostly on the experiences of historical figures who have influenced governmental decisions and policies in response to civic and political issues that affected their lives and communities. For example, Mr. Garrett discussed in the lesson vignette above how the U.S. Constitution can be changed, explaining “step five” in the American government handout. He reminded students that they could effect change by electing political officials who would alter the Constitution. These changes, he said, would influence their lives, and therefore they should be aware and informed of who they wish to elect and why.

Mr. Garrett noted his identification as a 2nd-generation immigrant (his mother is a 1st generation Cuban American) as one of the main reasons why studying politics and history are important to his social studies pedagogy for newcomers explaining:

I try to put it to them too, that I am a first generation American, on half of my family, so this is ours [the country] it just depends what we are going to do with it […] But the idea that, just being here in this country, whether you like it or not, you are an American. And there are really great parts of that, amazing parts of that, and there are things we should not be so happy about, but we should always talk about and discuss. Because that is the only way to, we can’t change the past, but that is the only way we can change who we are in the future.

Mr. Garrett used an understanding of historical figures and events in U.S. History as a lens for thinking about how to “change who we are in the future.” He wanted students to recognize that the events they studied in U.S. History are related to their current experiences, and “it just depends what we are going to do with it.” He felt that it was up to his students to pave the way
for future generations, and begin to make U.S. History. Mr. Garrett wanted students to re-see ‘American’ as including their voices, perspectives, and experiences, often talking about “our country” and changes “we” want to make.

Additionally, Mr. Garrett used what he called “MEPS,” which stood for “military, economics, political, and social,” as an analysis tool for discussing the intersections between politics and history, while relating the lesson to students’ current experiences in the United States. Mr. Garrett noted:

I like to use MEPS – the political and social are hand-in-hand, but also economic, ‘cause politics controls economics and it controls society and if any change that has happened in our country’s history […] has come through the people, socially, and then enforced politically- whether it is the progressive movement, women’s right to vote, the 17th amendment, you know anything, the civil rights movement, any of those changes have had to happen grass roots first […] I think personally that is more of the citizenship angle that they need, if you are an educated citizen you learn about the government first, and the founding fathers and all of that stuff, and then you start paying attention more and politics become what is in the newspaper and who is running for president.

Using MEPS supported Mr. Garrett’s orientation toward “infusing” politics and history. His attitude that one can’t study U.S. History without studying politics related to his belief that it was critical to encourage his newcomer students to become “educated citizens.” Becoming an “educated citizen” involved seeing the U.S. historical narrative as offering sites of opportunities for students to visualize and experience active engagement in their communities and U.S society.

“They are just regular people […] where they wanted to bring some kind of change to society or politics.” Mr. Garrett felt that teaching U.S. History for newcomers also needed to encompass multiple perspectives. Incorporating multiple perspectives in the U.S. historical narrative fostered pluralism, a key democratic ideal, and maintained a society that was culturally, linguistically, racially, and ideologically diverse (Parker, 2003). According to Parker (2003), democratic citizenship education sought to promote the idea that diversity is “a social fact,” “a
social good,” and thus “diversity and democracy require one another” (p.1). Mr. Garrett conceptualized a U.S. Historical narrative that supported diversity and pluralism in the United States, by teaching history through connecting students’ experiences to the human elements of history. He explained to his newcomers in class that people in history are “just like we are,” and articulated that it was important to see who historical figures are as “as people” because:

I think they should know- and we do this not only for presidents, but we also do this for autobiography stuff like Ford, Harriet Tubman- you know, Fredrick Douglas. They are just regular people and they are living in a circumstance and at a time where they felt like something was wrong, or something needed to be changed […] where they wanted to bring some kind of change to society or politics, and they did it. Kind of like the social justice angle, where you do not have to be the President to change things, but at the same time the President is a person. These members of government are people, who represent us. It is not like, they are totally infallible, but at the same time, they are a little bit more than us, they are not the same as us, but I think they can develop more of a relationship and feel more intimacy with our government.

Mr. Garrett wanted students to “develop a relationship” with historical people and moments, through the incorporation of multiple perspectives about why people desired to make a change in their society. He incorporated these perspectives by using film and primary documents so that students could see, hear, and experience what life in other time periods might have been like. For example, he used a film titled *The Story of Us*, which featured various stories of historical figures and events that often go untold and unheard. Using film, for Mr. Garrett, created an “intimacy” with history and government, and connected students to the curriculum in numerous ways. He explained that a student said, “I like Jefferson better because he felt like this, and I feel like this too;” therefore, using film offered opportunities for students to make connections that might not have been possible when using other texts.

Mr. Garrett’s attitudes and beliefs toward developing historical empathy and connectedness with various figures and events in U.S. History fostered incorporation of the democratic ideals of diversity and pluralism in the United States. His knowledge and skills
toward teaching U.S. History as a “story” with various “characters” possessing multiple perspectives and experiences created a more nuanced and complicated historical narrative. A discussion of how of Mr. Garrett implemented his social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth will be discussed in the following theme.

**Implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Knowledge and skills toward storying U.S. History to make cross-cultural connections and build a common language.** Mr. Garrett’s implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth highlighted the knowledge and skills toward storying U.S. History to make cross-cultural connections and build a common language. This theme will be organized using the three core categories of culture, language, and citizenship (see Chapter III: Methodology section for further information about the development of these categories). Within each category, an analysis of how Mr. Garrett’s pedagogical ideas and actions developed the knowledge and skills for implementing social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth will be discussed.

**Culture: “It is like a human experience that they can connect to.”** Mr. Garrett implemented a social studies pedagogy for all newcomer students by emphasizing shared cultural experiences within and across ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups in his classroom. He created pedagogical opportunities for students to share stories and experiences that generated cross-cultural connections between his newcomer students (Subedi, 2008). Culture is defined in this study as a group’s individual and collective beliefs, values, experiences, histories, and traditions, or a shared knowledge that varies within and among cultural groups (Siddle Walker, 1999; Tillman’s, 2002). Mr. Garrett’s implemented social studies pedagogy worked to create a new culture in his classroom by building a shared cultural knowledge based on “human experiences that they can connect to” within and among his culturally and linguistically diverse
newcomer students. He explained that the incorporation of students’ cultural backgrounds into his classroom was important to his social studies pedagogy because:

> Everybody is proud of where they are from and of who they are […] I want to show them that most of all, in my classroom, that being an American doesn’t mean that, you don’t love your home country, you don’t have to totally resign yourself from that, because that’s part of being an American, having this- none typical kind of a culture, this salad bowl theory- that is what makes America great in my opinion. That so many different people could come together and share the same values and the same ideas, but at the same time have different opinions of those ideas, they come from different places and different backgrounds and histories, you know?

In Mr. Garrett’s classroom, he wanted students to be “proud of where they are from and who they are.” This meant providing multiple opportunities for students to share experiences from their home countries and daily lives was central to his implemented culturally relevant pedagogy. For example, Mr. Garrett often began his lesson with a “guided writing,” or other opportunities for students to “think about a time when…” or “what do you know about…” or “tell me a story dealing with…” These guided writing activities asked students to draw on their previous knowledge and experiences (Yosso, 2005) by building a connection to the historical content or skills presented in the lesson.

In an introductory lesson for the year, Mr. Garrett wanted students to build skills for analyzing primary sources by deconstructing images of historical events. The lesson aim was: “how can analyzing documents tell us the ‘story’ of history?” At the beginning of the lesson he asked students to “write about a time where you struggled but succeeded.” Students responded with personal stories about school, home countries, and families. For example, one student from the Dominican Republic, Anais, wrote, “I remember a time in my country where I had to try so hard to become the best student of my school. I had to study so hard and do many things to achieve what I want.” Another student for Ecuador, Pedro, explained, “It can be when I have to do the homework and I struggle against the laziness but I succeed when I got my 100%.” After
two students shared, Mr. Garrett said, “So we have two basic stories, what are the three points of each story?” Students responded, “a conflict, a solution, and a result.” Mr. Garrett responded, “good, so what were some important things about the stories that were told? What was the story about?” One student, Jose, noted, “a theme.” Mr. Garrett said, “yes, so both stories have a similar theme, hard work.” He re-told each story, explaining how the theme of hard work showed a conflict, but each story had a resolution and an outcome. Furthermore, he said, “there were six elements of each story: who, what, where, when, why, and how, and we are going to be using these [elements] all year.”

When reflecting on the activity, he explained that he wanted students to use specific parts of a story that we “naturally [use] when we tell a story, and that is what we have to focus on when we look at primary documents […] when we look at historic people [and] historic events.” Mr. Garrett used students’ individual stories about successful experiences in their lives to show how their stories offered connections and commonalities with one another. Students also developed a document analysis framework (similar to the one used in the lesson vignette above) involving their experiences.

As the lesson continued, students were asked to create groups, and each group was given an image depicting a “scene” in the story of the “New World,” or the journey of the Europeans to North America and encounter with the Native Americans. He asked students in each group to “give the six elements of the story told in your document,” by providing evidence from the image, based on their analysis. After students engaged in document analysis, they presented their ideas using the SMART board, circling the evidence in the image that supported their understanding of the depicted historical “scene.” Mr. Garrett told students prior to presenting their document, “so you are going to teach us, you have been staring at this document, but the
other students in this class have not, so you have to teach them.” Students presented their
document, telling a story of what might have been happening in the image, pointing out gestures,
body language, geography, clothing, actions, animals, and other items they noticed. As the
students hypothesized and constructed stories about the events of each image, Mr. Garrett
frequently interjected in order to help connect the presented images together.

In this lesson, Mr. Garrett incorporated students lived experiences by creating a story, and
using the basic elements of storytelling to analyze documents. Mr. Garrett implemented his
social studies pedagogy by storying the history, engaging in image analysis, and building skills
for analyzing primary source documents. Reflection on this activity further supported Mr.
Garrett’s knowledge of and skills for accomplishing the goal for students to “participate in the
history that they are learning.” He desired for students to construct an understanding of the
historical narrative, and presenting to each other “so they learn from each other, and it makes
more of a community-based kind of learning.” He further explained: “I want them to be able to
look at a document and be able to just tell the story of what they think was happening […]
unpacking the history behind it.”

Telling a story of history, using students’ inferences and understandings of the images,
also supported English language development for Mr. Garrett’s English Language Learners. He
hoped that the activity’s focus on deconstructing images would, “show them that they need to
stop, they need to take things apart, they need to unpack a lot, in order to develop the next step-
which would be an essay, which would be a vocabulary quiz.” Taking the time to analyze,
unpack, and understand the document helped his ELLs to “write something about that picture”
and “when they are taking a test, they are visualizing what they saw, they are visualizing the
pictures, so they can describe it, so they can get an answer on their vocab quiz or an exam.”
Thus, images helped students remember the content as well as build academic language skills, by connecting what they saw to the social studies vocabulary and concepts they used in multiple forms of assessment.

**Language:** “You need to speak the language of social studies.” One of Mr. Garrett’s stated United States History curriculum goals was to: “develop English language acquisition through studying U.S. History.” Mr. Garrett’s implemented social studies pedagogy centered on English language development through vocabulary understanding and concept formation. His explicit teaching of key social studies terms and concepts developed a curricular skeleton for the course (as noted above in Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History Curriculum Goals). Mr. Garrett felt that using and learning vocabulary as the “whole foundation for the course,” was important for all students, stating:

[…] you need to speak the language of social studies, of U.S. History, you know we talk about importing and exporting goods, these are givens for kids who are typical Americans, some of these words, but even typical kids, in a typical high school [...] don’t necessarily know what the triangular trade is or things like that. So as far as the Regents goes, they use vocabulary constantly. They have about, probably between seven or eight vocab words in each question and the multiple choice, and for each multiple choice you have about 50 questions [...] probably more than 400 vocab words, just in the multiple choice. And in order to understand the documents, you need the background; you need some ammunition to kind of bring outside information into those documents.

Learning and understanding vocabulary, therefore, supported Mr. Garrett’s ELLs in learning the “language of social studies” for success in his classroom, as well as success on the state-wide Regents exam. It is important to note that Mr. Garrett’s newcomers were in their 11th grade year, so many of them had been in the U.S. for at least two years and transitioned through the bilingual program at the school. Therefore, students’ linguistic levels were most likely higher than someone who had just recently arrived to the United States. Mr. Garrett recognized these contexts, and felt that this was a critical year for his students to both prepare for the U.S. History
Regents as well as get ready for college, stating, “if they want to go to College, it is going to be in English, and I also emphasize that when I talk—’I know you guys are having a hard time with the language, and writing this research paper, but you guys have to realize, if you all apply to college […] you are not going to get any class in Chinese or in Spanish or in Bengali, you are going to get that class in English and you are going to have to deal with that.’ ” He believed his enacted social studies pedagogy prepared his students, whom he encouraged to attend College, to learn how to navigate the understanding of difficult concepts on their own, and therefore was one of his main academic and linguistic goals.

Mr. Garrett supported his English Language Learners’ understanding of U.S. History vocabulary by using a word wall (see Appendix G) that he frequently referenced throughout his enacted lessons. The word wall had key vocabulary words for each unit on note cards. On one side of the card was the word, and on the other side was a written definition for students to reference, if needed. In a lesson on the early republic, Mr. Garrett used his word wall to help construct an understanding of numerous vocabulary words. At the outset of the lesson, he introduced the aim, “how did George Washington’s response to the Whiskey Rebellion create a precedent?” He began asking students, “did we talk about this word yesterday, precedent, what is a precedent?” Students nodded, and one student responded, “It is an example.” Mr. Garrett re-stated the answer, “yes, it is an example, and it is important because who is going to follow that example?” Another student responded, “next people,” and Mr. Garrett said, “next people, in the future, in the preamble we call that ‘posterity,’ right? People in our future, for our future, we don’t know who is going to come out, but those people will use us as an example.” As the lesson continued, Mr. Garrett asked students, “What is the Whiskey Rebellion? Use your vocabulary list.”
One student, Muhammad, raised his hand, took time to think, and said, “they raised taxes…based on…Whiskey.” Mr. Garrett responded “good, and what did they do because of those taxes?” Students said, “rebelled,” and he said, “based on?” They responded, “Whiskey.” Mr. Garrett joked, “and this is why I teach social studies, okay…Remember we talked about dissecting, like cutting a frog like you do in science class, the same thing here.” He wrote on the board, “Whiskey Rebellion,” and said, “Dissect it, rebellion, what is a rebellion?” Another student, Darko, answered, “When someone rebels, when they don’t agree with something.” Mr. Garrett added, “good, when someone is going against the grain, going against something. And Whiskey, [he points to the word on the board] it is right there in front of you, the Whiskey Rebellion.” After dissecting this term, Mr. Garrett walked over to the word wall and said, “What other word could we dissect?” and together they decided to dissect the Alien and Sedition Acts, as this was a term they had not yet covered in class.

This example showed how Mr. Garrett, in the first few minutes of a lesson, discussed four vocabulary words: precedent, posterity, Whisky Rebellion, and Alien and Sedition Acts. His pedagogical strategy of “dissecting” these words helped make sense of the word on its own, without situating it in the U.S. History context. A key point, however, is that students also need to know the historical context of the vocabulary word to be able to fully understand and grasp the concept, and use the term in other forms. As the lesson continued, Mr. Garrett provided the historical context for the vocabulary words discussed, by using these terms, and others, to construct a narrative about George Washington’s response to the Whiskey Rebellion and the policy of neutrality (another key vocabulary term). Students read a short descriptive text, watched a film clip on George Washington from the History Channel and the President, and created a graphic organizer on the “Washington Administration,” which included boxes for the
terms “Whiskey Rebellion” and “neutrality,” and drew three extra boxes for other “key ideas” or vocabulary associated with George Washington.

This example further showed how Mr. Garrett focused both on understanding key vocabulary for the lesson and unit as well as contextualizing the vocabulary within the larger U.S. historical narrative of George Washington. These strategies supported his conceptualization of “speaking the language of social studies” through understanding vocabulary, and also implemented a key tenet of linguistically responsive teaching, “scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students’ learning” of content and skills (Lucas & Villegas, 2010, p. 307). Mr. Garrett offered instructional scaffolding throughout the lesson, providing temporary support, modeling how to dissect vocabulary words for students. He further supported notions of LRT by promoting language, content, and skill development for his ELLs by implementing vocabulary quizzes.

Mr. Garrett’s vocabulary quizzes asked students to do two things: (a) give the definition of the word, and (2) provide the U.S. historical context. These objectives were designed to show that students understood what the vocabulary word meant. He modeled an example on the board for students to see and hear before they began their first quiz, saying, “Mr. Garrett: Mr. Garrett is a social studies teacher at Newbridge International High School. Mr. Garrett is also a tremendous fan of the NY Giants football team.” The second part of the quiz supported his knowledge and skills toward having students “build a foundation” for understanding the interconnection of the vocabulary necessary for developing the “language of social studies.” He wanted students to show they understood the vocabulary on the quizzes, explaining:

I think it is important because, not just writing the definition of the word, but telling me why they think it is important, because there are so many different ways you can define some of these terms or people or places and I think sometimes we are so stuck on, George Washington is the first president, that is not the only thing he did, he did a lot of other
Mr. Garrett wanted students to bring in their own ideas of the vocabulary terms, saying he wanted them to “go learn something different, something more.” He also believed that vocabulary learning and understanding in the social studies encouraged students’ English language development, which was a key goal and purpose of the school and his class. Teaching and learning social studies in English was the goal of Mr. Garrett’s social studies pedagogy.

Furthermore, this goal related to citizenship education for Mr. Garrett, as he believed that to communicate and participate in civic and political activities required students know foundational historical and governmental vocabulary; stating, “But you have to know the vocabulary of Congress and the President, and you have to know that common- you have to speak the same language, in a way, when it comes down to it.” To be an active participate in society, one needed to “speak” the language, which included understanding vocabulary. He further stated, “but I still think that to me, it is important- as far as citizenship and all of these other ideals go- you know, English has to be part of it.” Therefore, he felt by supporting students’ English language development in his class, using social studies vocabulary and content, he was building students’ knowledge and skills for active and engaged citizenship in U.S. society.

**Citizenship: “To become advocates within their families.”** Implementing social studies pedagogy, for Mr. Garrett, involved citizenship education for his newcomers that included understanding the structures and functions of the U.S. government and becoming an “educated citizen” (for more information, see above in theme one on orientations); he explained how he defined citizenship for his newcomer as:
You need to be a citizen, an educated citizen, and you have to know the structure, in order to go to the places that need to be- you need to go to, to make the changes you want to see. So I look at it from that perspective.

Mr. Garrett situated the “changes you want to see” as related to participatory notions of active citizenship. One way he encouraged students to participate as active citizens was through the development of media literacy skills to critically analyze bias, stating, “Now, with TV and the mixing of different medias on the Internet, and blogging, and YouTube, I think it is important to be an educated voter, and for the kids to be able to see bias, even bias that they agree with.”

While Mr. Garrett conceptualized normative notions of citizenship for his newcomers, including making changes, seeing bias, and being an educated voter, he situated these notions within the immigrant experience. For example, he challenged societal notions of immigrants as “not American” or “not citizens” by forefronting inclusive notions of being an American and engaging as a citizen, telling students, “you are an American” and “it depends on what we are going to do with it.”

Mr. Garrett often asked students to reflect on their experiences in their home countries and in the United States, and how these experiences were intertwined and could help make sense of documents, understanding the government, and engaging in their new community in the U.S. For example, in a lesson on the U.S. Constitution (following the vignette above), Mr. Garrett and the class engaged in an in-depth discussion of Article IV and federalism, “a belief that we should share power.” He used the example of the U.S. flag to show federalism, explaining each element of the flag, and asked, “Which star is the biggest?” Students responded, “They are the same.” Mr. Garrett, acting like he was confused, replied, “wait, but Article II: the electoral college, how we elect our president, all different numbers represent the states the house and the president, we talked about this, right? Okay, so based on population, which state is the biggest?” Students
Mr. Garrett noted, “If you’re doing poorly, I shouldn’t talk to you? These states are all different. California is much bigger than Texas. Which state has more power?” Students yelled, “California, of course!” Mr. Garrett confirmed, “Okay, California, so which state is the biggest?” Students yelled, “Texas, no California.” Mr. Garrett confirmed, “Okay, California, so which state is the biggest?” Students yelled, “no! They are the same size!” One student, Muhammad explained, “they all have the same power.” Mr. Garrett continued, “Right, good. So in this class, some of you are really good students, some of you are pretty good students, and some of you…we could all do better. Does that mean you are not students? Does that mean I shouldn’t talk to you because you are doing badly in my class? Should I make the 90% students sit in the front, the 80% students sit in the middle, and then the 70% and lower sit in the back? Is that right? No, it is not! Because you all should be treated equally!” Mr. Garrett noted, “equally, good. The same with our states. Some states are bigger than other, some states are more powerful than others when it comes to taxation…but they are still all states.”

The lesson continued with a discussion of national and state governments, and *E Pluribus Unum*, or “out of many, one.” He explained that this is “engrained in our society, that we are many, but we are also united as one.” The states and the government have shared powers, but each state has different ideas and goals. Each state has their own government and their own Constitution; Mr. Garrett asked, “In many of your home countries, you have federalism, right? You have provinces and you have counties, right? And those counties have governments that try and make roads, schools, and do things, and you also have a national government that will defend your country.” Students nodded, and many commented, “yes.” They were very engaged in the discussion about federalism in the U.S., and what this might have looked like in their home countries.

In this example, Mr. Garrett made a connection between students’ ideas and prior experiences with government in their home countries (both locally and nationally), and the system and structure of government in the U.S. He also wanted students to grasp that both
systems, those in students’ home countries and in the U.S., were equally important to understand. He didn’t want students to give up their allegiance and connection to their government back home, but rather he wanted students to understand how the U.S. government worked (and at some point build a connection), and recognize this understanding was connected to their current knowledge of their home country’s government. These notions and examples supported elements of “new citizenship” (Ladson-Billings, 2004), in which one’s multiple allegiances to and participation in societies are based on various axes of identity, i.e. racial, ethnic, cultural, or linguistic.

Furthermore, Mr. Garrett supported students’ civic engagement as it related to sharing what they had learned in class about U.S. History and Government with their families, friends, and community members. He explained wanting students to:

[…] be able to have these conversations with their families, to become citizens themselves, pass the citizenship test, and then to become advocates within their families for these things.

He proudly noted, “I’ve had so many kids e-mail me and come back and say, ‘I taught my dad for the citizenship test, and I’ve never had a relationship with this member of my family, and you don’t know how much they appreciated the fact that I knew all of this stuff.’ ” These notions of civic action and engagement, for Mr. Garrett, supported what he hoped was a “life long education process,” between students, families, and their communities, both in the U.S. and in their home countries. Implementing social studies pedagogy meant moving students to take action and “advocate” for their families to pass the citizenship test, and/or “make the changes you want to see.” Advocacy, in this sense, also supported notions of reciprocity for Mr. Garrett. He hoped students would take what they had learned about the Declaration of Independence, the
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U.S. Constitution, and systems of government back to their homes and communities. Mr. Garrett noted that he often said to his newcomer students:

I expect something of all of you [...] to bring this into your home, because the least that you can do for the people who have brought you here, who have worked so hard to give you a different, whether you know it or not now, the least you can do is help them pass their citizenship text. That is your burden, that is your responsibility that I am giving to you, it is your assignment, that you know people in your family, you know people in your neighborhood that are taking this test [...] now your job is to help them out.

Notions of reciprocity meant that students gave back to their families and communities, by taking what they had learned in school, and using it to support those taking the citizenship test. These elements support Haste & Hogan’s (2008) argument that in order to understand what active citizenship looks like, we need to start with how the citizen understands citizenship, and her/his individual motivations for civic participation. In this case, newcomer students’ motivations and active civic engagement involved helping the welfare of their immigrant families and communities (Jensen, 2008) by sharing information and teaching about U.S. History and Government.

Case Summary

Mr. Garrett’s personal and professional commitment to teaching social studies for ELLs, desire to participate in multiple professional development opportunities, and service-oriented dedication to teaching at Newbridge International High School all greatly influenced his conceptualizations and implementations of social studies education for Latino/a newcomer youth. Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History course focused on developing an understanding of major themes, events, and developments in U.S. History and government. His central goal for the course was for his newcomer students to leave with a fundamental understanding of how the U.S. government is structured and how the system works. In addition to content goals, Mr. Garrett hoped his newcomer students would be well prepared and receive good grades on the
New York State Regents exam. Mr. Garrett differentiated his social studies curriculum for all his newcomer students and conceptualized a pedagogy that supported the individual and collective needs of the students in his classroom. Teaching and learning social studies in English was also an important goal of Mr. Garrett’s social studies pedagogy. He felt by supporting students’ English language development with social studies vocabulary and content, he was building students’ knowledge and skills for active and engaged citizenship in U.S. society.

The findings in this case examined how Mr. Garrett conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth. Mr. Garrett conceptualized teaching social studies for all newcomer youth by having students develop historical empathy and a connectedness with various people and events in U.S. History, in order to foster the democratic ideals of diversity and pluralism in his curriculum. He further supported an orientation toward developing an “educated citizenry” through an understanding of the structures and functions of the U.S. government. Mr. Garrett’s knowledge and skills toward teaching U.S. History as a “story” created a nuanced and complicated historical narrative constructed from human experiences. He implemented social studies pedagogy that emphasized shared cross-cultural experiences within and across ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups in his classroom. Mr. Garrett created pedagogical opportunities for students to share stories and experiences in their lives, generating connections among his newcomer students. He also centered his pedagogy on English language development through vocabulary understanding and concept formation and by developing a “language of social studies.” Examples of Mr. Garrett’s implemented pedagogy included storying history, engaging in image analysis, building document analysis skills, using graphic organizers, incorporating film, and dissecting vocabulary words.
Chapter Summary

Chapter IV began by re-introducing the major research question for this study: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? Next, I provided an overview of the organization and theoretical constructs used to frame the findings, orientations and knowledge and skills, toward culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. After the introduction to the chapter, I examined the contexts and findings of four cases: Ms. Linda Sanford and Mission Valley International High School; Mr. Jeremy Sharp and Empire International High School; Mr. Rafael Burgos and Pacific International High School; and Mr. Colin Garrett and Newbridge International High School. The contexts I examined for each case included teacher background, school, students, course curriculum, and a lesson observation vignette.

In each case study’s findings section, I answered the following subsidiary research questions: how does the teacher conceptualize teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth? How does the teacher implement social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? [How] Does the teacher conceptualize and implement culturally relevant pedagogy? I analyzed the findings by highlighting two emerging themes regarding how each teacher: (a) conceptualized their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth, and (b) implemented their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

In each theme, I examined how each teacher’s attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions showed overlapping and intersecting qualities of the principles and elements of CRP, LRT, and notions of active and engaged citizenship for Latino/a newcomer youth. I examined how each teacher’s attitudes and beliefs led to the conceptualization of orientations toward teaching social studies. I also examined how each teacher’s ideas and actions led to the implementation of
knowledge and skills for teaching social studies as they applied toward culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer students. These ideas and actions were organized using three core categories of culture, language, and citizenship, and pedagogical activities were used to show how each teacher implemented their social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students (see Table 5 for an overview of each case).

In the next chapter, I will highlight cross-case themes based on the findings discussed in this chapter and answer the final subsidiary question: what new theories emerge from social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? I will also further develop the emerging grounded theory for this study. I will conclude with: implications for research, teaching, and teacher education; suggestions for future research; and a conclusion of the study.
### Table 5

**Case Overview: Participant Orientations and Knowledge & Skills of Teaching Social Studies for Latino/a Newcomer Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Names</th>
<th><strong>Orientations</strong> (Pedagogical Attitudes and Beliefs)</th>
<th><strong>Knowledge and Skills</strong> (Pedagogical Ideas and Actions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Linda Sanford</strong></td>
<td>History as inquiry;</td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong>: Setting a schema for students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making connections for students with content and each another;</td>
<td><strong>Language</strong>: Seeing and experiencing complete texts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing literacy skills;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting explicit expectations to foster academic success.</td>
<td><strong>Citizenship</strong>: Rethinking “American” and participation in society;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Jeremy Sharp</strong></td>
<td>History as everyday experiences of different groups of people;</td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong>: Making cultural connections for and with students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using historical thinking to approach anything in life;</td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Learning stations group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing a space for students to exercise their voice;</td>
<td><strong>Language</strong>: Learning language through classroom experiences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using language as political action.</td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Experiential learning, language experience approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Citizenship</strong>: Creating a close-knit community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Inquiry-based learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Rafael Burgos</strong></td>
<td>Social studies as building civic engagement;</td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong>: Building on students’ social and academic assets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building individual relationships with students;</td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Project-based curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a community of learners;</td>
<td><strong>Language</strong>: Using bilingual practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming an advocate educator.</td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Activity</strong>: Translanguaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Colin Garrett</td>
<td>Social studies as developing an educated citizenry; Teaching for all newcomers; Infusing politics into history; Incorporating multiple perspectives.</td>
<td>Culture: Emphasizing shared experiences to promote cross-cultural connections; Pedagogical Activity: Storying history by using images.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, I analyze common themes between the four cases of Ms. Sanford, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Burgos, and Mr. Garrett to answer the major and subsidiary research questions: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth, and what new theories emerged from the social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? I present cross-case themes, based on the findings in chapter IV, which theorize the intersections of culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings 2004; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). I go on to develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education.

After presenting the cross-case themes and emerging grounded theory, I answer the final subsidiary question: what are implications of the teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth with regards to social studies education? I discuss implications for research, teaching, and teacher education. Finally, I provide suggestions for future research and a conclusion of this dissertation study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Chapter V:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Case Themes and Emerging Grounded Theory: Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Making Cross-Cultural Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Building a Language of Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Community-based, Participatory Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7. Overview of Chapter V*
Cross-Case Themes and Emerging Grounded Theory: Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education

In this section, I present cross-case themes to develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. The grounded theory in this study seeks to refine, extend, and challenge (Charmaz, p. 169) the theoretical constructs and principles highlighted in culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP), by offering additional theories of pedagogies that emerged from the social studies teachers’ classrooms in this study. The findings, cross-case case themes, and analysis reveal intersections of culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings 2004; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). These points of intersection develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education (see Figure 8), and reveal various theoretical principles of social studies teachers conceptualized and implemented pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth.

![Figure 8](image)

Figure 8. Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education

The principles of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education include: pedagogy of community, pedagogy of success, pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections,
Pedagogy of building a language of social studies, and pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship (see Table 6). I discuss each principle by answering the major and subsidiary research questions: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth, and what new theories emerged from the social studies teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth? I focus on how each teacher conceptualized and implemented her/his pedagogical attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions of teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer students. I also discuss the intersections of each theoretical framework (culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship), in addition to prior research on teaching and learning social studies for immigrant youth, to further develop the emerging grounded theory.

Table 6

Cross-Case Analysis: Principles of Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education for Latino/a Newcomer Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Citizenship Education</th>
<th>Conceptualized and Implemented Pedagogical Attitudes, Beliefs, Ideas, and Actions of Teaching Social Studies for Latino/a Newcomer Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Community</td>
<td>Advocating for newcomer youth cultivated by teacher caring; Building <em>confianza</em> (mutual trust); Fostering supportive and positive teacher-student and student-student relationships; Requiring <em>respeto</em> (respect).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Success</td>
<td>Expanding on students’ assets; Exercising student voice; Setting clear, high expectations and goals; Building on multiple, frequent successful experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Making Cross-Cultural Connections</td>
<td>Emphasizing communication for all newcomers; Connecting content to human experiences and students’ prior knowledge;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedagogy for Latino/a Newcomers

Pedagogy of Community

Pedagogy of building and fostering a community of learners for all newcomers in the social studies classroom was a significant theme across the four cases in this study. As Dewey (1915) argued, schools should be “made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons” (p.10). The goal of Dewey’s classroom community was to have students work together, to develop a unifying spirit that fostered an interchange of ideas and inquiries toward a common purpose. This unification, according to Dewey, develops out of a “common and productive activity,” whose goal is to cultivate an orientation toward thinking and doing for the common good and “prepare future members of the social order” (p. 11).

In addition to the classroom communities created by the teachers across this study, each newcomer school had an incredible community that promoted a culture of newcomer student success, achievement, and engagement (Bartlett & García, 2011; Salinas & Reyes, 2004; Short, 2002). These philosophical ideas and school contexts were critical elements to consider for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy of Building a Language of Social Studies</th>
<th>Using bilingual practices;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquiring English using multiple texts, content, and vocabulary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying linguistic demands of classroom tasks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing literacy skills;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy of Community-based, Participatory Citizenship</th>
<th>Identifying and belonging as essential elements;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channeling civic and political motivations by understanding local and community-based issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building on civic knowledge and skills for democratic participation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting and enacting civic engagement in various forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developing a community of learners, both within a school and in the classroom, and show the intersections of culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy and active and engaged citizenship across the teachers’ pedagogies. The pedagogical attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and actions of the teachers’ in the study included: advocating for newcomer youth, building confianza (mutual trust), fostering supportive and positive teacher-student and student-student relationships, and requiring respeto (respect).

Teachers in this study fostered pedagogy of community by advocating for newcomer youth (Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Salinas & Reyes, 2004). Their advocacy cultivated elements of teacher caring (Gay, 2000; Noddings, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). Teacher caring was embodied by all of the teachers in this study, but enacted differently across the four cases. For example, students felt a willingness to open up, share, and “hash out” their pre-conceived ideas about global warming and climate change in class-wide discussions in Mr. Sharp’s Global History class. Once Mr. Sharp showed an interest in and cared about students sharing their opinions, they increasingly began to open up to the class in discussions and group work. By developing inquiry questions as a group, Mr. Sharp supported a reciprocal relationship with his students. He operationalized his conception of citizenship as “a close-knit community” by working to foster a professional, safe, and community classroom space where his students could thrive socially, academically, and linguistically. Furthermore, the inquiry questions were used to guide students’ research using different pieces of evidence in his learning stations. Like Mr. Sharp, all the teachers in this study took action in their pedagogical practice based on their awareness and knowledge of students’ social, political, academic, and linguistic contexts in New York City. These contexts were critical to understanding history and employing classroom activities (Almarza, 2001).
Although advocacy and caring for all newcomer youth was seen across the four cases, there were specific aspects of cariño (caring, affection) for Latino/a newcomers that were particularly apparent in some of the social studies classrooms. Generally, each of the four cases showed caring for all newcomer youth by improving English Language Learners’ educational experiences (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), supporting a fluid sense of belonging within the school and larger community (Flores & Benmayor, 1997), and seeing students as capable of academic success and high levels of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 2010).

In addition, some classrooms displayed especially strong elements of cariño (caring, affection) for Latino/a newcomers. For example, Mr. Burgos enacted caring for his Latino/a newcomers by advocating for his Mexican students. He often interacted, talked, and reflected with his students throughout the day, during class, after school, and into the evenings about, “what is going on with them,” and how to engage in the various issues that affected their lives as newcomer youth. These actions supported his role as an advocate educator, acknowledging his students’ “collective recognition” at the school and in the community (Salinas & Reyes, 2004, p. 55), in order to “to remind everyone else that they are still here.” He developed a confianza or mutual trust with his Mexican students, building a reciprocal relationship, similar to Mr. Sharp, but by developing individual relationships, promoting community understanding and involvement (Salinas & Reyes, 2004), and fostering an environment for learning.

Mr. Burgos’s actions as an advocate educator supported elements of cultural citizenship (Flores & Benmayor, 1997). For example, his implemented teacher caring for Latino/a newcomer youth incorporated notions of educación, education both formal and informal, including social, emotional, civic, and political education (Yosso, 2005, p. 79). Furthermore, teachers in this study also expanded Yosso’s (2005) notions of family capital, or cultural
knowledges nurtured within families, to include youths’ teachers as part of their “extended family” (p. 79). This was particularly apparent in the case example of Mr. Burgos’s pedagogy, but took numerous forms across the four teachers.

Mr. Garrett desired to create a community in his classroom by encouraging students to “leave their playing fields and come to my hometown.” He used the analogy of creating a “team” in his classroom that extended notions of family capital (Yosso, 2005) and created a classroom community that developed a cultural knowledge of its own (Nieto, 2010). The culture in Mr. Garrett’s U.S. History classroom had its own values, goals, and ideas. Mr. Garrett’s (as well as Ms. Sanford’s, Mr. Burgos’s and Mr. Sharp’s classrooms) classroom culture created pedagogical opportunities for students to share stories and experiences in their lives, building on a shared cultural knowledge based on “human experiences that they can connect to” (Mr. Garrett). This pedagogy promoted high standards for academic success and achievement, supported accessing and using students cultural and linguistic backgrounds and experiences, and encouraged students to work collaboratively and respectfully with one another (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Ms. Sanford also fostered pedagogy of community by creating supportive and positive teacher-to-student and student-to-student relationships in her social studies classroom.

Ms. Sanford strived for students to “make connections” both with one another and with the content by sharing prior experiences, and fostering supportive relationships to collaborate with and take responsibility for one another (Ladson-Billings, 1994). For example, in the lesson described in case one on Christopher Columbus, Ms. Sanford encouraged students to talk about their personal experiences in connection to the historical content, while also making connections to one another. She used supportive prompts to encourage positive student-to-student relationships in class discussions, including, “tell me more” or “what does this meant to you?”
resulting in respectful student responses. In one instance described in the case, Malik responded respectfully to Veronica after she noted that Columbus “took many people’s lives,” stating, “I know in the past many people died because of Columbus, but there are a lot of new people here, and the new people invent a lot of things and make a lot of progress.” This dialogue between students in Ms. Sanford’s class promoted student connections to the content and one another through class discussions. Making connections to one another also required *respeto* (respect) for each other and the classroom teacher. Ms. Sanford fostered a community of learners, in which the interchange of ideas created an active and productive community (Dewey, 1915).

The pedagogical conceptions and implementations across the teachers in this study fostered positive teacher-to-student and student-to-student relationships through advocacy, the development of mutual trust, and the requirement of respect for one another. These elements established the attitudes, knowledge, and skills for participating in a classroom community (CIRCLE, 2003). The classroom community across the four cases worked toward supporting the needs and interests of all newcomer youth for the common good, therefore creating a foundation for future participation in community-based, social-civic related activities (Rubin, 2007).

Furthermore, building on Latino/a students’ cultural environments of *cariño* (caring, affection), *confianza* (mutual trust), and *respeto* (respect) in the social studies classroom encouraged students to feel “safe” and at “home,” and fostered a sense of belonging in the community (Flores & Benmayor, 1997, p. 15). This sense of belonging encouraged newcomer students to engage in inquiry discussions, examine issues affecting their lives, share stories and experiences, and make connections within and among various cultural groups. The goal of these actions was to promote and motivate newcomer students to be active and engaged in civic and political issues that connected to not only their individual lives, but also to the lives of people in
Pedagogy of Success

Teachers in this study conceptualized and implemented pedagogy of success for newcomer youth that focused on “meeting kids where they are” (Mr. Sharp) and pushing them toward what they “can do” rather than what they “can’t” (Mr. Burgos). Unlike findings in Cho & Reich’s (2008) study, which revealed significant challenges due to the lack of background knowledge and language barriers faced by ELLs (p. 237), teachers in this study saw students’ prior cultural knowledges and experiences as assets (Yosso, 2005). All four teachers in this study implemented additive pedagogies (Bartlett & García, 2011; Valenzuela, 1999), for example, by using students’ bilingual proficiencies and emerging English language proficiencies to help understand the historical content. The pedagogies of success for newcomer youth across the four cases align with and extend culturally relevant pedagogy. For example, the teachers desired that newcomer students choose academic success, felt successful in their actions at school, and begin to develop an understanding of how this success translates to the world beyond high school (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). The teachers in this study effectively fostered a pedagogy of success for Latino/a newcomer youth by: expanding on students’ assets; exercising student voice; setting clear, high expectations and goals; and building on multiple, frequent successful experiences.

Supporting a cultural asset perspective (Knight, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Yosso, 2005), teachers in this study forefronted and expanded on students’ cultural, linguistic, and active citizenship experiences. For example, Mr. Burgos’s Global History project-based curriculum expanded students’ assets through its goals, pedagogical implementation, and outcomes. He felt that working toward an end of the unit project presented
his newcomer Latino/a students with “something concrete to work for.” Given that the project provided students with a purpose and structure, the enactment of his curriculum supported their successful experiences in the social studies classroom (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Furthermore, the implementation of the project required students to work in groups, and culminated in a presentation. These pedagogical activities supported students’ social, academic, and linguistic assets for Mr. Burgos, who stated that his students were willing to have “open conversations about things,” and “not shy about telling you what they are thinking.” Additionally, the presentations offered a space for students to share their academic content knowledge and linguistic proficiencies (in Spanish and English) with their peers. The presentations also provided students who enjoyed speaking and showcasing their knowledge with the opportunity to do so in front of the group. The project-based curriculum, group work, and presentations all pulled from students’ varying assets in Mr. Burgos’s social studies classroom.

Mr. Garrett also expanded on students’ assets through his conception and implementation of infusing politics into U.S. history. Mr. Garrett’s description that politics is “government run, but influenced by the people” informed how he conceptualized teaching U.S. History through the lens of everyday people who have and do influence politics. Mr. Garrett hoped that by using these historical lessons, students would access and use their civic assets, or their ability to influence and made change in society, and become “educated citizen[s].” An educated citizen, in this case, seeks to “change who we are in the future” by engaging in political activities that have the potential to influence governmental action (Jacobsen & Linkow, 2012). These conceptions are similar to Mr. Sharp’s implementation of exercising students’ voice in his social studies pedagogy. Mr. Sharp desired to foster an “experience of success in the classroom” where
students “feel successful” in everyday classroom and lived experiences. He felt that all students were capable of academic success (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995a), and showcased this orientation by having students exercise their voice in all classroom activities, including: presenting the lesson agenda, organizing and running class discussions, generating inquiry questions, and participating in group goal setting activities.

Mr. Sharp believed that exercising students’ voice in the classroom was important to encourage students to speak, listen, and interact in both their native language and in English. These multiple literacy practices also developed his ELLs’ academic language proficiencies in both languages. He valued students’ linguistic diversity and attempted to learn about students’ language backgrounds and experiences (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). For example, Mr. Sharp hoped that by exercising their voice, students would “have that voice, in the larger class and just increasing it. I think that is a big thing because, newly arrived immigrants in the United States- in our society- do not have a voice, or a very little one, the system is set up to silence them. So you have to fight pretty hard against that, to get anywhere, with giving kids voice.” For Mr. Sharp, using voice in the classroom supported the actions of a citizen both in his social studies class, and later, in society at large. These actions involved speaking, debating, writing, cooperating, and presenting, and connected to his belief that language and speaking are “political acts;” therefore, he prepared his newcomers students for active and engaged citizenship, and participation in a variety of political and/or community-based, social-civic activities (Parker, 2003; Rubin, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Ms. Sanford emphasized notions similar to those of Mr. Sharp, Ms. Burgos, and Mr. Garrett by fostering pedagogy of success for Latino/a newcomer youth through setting clear, high expectations and goals for her newcomer students. Ms. Sanford paid particular attention to
setting clear expectations that individual students have successful experiences when designing and implementing lessons/assessments. Ms. Sanford recognized that her newcomer students’ understanding of success in the classroom varied depending on their prior schooling and social studies experiences, stating, “I think the students are successful when, I think they feel successful--I think there is a confidence that comes with that […] So, I think providing the opportunities to have success through projects, through class participation […] so that there are different ways for them to be successful.” Ms. Sanford’s class experienced academic success in multiple ways, but with a clear focus on understanding history through developing literacy skills. She believed setting explicit expectations for students fostered successful experiences in the classroom, noting, “you know really trying to pull out exactly what they aren’t doing, like there are really specific things that they can do.”

Ms. Sanford helped her Latino/a students navigate their way through their new schooling experiences, seeking to build “confidence,” provide students with multiple opportunities to be successful, and be clear about her expectations for assignments and classroom tasks. For example, she used multiple forms of assessments like projects, quizzes, tests, and essays, and provided students with a rubric, which she discussed at length in class, for each class assignment. Ms. Sanford approached every task and assessment as though students could and should complete what she required, setting high expectations, and always providing an incredible amount of scaffolding for her English Language Learners to successfully complete classroom tasks (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). By setting clear, high expectations and goals for their newcomers, teachers in this study provided students with high quality learning opportunities (Gay, 200, p. 57), which translated into student behaviors that resulted in academic achievement and engagement.
These four teachers stressed building off a multitude of frequent successful experiences, extending the tenet on academic success in culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995a), rather than focusing solely on achieving one successful experience, like passing a statewide exam. For example, Mr. Sharp explained, “You know, I think a big thing for these kids, is convincing them that they know how to do this […] It’s supporting them to have a success, which then supports them to have another success, and building success in all that.” It was important for Mr. Sharp, and the other three teachers in this study, that students experience success in his class and in other classrooms, to ensure the “kids to come back, or to continue on,” having successful experiences in school. Explicitly articulating student success in teachers’ pedagogy challenged the preconceived notions others outside of school and in society might have had about new immigrant youth (Goodwin, 2010). Challenging these oppressive forces and deficit views in society was each teacher’s main goal for fostering pedagogy of success for newcomer youth. They cultivated a culture of success in their social studies pedagogy based on students’ current knowledge and experiences, offering a space to speak and be heard, and setting clear, high expectations to work toward building a confidence for future success that confronts and takes action against social and linguistic injustice (Westheimer & Kahn, 2004).

**Pedagogy of Making Cross-Cultural Connections**

Teachers in this study fostered pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections with the historical content, one another, and larger sociopolitical issues in their communities. Supporting Subedi’s (2008) findings of two immigrant teachers who fostered “cross cultural view-points” (p. 434) for students in their social studies classrooms, teachers across the cases in this study supported practices that developed curricular and pedagogical connections for all newcomers in their classrooms. The cross-cultural practices implemented sought to make connections within
and among students’ cultural groups by engaging in communication, building relationships, and creating a community of learners. Communication, as discussed by Gay (2000), in regards to culturally responsive teaching, “cannot exist without culture” (p. 77). She posits that communication must take place between teachers and students as well as between students themselves.

Communication across the four cases fostered intercultural and cross-cultural interactions and knowledge building, which could further prepare students for democratic living (Parker, 2003). Gaining experiences in the social studies classroom helped students foster skills of cooperation, deliberation, the exchange of ideas, and “listening across difference” (Parker, 2003, p. 88). These experiences included interacting with other students and building on prior cultural knowledge with peers who were racially, ethnically, linguistically, and experientially similar and/or different than themselves. Teachers recognized that students’ multifaceted contexts were important and incorporated these contexts when navigating and negotiating possible cultural and “communication mismatches” (Gay, 2000, p. 78) by connecting historical content to human experiences and students’ prior knowledge, working in groups, and incorporating multiple perspectives when constructing historical content knowledge.

Teachers in this study implemented pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections with their newcomer students by linking the U.S. and Global History curriculums to collective human experiences and students’ prior knowledge. For example, Mr. Garrett and Ms. Sanford implemented guided writing activities that accessed students’ understandings about historical concepts, vocabulary terms, or events. In the lesson vignette described in case study one, Ms. Sanford asked students to think about and quick write on, “what comes to mind when you hear the word ‘Independence?’” Students, in this activity, were able to draw on examples from
personal experience and connection with historical content. For example, one student said, “Everyone needs their independence. For example, when you go out, you are independent from your parents.” This activity allowed students to think about their own conceptualizations of independence, or what Ms. Sanford called “setting a schema” for students, while also listening to their classmates’ understandings of independence.

Furthermore, Ms. Sanford showed in this example that she conceptualized knowledge as fluid, shared, and constructed by newcomer students’ experiences, and she sought to draw out their prior knowledge (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Having students write, share out loud, and discuss in small groups, also fostered scaffolding for speaking and writing in English (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Working in groups was a common pedagogical implementation across the four cases, particularly in the case of Ms. Sanford, Mr. Burgos, and Mr. Sharp’s classrooms, fostering cross-cultural interactions and connections.

Group work fostered pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections through collaborative learning, the sharing of cultural knowledge, and responsibility for each other among students (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Teachers in this study encouraged students to speak both in their native language as well as in English when working in groups, which fostered student engagement in class, and scaffolded instruction to promote learning historical content and group skill building (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). In Ms. Sanford, Mr. Burgos, and Mr. Sharp’s schools, group work and cooperative learning were essential elements of their mission and philosophy. Therefore, in each classroom, students worked at tables and in groups throughout the day. The school and teachers felt that group work supported learning English through the content areas, fostered basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), and developed cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALP) (Cummins, 2008). Second language learning
research (Long & Porter, 1985) shows that group work increases language practice opportunities, improves the quality of student talk, creates a positive effective climate for ELLs, and increases student motivation.

Further, studies on interlanguage talk, or “conversation between non-native speakers” (Long & Porter, 1985, p. 207), show that students talk more in interlanguage groups and use a “wider range of speech acts” (Long & Porter, 1985, p. 215), or a higher quality of speech (i.e. more grammatically correct), than in traditional group work. While interlanguage talk provides a greater quantity and quality of discussion in group work, it also provides interactions across students’ cultural backgrounds, and fosters connections with historical content. In Mr. Sharp and Ms. Sanford’s cases particularly, the teachers articulated that while group work did provide pedagogical merits like increasing students’ opportunities to practice language and interact within and across cultural groups, it was also necessarily to include individual work for students to move toward academic language acquisition and further understanding of social studies concepts, terms, and vocabulary. In Mr. Sharp’s case he implemented learning stations in which students worked with various groups and with different classmates, but also required students to produce their own individual work accumulated in the stations. The activities he used in each station, paired with the group work discussions, incorporated multiple perspectives for newcomers to construct an understanding of the topics covered in his enacted Global History curriculum.

Teachers across the cases encouraged students to question and inquire about the standardized curriculum. They did this in multiple ways, including offering a thematic curriculum, using discussion, developing inquiry “research” questions for a unit, and encouraging students to challenge the dominant narrative by incorporating multiple perspectives.
These pedagogies challenged Terzian & Yeager’s (2007) findings regarding the teaching of AP U.S. History to Cuban-American students, in which students did not reflect on or question the curriculum that was taught, and their views were often based on their teacher’s conceptions of U.S. history. Mr. Sharp and Mr. Garrett offered pedagogical experiences during which students could frequently challenge the dominant narrative and identify bias. Often these pedagogies were highly scaffolded, and focused on clear, guided practice for questioning the narrative.

For example, Mr. Sharp’s use of three concepts for every unit guided students in counter-narratives like “encounter” versus “discovery,” and promoted an understanding of what these concepts meant in relation to the larger Global History narrative. Mr. Sharp also took students’ prior understandings of Columbus into consideration, encouraging students to challenge what they already knew about Columbus, and “see” the historical narrative as constructed. Mr. Garrett used various images to teach about the “New World” or the European encounter with the Native Americans. Students de-constructed images using six elements of a story (see case four) to construct an understanding of the historical narrative and challenge the narrative students might have previously learned.

Analyzing teachers’ conceptions and implementations of social studies pedagogy across the four cases reveals pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections. The four social studies teachers emphasized the importance of culture and communication for all their newcomers by connecting historical content to human experiences and students’ prior knowledge. To make this connection, the teachers implemented group work and incorporated multiple perspectives while constructing an understanding of historical content. These pedagogical elements support active and engaged citizenship by working with diverse cultural, linguistic, ethic, and racial groups on tasks that involve multiple perspectives regarding the historical narrative.
The four teachers supported Epstein’s (2009) description of teaching history from the “participatory democratic perspective,” or forefronting the experiences of people of color, women, and others who have been marginalized from the traditional historical narrative. She explains this framework of teaching history locates and discusses how these marginalized experiences show multifaceted social issues, as well as the incredible knowledge possessed and action taken to combat and solve these issues (p. 14). Sharing these perspectives, experiences, and actions offers students historical perspectives and experiences to connect with and relate to, and examples of how to enact change in their lives and the lives of others in their multiple communities of belonging.

**Pedagogy of Building a Language of Social Studies**

The four teachers conceptualized building a “language of social studies” (Mr. Garrett) for newcomer youth that braids together students’ cultural, linguistic, and citizenship experiences while developing students’ academic language proficiencies (Cummins, 2008) and interdisciplinary social studies content knowledge (NCSS, 2010). Teachers emphasized that developing students’ English language proficiencies through social studies content required an understanding of newcomer youths’ contexts, needs, and interests (Szpara & Ahmad, 2007). Through frequent one-on-one conferences, class discussions, and multiple assessments of student work, teachers were able to better understand their students’ current linguistic proficiencies. They created classroom environments in which various techniques, such as scaffolding and modeling, were used to support the language demands of the social studies, and helped to further build upon newcomers’ social studies knowledge and skills (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Teachers across the four case studies conceptualized and implemented their social studies pedagogy toward building a language of social studies by: using bilingual practices; acquiring English
using multiple texts, content, and vocabulary; identifying linguistic demands of classroom tasks; and developing literacy skills.

Two teachers, Mr. Burgos and Mr. Sharp, frequently implemented bilingual practices in Spanish and English in their social studies pedagogy. They conceptualized English language learning in the social studies as the use of students’ cultural and linguistic knowledge and proficiencies (Lee, 2010), by translating, speaking, and interacting in English and Spanish (and in Mr. Sharp’s class French and Bengali as well) for their newcomer students. For example, Mr. Burgos spoke in both Spanish and English, and enacted “translanguaging” (Bartlett & García, 2011; García, Flores, & Chu, 2011) pedagogy in class discussions and instructions. Furthermore, he also used a translation process of Spanish to English in most classroom tasks to support his conception that that, “Spanish gets them the information, and English is for them to aspire to.” Mr. Burgos supported a sociolinguistically conscious pedagogy by using students’ linguistic experiences, working with students to build a confidence in speaking both languages in an academic environment, and expanded the linguistically responsive teaching framework (Lucas & Villegas, 2010) by incorporating translanguaging pedagogy in the social studies classroom.

Across the cases, teachers supported their newcomer students’ acquisition of English by using multiple texts to facilitate content instruction and dissect vocabulary terms and concepts. Similar to findings in Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman’s (2006) study on using children’s literature to access students’ prior knowledge and develop an environment for historical inquiry, Mr. Garrett desired that students “story” history by using images and multiple texts in his pedagogy. Salinas, Fránquiz, & Guberman (2006) also emphasized pointing out key vocabulary to promote English language learning by using pictorial visuals and graphic organizers to
understand and make sense of the historical content, which all the teachers in this study also implemented.

Specifically, Mr. Garrett used images, graphic organizers, a word wall, and vocabulary quizzes to contextualize the U.S. History content and encourage students to fully understand concepts in the social studies. Mr. Garrett hoped that vocabulary understanding would build the “same language” that would then transfer to conversations with others—either verbally or through writing—and develop skills needed to be an “educated citizen.” Mr. Garrett explained that being an “educated citizen” promoted active and engaged citizenship, and was fostered with knowledge of the common vocabulary used to understand the “structure of the [U.S. government] system” and how to “make the changes you want to see” to these structures. He hoped that students would take the vocabulary and critical thinking skills they learned in his class to further inquire about “What is going on in the world.” The ultimate goal of vocabulary and language instruction across the four cases was to help their newcomer students develop the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in conversations, critiques, and action-taking involving issues of individual and/or communal concern (Jensen & Flanagan, 2008). These pedagogies worked to support a growing civic identity (Rubin, 2007) that is founded upon newcomer youths’ current contexts and experiences in society (Jensen, 2008).

Identifying linguistic demands of classroom tasks is a key principle of the linguistically responsive teaching framework. This principle included explicitly identifying and teaching linguistic tasks needed for classroom activities and promoting language, content, and skill development for ELLs. These elements were observed in Mr. Sharp and Ms. Sanford’s enacted social studies pedagogy. Identifying language demands of the enacted social studies curriculum was seen through explicit English language instruction in classroom activities, which promoted
language development by teaching historical content and literacy skills (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). In both Mr. Sharp and Ms. Sanford’s schools, time was set aside once a week to have “language day” during which the focus was more on English language instruction than content learning. While these days looked different in each school, they both sought to support newcomers’ English language learning.

Mr. Sharp was the only certified TESOL teacher in this study, and therefore had explicit language objectives for his social studies class. Throughout his classroom instruction, students were always focused on English language acquisition, which was facilitated through the Global History curriculum. For example, Mr. Sharp’s use of a Language Experience Approach (LEA) sought to have students understand the overall concepts used in a unit (usually consisting of three concepts: i.e. Unit 2 concepts: encounter, colony, and motive) by experiencing the concept first, then writing a collective definition as a class. Ms. Sanford similarly identified and implemented specific language objectives in her class; however, her students were 11th grade newcomers and she considered this year a “bridge” year for her students who were making the leap from 9th/10th grade to 12th grade and preparing for college.

Ms. Sanford centered her social studies pedagogy on developing students’ literacy skills, while also developing historical inquiry skills and an understanding of early U.S. History in her social studies pedagogy for newcomer students. Ms. Sanford discussed wanting to “work literacy into” her social studies pedagogy, as she felt very strongly about teaching English language skills through the content area. The teaching about and for English language development also related to an emerging understanding of a “language of social studies,” or what she described as supporting her students’ desire for historical inquiry and developing an opinion around the “controversies” of history. She stressed her desire for newcomer students to “grab those
controversies” by writing, “building vocabulary” and “giving phrases for things.” She often gave students prompts for writing, speaking, and interacting to help facilitate English and content learning.

Additionally, Ms. Sanford had students read and write often and in multiple forms. As seen in the lesson vignette in case one, she supported students by using a read aloud to see, hear, and experience a primary source document, the Declaration of Independence, as she felt it was important for her newcomer students to “see the actual document.” Similarly to the writing activities of Mr. Sharp, Mr. Burgos, and Mr. Garrett’s classrooms, Ms. Sanford wanted her newcomer students to write formally in essays or letters, and informally in pre-writing activities and journal writing. These writing practices encouraged all four teachers to learn more about their students’ linguistic backgrounds and experiences, as well as develop their academic language proficiencies (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). These enacted pedagogies contributed to an emerging concept of a “language of social studies” for newcomer youth.

Teachers in this study fostered a pedagogy of building a language of social studies by: using bilingual practices; acquiring English using multiple texts, content, and vocabulary; identifying linguistic demands of classroom tasks; and developing literacy skills. They embraced a social studies pedagogy that included learning and engaging with difficult social studies terms, concepts, and written texts. The four teachers expanded Salinas, Fránquiz, & Reidel’s (2008) argument that a world geography curriculum was a useful model for teachers of late-arrival immigrant youth, because it offered more visual representations and physical models for newcomers. Teachers across the cases scaffolded and modified texts instead of simplifying them, to amplify the learning of terms and concepts. They wanted to provide newcomers with entire
documents and texts, rather than simplified sections or re-written documents. Engagement with the full written text provided the contextual information for their newcomer students, and fostered reading and writing in academic forms of English. These were critical skills for passing the statewide Regents exam, successful college experiences, and fostering skills for active and engaged citizenship.

**Pedagogy of Community-based, Participatory Citizenship**

Across the four cases, teachers conceptualized and implemented pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship for their Latino/a newcomer students. Although all four teachers in this study considered active and engaged citizenship for their newcomer students as founded upon local and community-based experiences, how they conceptualized and implemented this pedagogy varied. Teachers’ perceptions of what a community looked like, how to create awareness of community issues, and what encompassed participatory action, were located on a continuum.

On one side of the continuum was a very local conception of community, the classroom. And on the other side of the continuum were national and global notions of community. In between were communities based on students’ cultural groups, neighborhoods, and families. Across the continuum, how teachers implemented their citizenship ideas and actions for Latino/a newcomer youth also varied based on the following factors: how they accessed and built on students’ civic knowledge and experiences in the social studies classroom; what they did to implement classroom pedagogical experiences to foster this civic knowledge; and what they hoped students would do with the civic skills they already possessed. Simply put, the key attributes of the teachers’ pedagogy of community-base, participatory citizenship included: identifying and belonging as essential elements; channeling civic and political motivations
through an understanding of local and community-based issues; building on civic knowledge and skills for democratic participation; and promoting and enacting civic engagement in various forms. Within these four attributes are five elements that summarize the enactment of this pedagogy and show the overlapping and intersecting qualities of each theoretical framework emerging from the grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. These elements include identity, belonging, motivation, participation, and engagement.

Teachers believed students should feel connected to the classroom space, one another, and local community to foster identifying and belonging as essential elements for active and engaged citizenship. Identifying and belonging to a community space fostered a sense of membership. Space, as argued by Gottdiener, in this sense does not necessarily designate an actual physical place, but encompasses “socio-material concerns” including a “piece of real estate” or “an existential freedom and a mental expression” (as cited in Flores & Benmayor, 1997, p. 15). These feelings of belonging to a community space are “essential to survival” for Latino/as, and promote a collective identity (Flores & Benmayor, 1997, p. 16). Collective identity, membership, and belonging all support civic and political participation, and are essential factors of cultural citizenship for Latinos (Flores & Benmayor, 1997).

Teachers across the social studies classrooms in this study fostered various elements of cultural citizenship in their implemented pedagogy. In Mr. Sharp’s class, cultivating a sense of place, belonging, and collective identity was implemented at a very local level. For Mr. Sharp, citizenship involved “a close-knit community, like school or the classroom […] small-citizenship of those small-communities that they’ll be in, in- their work place, their neighborhood, other classes.” He argued it was important to provide the space for students to
bond and feel connected to the classroom community before they would “respond positively to being pushed.” Elements of his community included professionalism, the creation of a safe space, and a feeling of community. By viewing citizenship at a very local, “small” community level, Mr. Sharp believed his students could thrive, feel confident, and grow in his classroom, if given the time and space. For his newcomer students, this space needed to be fostered from the beginning of the year, through conscious pedagogical decision-making, including establishing a community of learners, exercising student voice, and developing guided inquiry questions to navigate learning Global History content. Through his implemented pedagogy, Mr. Sharp hoped to foster actions like working with other people, being on time, and respecting others. His pedagogy was aimed at helping his small/classroom-based citizens develop transferable skills for use in the larger society.

Teachers believed students could thrive, feel confident, and grow together in the classroom by channeling civic and political motivations through an understanding of local and community-based issues and grappling with how to take action on these issues. Across each case, social studies teachers for Latino/a newcomer youth supported Jensen’s (2008) findings that immigrants’ civic engagement is found mostly as the community level due to motivations from youths’ “cultural identity” and the welfare of their “cultural communities” (p. 70). For example, Mr. Burgos and Mr. Garrett reflected on conceptualizing social studies as “civic engagement” and “becoming advocates for their families and communities,” respectively. Mr. Burgos conceptualized building his Latino/a newcomer students’ civic engagement through “community understanding and involvement.” He wanted his students to be “aware of what is going on around you” whether in their neighborhoods, schools, or cultural groups. Community, for Mr. Burgos, also involved the classroom, similar to Mr. Sharp, but included one’s school, identities,
and surrounding communities as well. In discussing students’ awareness of issues in their communities, he hoped students would want to “be involved in your community” and motivated to be “aware of the problems,” “address the issue,” and “trying to help out.” By developing individual and collective relationships with his students in the classroom and outside of school, Mr. Burgos showed a desire to work on these issues together, as a group, by discussing the “problems we encounter […] just try to make things better,” and supporting and developing a critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1994) for his Latino/a newcomers. Awareness of issues was civic engagement for Mr. Burgos, and generating awareness in his classroom was enacted through small and large group discussions based on his students’ inquires and interests in the Global History content.

Additionally, teachers believed that building on civic knowledge and skills for democratic participation (CIRCLE, 2003) was an essential attribute of developing pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship. Across the four cases, teachers noted that students already possessed civic knowledge and skills, such as helping their families, desiring to discuss their ideas, and an awareness of various issues going on around them. All four teachers wanted to build on these civic assets. For example, Ms. Sanford offered her newcomer students the space, through her curriculum, to think further about “what does it means to be an American?” This was an essential question for her class, and she frequently referred back to it throughout the year through informal writing exercises and discussions. Implementing bi-monthly journal writing, Ms. Sanford was able to have one-on-one conversations with students to see how their perceptions of the essential question changed throughout the year depending on their experiences with the content, in class, in school, and in the broader U.S. Ms. Sanford hoped frequent writing conversations would tap into students’ conceptions of citizenship, fluid and shifting identities,
sense of belonging, and how these conceptions affected their understandings of participatory
citizenship (Flores & Benmayor, 1997; Haste & Hogan, 2008).

Ms. Sanford, like Mr. Garrett, encouraged students to rethink what an “American” is and was through the U.S. History curriculum, and what participation in U.S. society looked like through multiple perspectives and narratives. In Ms. Sanford and Mr. Garrett’s classrooms, students were encouraged to view community-based participatory notions of citizenship on the national level. Ms. Sanford felt using a “basic sense of history” would give students “opinions about what is happening” in current events and help them relate their knowledge of U.S. History to what “people do in a democracy” and the participatory actions (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) they have taken. By requiring her newcomer students to provide evidence when speaking, engage in active listening, and participate in discussions within cross-cultural groups, Ms. Sanford supported various skills and literacies of active and engaged participatory citizenship for her newcomer students.

Furthermore, all four teachers promoted an active civic engagement in various forms. For example, Mr. Burgos felt awareness was a stepping-stone to realizing and identifying oneself as a citizen, and a form of action and engagement towards improving one’s community. Mr. Sharp saw “language as a political act,” and emphasized the importance of using language to interact and “make decisions that affect [students]” both locally and nationally, supporting a sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Ms. Sanford articulated civic engagement as participation in rethinking what it means to be an American, and engaging in actions to support a healthy democracy (CIRCLE, 2003). Similarly, Mr. Garrett’s pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship was conceptualized on the continuum of community at both the national and local levels by participating as a citizen who “advocates for their
families.” Mr. Garrett felt that becoming an “educated citizen,” meant knowing the political process and structures of the U.S. government system. Mr. Garrett wanted his students to take what they had learned in his U.S. History class and support family and friends taking the U.S. citizenship exam, campaign for candidates who advocated for their rights and interests, and become involved in community organizations that made a difference in their communities (Rosaldo & Flores, 1997).

Teachers reflected on youths’ multiple allegiances and participation in their communities and societies based on their various axes of identity, i.e. racial, ethnic, cultural, or linguistic (Ladson-Billings, 2004). They conceptualized and implemented a pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship that focused on students’ multiple and fluid identities, sense of belonging, motivation, participation, and engagement in U.S. civic society. All four teachers sought to support students’ active and engaged citizenship by enacting a Global and U.S. History curriculum that supported Salinas’ argument for an immigrant curriculum that “can offer participatory and inclusive approach to citizenship education while providing for a multicultural history that promotes opportunities for historical reasoning and thinking” (Salinas, 2006, p. 23).

Accessing, hearing, and incorporating newcomers’ voices, perspectives, and experiences in the social studies curriculum are critical to fostering an active and engaged citizenry. This may be accomplished by building newcomers’ confidence to speak and engage in inter/cross-cultural discussions in a safe, trusting, and respectful community of learners. Pedagogy of community-
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based, participatory citizenship includes: identifying and belonging as essential elements; building on civic knowledge and skills for democratic participation; channeling civic and political motivations through understanding local and community-based issues; and promoting and enacting civic engagement in various forms. By enacting this pedagogy, social studies teachers in this study worked toward re-conceptualizing citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer youth.

Section Summary

In this section, I presented cross-case themes to develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. The cross-case themes and principles of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education analyzed and described in this section included: pedagogy of community, pedagogy of success, pedagogy of making cross-cultural connections, pedagogy of building a language of social studies, and pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship. I discussed each principle, focusing on how the four teachers in this study conceptualized and implemented their pedagogy of teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer students. I also examined the intersections of each theoretical framework (culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship), in addition to prior research on teaching and learning social studies for immigrant youth, in order to develop the emerging grounded theory. In the next section, I will discuss potential implications for this dissertation study on research, teaching, and teacher education, followed by suggestions for future research and a conclusion of the dissertation.

Implications

In this section, I discuss the potential implications of this dissertation study for research, teaching, and teacher education. I present the implications by answering the final subsidiary
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question: what are implications of the teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth with regards to social studies education? I reflect on the findings from each case study that examined how four secondary teachers conceptualized and implemented social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth. I also consider the emerging grounded theory in discussing the possible implications for this study. I conclude with a summary of the section on implications.

Research

This study has the potential to add to and expand on the discourse regarding social studies pedagogy for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011), newcomer schools (Short & Boyson, 2000), English Language Learners (Cruz & Thornton, 2009), and citizenship education for newcomer youth (Salinas, 2006). By analyzing how teachers in four newcomer schools conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer students, this study informs the literature on teaching and learning in culturally and linguistically diverse school settings. Culturally and linguistically diverse youth have an incredible wealth of knowledge and experience, and this study also informs the research on how to tap into these “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) by drawing upon students multiple assets in classroom pedagogies. Examining what these pedagogies looked like in a newcomer school environment also informs the research on teaching and learning for newcomer youth.

Newcomer schools (Short & Boyson, 2000) are unique social, cultural, and linguistic schooling environments. They provide educational opportunities that are focused on meeting the cultural, linguistic, academic, and community needs of newcomer youth (Bartlett & García, 2011). This study provided an overview of the organization and goals of four different newcomer schools and how their missions potentially influenced teachers’ curricular and pedagogical
enactments. Furthermore, the newcomer schools in this study provided a safe and welcoming environment for new arrival immigrants, and offered a unique context to examine how teachers helped students acquire English language skills through social studies instruction. These findings also bridge the gap between what we know about social studies curriculum and pedagogy for immigrant students and how teachers conceptualize this pedagogy in a newcomer school environment. Therefore, the findings inform a consideration of teaching English Language Learners in the social studies, with a focus on citizenship education for newcomer youth.

This study has potential implications for teaching English Language Learners in the social studies classroom (Cruz & Thornton, 2009). Findings across the four cases show how teachers implemented their curriculum and pedagogy for ELLs, focusing on literacy skills development and building communicative and academic English language proficiencies. For example, teachers used various social studies pedagogical strategies that incorporated writing, reading, experiential learning, speaking, and multiple text analysis. These findings expand the literature on linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), as the findings focused specifically on social studies and the orientations/knowledge and skills possessed by teachers in four different high schools. Specifically, Mr. Sharp and Mr. Burgos incorporated pedagogical strategies that supported newcomers’ “language acquisition as a social process” (Bartlett & García, 2011, p. 15) for example, implementing translanguaging, the language experience approach, and using peers as translators. In examining both Global and U.S. History curricula, the findings also offer numerous ways to think about curricular implementation for English Language Learners in the content areas.

Lastly, this study further expands the literature on culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship (CIRCLE, 2003; Flores &
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Benmayor, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings 2004; Lucas & Villegas, 2010) in developing an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. By examining teachers’ conceptualizations and implementations of social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth, these findings seek to re-conceptualize citizenship education for immigrant students by focusing on students’ cultural, linguistic, and civic assets in the enacted curriculum. The study’s emerging grounded theory informs the fostering of newcomer students’ participation in U.S. democratic society as situated in their local, community-based civic experiences (Rubin, 2007). Furthermore, the study’s findings support and expand elements of cultural citizenship for Latino/as (Flores & Benmayor, 1997) by examining how these elements are conceptualized and implemented in social studies classrooms with newcomer Latino/a youth. For example showing how teachers promoted: a sense of belonging to cultural and/or experiential groups; an awareness of issues facing one’s cultural group; recognizing a nuanced sense of identity and belonging; fostering a community of caring, trust, and respect; and supporting civic skills including translating, communicating, inquiring, and questioning (Benmayor, 2002; Jensen; 2008; Rosaldo, 1997; Silvestrini, 1997).

Teaching

Findings in this dissertation study have the potential to inform how teachers conceptualize and implement curriculum and instruction that engages: culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and citizenship education; teaching English Language Learners in the social studies; and re-conceptualizing citizenship education for newcomer youth. The pedagogies implemented by teachers in this study offer examples for teachers who are either experiencing new and exciting demographic shifts in their classroom, or those who already have culturally and linguistically diverse students in their classrooms.
Teachers in this study implemented social studies pedagogy by using students’ cultural, linguistic, and citizenship knowledge in various ways, and therefore the study has the potential to inform the practice of teachers who are interested in building off students’ multiple assets (Knight, 2011; Yosso, 2005) in their classrooms.

Teachers enacted a social studies pedagogy that focused on history as inquiry, controversy, based on everyday experiences, civic engagement, and the development of an educated citizenry for their English Language Learners. Although there were multiple conceptions of social studies articulated by teachers in this study, practitioners can use these findings to analyze which teacher they might identify with, and make connections with their pedagogical practices and student contexts. The implemented pedagogies in this dissertation study give teachers multiple ideas and actions to create a curriculum for culturally and linguistically diverse students, ELLs, and newcomers. Teachers might consider choosing elements that fit their specific needs, interest, and contexts. For example, all the teachers in this study enacted social studies pedagogy focused on developing literacy skills and English language proficiencies through the social studies content, which has the potential to inform all youths’ literacy practice and development.

This study has the potential to inform the practices of teachers who wish to prepare their culturally and linguistically diverse students for active and engaged citizenship. The findings in this study inform how we might go about conceptualizing citizenship that reflects the civic identities, sense of belonging, motivations, participations, and engagements that are already present in youths’ lives. By examining the orientations and knowledge and skills of the social studies teachers in this study, practitioners can reflect on how they conceptualize citizenship and (re)consider how their understandings might incorporate students’ cultural backgrounds and
knowledge(s). For example, the case on Mr. Sharp provides clear examples of pedagogies for thinking about a “close-knit community” in the classroom, and how the actions associated with and enacted in his developing classroom community can be transferred into society at large.

**Teacher Education**

Findings across the cases in this study have the potential to inform the practice of pre-service teachers who are striving to include the voices and perspectives of all their students in the classroom, and considering how to conceptualize and implement culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. Furthermore, these findings also inform teacher educators by reflecting on the importance of teaching about issues in diversity, particularly concerning English Language Learners in the social studies curriculum. Lastly, teacher education programs should consider these findings as evidence for placing student teachers in schools and classrooms with a high population of newcomers and ELLs.

Pre-service teachers should critically examine the themes in this study to develop an understanding of how to employ the emerging pedagogies for culturally and linguistically diverse students. The examples used throughout this study give new teachers a sense and feeling of how to include the voices and perspectives of all their students in the social studies classroom. Furthermore, the social studies curricular designs and lesson vignettes offer practical ideas for how to implement curriculum and pedagogy for English Language Learners. Pre-service teachers, however, are encouraged to examine the case studies by looking across the findings to see how each teacher’s conceptualizations might align with their emerging teacher identities and philosophies for teaching social studies. Examining these case studies might be helpful, as it can be difficult for pre-service teachers to visualize how they might implement various theoretical frameworks discussed in teacher educator coursework. I hope the findings in this study
encourage pre-service students to consider what culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education is, what it looks like in the classroom, and perhaps practice some of the emerging principles in their field experiences.

Teacher educators and teacher education programs might consider the findings in this study useful, as they offer important implications for the need to discuss diversity issues in the social studies curriculum and consider how to teach ELLs in the social studies classroom. Teachers in this study think about and enact curriculum and pedagogy that support aspects of a multicultural education curriculum (Banks, 2008) by incorporating the perspectives of students’ in their implemented pedagogy, as well as incorporating historically marginalized narratives into the curriculum. For example, Mr. Sharp and Mr. Garrett’s enactment of the “encounter” narrative, which traditionally features the perspectives of Christopher Columbus and the European explorers, forefronts the experiences of the Native Americans. Using the findings in this study, teacher educators might consider using Banks’s curriculum transformation approach to critically examine the case studies offered in this dissertation study. Pre-service teachers could reflect on how the four teachers did or did not successful reach Banks’s levels 3 (the transformative approach) and/or 4 (the social action approach) in the curriculum transformation framework. For example, questions one might ask when examining the case studies using this framework include: [How] did the teacher challenge and/or change the “basic structure or canon of the curriculum?” [How] did the teacher encourage students to view “concepts, themes, and problems from different [or diverse ethnic and cultural] perspectives and points of view?” [How] does the teacher encourage students to “make decisions on important social issues and take actions to help solve them” (Banks, 2008, p. 46-47)?
Furthermore, consideration of the language development needs of ELLs, through bilingual practices and the teaching of English, can also be examined throughout the findings and are useful examples for teacher educators to use in their coursework on teaching ELLs in the content areas. Lastly, teacher education programs should consider placing student teachers in classrooms with a high concentration of newcomers and ELLs (perhaps in newcomer programs), and with experienced cooperating teachers (like the teachers in this study). Student teaching in social studies classrooms with a high population of ELLs, and with teachers who have a dedication and commitment to working with this population, is critical for developing the orientations and knowledge and skills for teaching newcomer youth.

Section Summary

In this section, I discussed the potential implications of this dissertation study for research, teaching, and teacher education by answering the question: what are implications of the teachers’ pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth with regards to social studies education? I reflected on the possible implications of the findings from each case study that examined how four teachers conceptualized and implemented social studies education for Latino/a newcomer students. I considered the potential for expanding the research on culturally and linguistically diverse populations, re-conceptualizing citizenship education for immigrant youth, teaching newcomers and ELLs in the social studies classroom, and incorporating the teachers’ orientations and knowledge and skills for newcomer youth in social studies teacher education coursework. The emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education, should be critically examined and refined with future research on teaching Latino/a newcomer students in the social studies classroom, and will be discussed in the following section.
Future Research

In this section, I discuss possibilities for extending the findings from this dissertation study in future research. Possibilities for future research can be categorized into three sections: (1) students’ perceptions; (2) teacher education; and (3) teachers in other grade levels and contexts. I will discuss these categories using guiding inquires for future research projects.

(1) How do newcomer students’ cultural and linguistic experiences influence their perceptions of social studies and conceptualizations of citizenship? Absent from this dissertation study is an understanding of how newcomers youths’ cultural and linguistic experiences influence their perceptions of social studies and conceptualizations of citizenship. Future research would benefit from examining how Latino/a immigrant youth experience, understand, and engage with the social studies pedagogy implemented in their classrooms. An exploration of how students engage with and/or challenge the emerging grounded theory in this study is critical for future research on social studies pedagogy for newcomer youth.

(2a) How do these findings illuminate possibilities for developing a more culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education program? Using the findings and emerging grounded theory from this study in teacher education coursework is critically important to transferring these pedagogical ideas and actions into future social studies classrooms. Future research might have pre-service teachers engage with the findings in this study by constructing an understanding of what these pedagogies and theories mean for their practice, and begin to implement these ideas in their student teaching placements. This future research project’s aim would be to work toward fostering a more culturally and linguistically responsive social studies teacher education program by constructing, reflecting, and connecting with the pedagogies that emerged across the cases in this study.
(2b) How do we create professional development opportunities for in-service teachers who are experiencing new and exciting demographic shifts in their classrooms? Future research might also benefit from an examination of professional development workshops for teachers desiring to foster culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education in their social studies classroom for immigrants, ELLs, and/or culturally and linguistically diverse students.

(3) How do elementary teachers and/or teachers in rural/suburban contexts conceptualize and implement their social studies pedagogy for immigrant youth? Future research would benefit from extending the findings of this study by examining how elementary school teachers, as well as social studies teachers in rural/suburban contexts, conceptualize and implement social studies education for Latino/a newcomer youth. Expanding on the emerging theory and pedagogies developed by secondary social studies teachers in this dissertation study to explore how elementary educators and rural/suburban social studies teachers engage with and/or challenge the principles of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education would critically examine and refine the emerging grounded theory.

Highlighting the particular integrated social studies experiences in elementary school, by examining teachers’ philosophies and enacted social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer children, is critical for further understanding of what culturally and linguistically relevant social studies education looks like for young learners. Also, research on the particular nature of the urban context in relation to the rural/suburban context, and how this might influence teachers’ orientations and knowledge and skills toward teaching social studies for immigrant youth, would make for an interesting and important expansion of this dissertation study.

Conclusion
This dissertation study examined how teachers in four newcomer schools conceptualized and implemented social studies pedagogy for active and engaged citizenship of Latino/a newcomer youth. The purpose of this multi-site, collective case study design was to show how four teachers used students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds in their social studies pedagogy, and worked toward harnessing the initial positive sentiments and energies expressed by most newcomers. I documented how social studies teachers (U.S. History and Global History) were teaching Latino/a newcomer youth within urban newcomer high schools through the research question: how do four secondary teachers conceptualize and implement social studies education for newcomer Latino/a youth? As evidenced in their culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy, teachers in this study provided constant support, encouragement, and opportunity for Latino/a newcomer students to succeed academically, and encouraged active civic participation by using students’ cultural, linguistic, and civic knowledge and experiences as central to their pedagogy.

The four teachers in this study encouraged an intellectual curiosity in their classrooms, fostered through group work, discussions, and inquiry-based pedagogies, about issues taking place in their local communities, nation, and world. Findings were analyzed within and across the case studies to develop an emerging grounded theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. This developing grounded theory analyzed the intersections of culturally relevant pedagogy, linguistically responsive teaching, and active and engaged citizenship. These intersections and cross-case analysis of the four teachers’ social studies pedagogy for newcomer Latino/a students developed five principles of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. These principles included: pedagogy of community, pedagogy of success, pedagogy
of making cross-cultural connections, pedagogy of building a language of social studies, and pedagogy of community-based, participatory citizenship.

This study has potential implications for research, teaching, and teacher education regarding how to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students in the social studies classroom. Possibilities for future research might include examining how Latino/a immigrant students’ cultural and linguistic experiences influence their perceptions of social studies and how they conceptualize citizenship. Furthermore, additional research might also explore how the findings in this study may be used to develop a more culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education program, create professional development opportunities for in-service teachers, and examine how elementary teachers and teachers in rural/suburban contexts conceptualize their social studies pedagogy for immigrant youth.
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NOTES

i Latino is a broad term referring to people from Latin America where Spanish is spoken (Rong & Preissle, 2009). The U.S. Census uses the terms, Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino, to refer to those who classify themselves as: “Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano,” “Puerto Rican,” or “Cuban.” Those who identify as “other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino” include people whose origins are from “Spain, the Spanish-speaking countries of Central or South America, the Dominican Republic or people identifying themselves generally as Spanish, Spanish-American, Hispanic, Latino, and so on” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Puerto Ricans are included in the U.S. Census Bureau’s definition of Hispanic or Latino, they are classified as migrant, native-born U.S. citizens wherein, “Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory through annexation in 1898, and its residents were allowed to become U.S. citizens through the passage of the Jones Act in 1917” (Rong & Preissle, 2009, p. 212). Therefore, Puerto Ricans will not be included in the analysis of newcomer Latino students. It is important to note that there is not only much diversity within the Latino community in the United States and specifically New York City, but also diversity within different countries of origin. For example, Dominicans in New York City might have very different experiences due to their communities of belonging and length of time in the New York City and the United States.

ii “Newcomers,” also defined as newly arrived immigrants in the literature, are born in their native country, and have arrived in the United States within the last 5 years (Suárez-Orozco, Pimentel, & Martin, 2009).

iii The National Council for the Social Studies (1994) states that, “The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (p. vii). These goals, which have been argued over the course of one hundred years, are delivered by the curriculum or course work, whose aims and objectives are decided prior to entering the classroom (Tyler, 1949).

iv For further information and definition of “active and engaged citizenship” see the Theoretical Framework.

v Ross (2006) contends that it is the teacher who enacts the goals of social studies education, whose “beliefs about social studies subject matter and student thinking in social studies as well as planning and instructional strategies, together create the enacted curriculum of a classroom--the day-to-day interactions among students, teacher, and subject matter” (p. 4). The enacted curriculum differs from the formal curriculum (curriculum state standards), such that the teacher is the “mediator” or “curriculum maker,” and the students’ contexts and experiences are the center of the curriculum making (Dewey, 1915). The enacted curriculum as it relates to teacher instruction and student understanding can also be referred to as pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). PCK is defined as “That special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding […] of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). Using these conceptions of curriculum and pedagogy, it is clear that the teacher is the curricular-instructional-gatekeeper (Thornton, 1991) and pedagogical decision-maker in teaching social studies for Latino/a newcomer youth, and it is important to consider what influences their pedagogical decision-making and enacted social studies curriculum.

vi English Language Learners are defined as, “any student in an American school setting whose native language is not English. Their English language ability lies anywhere on a continuum from knowing only a few words to being able to get by using everyday English” (Cruz & Thornton, 2009, p. 8). Due to shifting demographics, political English-only movements and No Child Left Behind (Erben, 2008), more ELLs are now entering mainstream (content-area) classes immediately when they arrive to the United States, instead of English-as-a-second-language (ESL) or bilingual classrooms (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), these are important contexts to consider.

vii All names are pseudonyms.
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## APPENDIX A: OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation #:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Time/Duration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td># of Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Topic:</td>
<td>Males/Females:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Sketch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Observation/Description</th>
<th>Comments/Reactions/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Teaching and Educational Background
- Tell me a little about yourself and your classroom.
  - What is your name?
  - Where are you from?
  - What class(es) do you teach?
  - How many students do you have? What grade or year are they?
  - What is the demographic make-up of your class? [country of origin, native language]
- Tell me a little bit about your background.
  - Where did you grow-up?
  - Where were you educated? Where did you attend high school, undergraduate school, graduate school?
  - What was your major/minor?
  - How long have you been teaching?
  - How long have you been at this school?
  - Why did you decide to come to this school?

Philosophical Foundations in Social Studies
- What do you think are the goals and purposes of the social studies? Why?
- What do you hope to accomplish in your classroom?
- What do you hope your students will take away from the unit/your class? Why?

Conceptualizing Social Studies for Latino/a Newcomers
- How do you conceptualize teaching social studies to Latino/a newcomer students?
- How do you conceptualize teaching U.S. History and/or World History to Latino/a newcomer students?
- Can you describe and/or characterize how Latino/a newcomers are as students, what characteristics can you think of- do Latino/a students bring to the classroom?

Implementing Social Studies for Latino/a Newcomers
- What have you done, if anything, in your social studies classroom that fosters the academic success of Latino/a newcomer youth?
- What pedagogical strategies do you implement specifically for Latino/a newcomer students? Are these similar or different than what you use with other students?
- [How] do you incorporate your students’ cultural backgrounds in the classroom? Linguistic backgrounds?
  - [How] does this relate, in your opinion, to your goals for the social studies?
- Can you tell me a little bit about any constraints, issues, or problems you have encountered when implementing the social studies curriculum?

Citizenship Education for Latino/a Newcomers
- How do you define citizenship?
- [How] do you conceptualize citizenship education for Latino/a newcomer youth?
APPENDIX C: “WHAT DO WE ALREADY KNOW/WANT TO KNOW ABOUT U.S. HISTORY?” ACTIVITY (MS. SANFORD)
APPENDIX D: AN INCONVENIENT TRUTH IMAGE (MR. SHARP)

By far the most terrifying film you will ever see.
APPENDIX E: ENGLISH PROFICIENCY LEVELS (MR. BURGOS)

How do I move up to the next level???

... PRACTICE MY ENGLISH!
APPENDIX F: POSTER EXAMPLE (MR. BURGOS)
APPENDIX G: WORD WALL (MR. GARRETT)