Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2019

Best Practices for Teaching Social Studies in the Secondary Dual-language Immersion Setting

Jonathan Mitchell
Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: https://spark.bethel.edu/etd

 Part of the Educational Methods Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, J. (2019). *Best Practices for Teaching Social Studies in the Secondary Dual-language Immersion Setting* [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/446

This Master's thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark.

BEST PRACTICES FOR TEACHING SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE SECONDARY DUAL-LANGUAGE IMMERSION SETTING

A MASTER'S THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY

JONATHAN MITCHELL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

JULY 2019

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BEST PRACTICES FOR TEACHING SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE SECONDARY DUAL-LANGUAGE IMMERSION SETTING

Jonathan Mitchell

July 2019

APPROVED

Thesis Advisor: Lisa M. Silmser, Ed. D.

Program Director: Molly Wickam, Ph. D.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my parents Andy and Joanie for their lifelong support of my interests and passions; to my teaching community that constantly challenges me to improve my craft; and to Dr. Silmser for her thoughtful advising throughout this process.

Abstract

Teaching Social Studies in the Dual-Language Immersion setting provides unique challenges and opportunities. This paper's introduction provides a brief explanation of the classifications, terminology and history of Dual Language Immersion programs in the United States and in Minnesota. The literature review is divided into five sections, each covering a significant challenge for secondary social studies teachers in the Dual Language Immersion program. The first section reviews best practices for teaching historical thinking skills in the immersion setting. Those best practices include implementing a specific framework for analyzing primary sources and content-obligatory and content-compatible vocabulary for each unit. The second section focuses on teaching oral communication; it finds a need for teachers to intentionally scaffold the teaching of historical genres, model academic discourse in the target language, and embed language-specific lessons within the content material. The third section addresses best practices for written communication, which entail both exposing students to advanced texts in the target language and intentional modeling of varied and differentiated grammatical structures that correlates to the social studies content. The fourth section discusses best practices for developing students' "inner voice" and "inner ear" in the target language by modeling the process and providing necessary vocabulary, grammatical structures and authentic practice opportunities. The fifth section identifies key areas of improvement for immersion teacher collaboration, professional development and training.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In the context of a rapidly globalizing world, the need for leaders who can communicate effectively in multiple languages is paramount. Many public schools in the Twin Cities have addressed this need with the implementation of educational programs to teach second languages. In particular, the proliferation of Dual-Language Immersion (DLI) programs over the past 20 years has demonstrated a commitment on behalf of many school districts to create bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate students.

Schools that implemented Spanish immersion programs in the early 2000s, including Roseville, Richfield, and Minnetonka, face difficult questions as their first group of immersion students have arrived at the high school. How can the need for rigorous academic coursework such as AP courses, offered only in English, be balanced with students' desires to continue developing Spanish? How can administrators find fluent educators who are also effective teachers in both English and Spanish? To what extent should grammar and mechanics be included in Immersion curriculum?

These are only some of the questions these schools have to grapple with. While further research is suggested on each of these topics, this paper will focus on one unique aspect of DLI programs: teaching social studies at the high school level.

Teaching social studies in Dual-Language Immersion (DLI) secondary programs provides unique challenges and opportunities. This paper seeks to explain the five most significant challenges faced by teachers in this role, and provide best practices and potential solutions for each of those challenges. Before doing so, this introductory

section will clarify the misleading classifications of immersion programs, review the history of immersion programs in Minnesota and the United States, and outline the benefits of immersion education.

What is a Dual-Language Immersion program?

It is important to set out some important definitions for a more nuanced understanding of dual-language programs, as programs vary greatly from school to school. Indeed, in the U.S. Department of Education's report on Dual Language Education Programs, the authors state, "Examining states' dual language programming and policies is challenging because states vary considerably in how they name their programs" (Boyle et al., 2015, p. 15).

In the Twin Cities, Spanish Dual-Language Immersion programs are commonly understood to be programs in which students who are both Native-Spanish and Native-English speakers attend elementary schools where the majority (between 50% and 100%, depending on the school and grade-level) of students' classes are conducted in Spanish. Then, upon arriving to middle- and high-school, students take the majority of their classes in English with some (between 1-3, typically) courses in Spanish.

However, this is not entirely consistent with the more widely understood meaning of "Dual Language" education. For instance, the Department of Education's 2015 report of Dual Language Programs suggests, "the field use the term "dual language" to refer to programs in which instruction is provided in two languages, with the goal of promoting proficiency in both" (Boyle et al., 2015, p. 15).

An important clarification follows in the report: “We suggest using the term “two-way” to describe dual language programs in which roughly equal numbers of students from two languages groups (e.g., English speakers and partner language speakers) participate, with the goal of both groups learning both languages. We suggest that the term “one-way” be used for programs in which predominantly one language group (e.g., language minority students, native English speakers, students with a family background or culture” (Boyle et al., 2015, p. 15).

Thus, there is indeed an important distinction between one-way and two-way immersion programs. One-way programs consist of students who all speak the same native language; thus, in these programs, the instructor is tasked with providing the majority of the second language (L2) instruction. Two-way programs consist of students who are native speakers of different languages and can thus learn the L2 from their peers in addition to the instructor (Call et al., 2018). However, the breakdown of students within two-way programs can vary greatly--often times there are 80% English speakers and 20% Spanish speakers, and vice versa.

Academic researchers agree with the government’s suggestions. Call et al. (2018) suggest that Two-Way Dual Language Immersion programs consist of school instruction and learning in two languages, while One-Way programs focus primarily on one language (Call et al., 2018), while there is some time allotted for English. The most common models are a 90/10 model, in which approximately 90% of the classroom discourse is conducted in the foreign language and 10% is in English, and a 50/50 model, where time is divided as evenly as possible between the two languages (Call et al., 2018,

p. 24). In the United States, as in Minnesota, programs typically start with more instruction time spent in the target language and progressively add more English instruction time in later years of the program (Call et al., 2018).

Immersion programs in the United States typically start in Kindergarten with the expectation that students will remain in the program throughout elementary school. In middle and high school, some courses continue to be taught in the immersion language, while others are purely taught in English (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008).

Throughout the country, as of December 2015, when the last national review of Dual Language programs was released, there were 35 states with Spanish/English immersion programs. The specific purpose of each immersion program varies largely depending on community demographics, target languages, administrational priorities, and myriad other factors. However, as Palmer points out, Dual language immersion programs' three paramount goals are to achieve: (a) bilingualism/biliteracy, (b) cross-cultural understanding, and (c) high academic achievement (Palmer, 2007).

In sum, it can quickly become confusing to understand immersion programs' classifications, as there are wide inconsistencies between the language used by the federal government, academic research, and individual schools. Further confounding this language are changing demographics and models employed by individual schools.

History of Dual Language Immersion programs

Bilingual education has existed in the United States since its early colonial history. 19th century examples of French-English schools in Louisiana, Spanish-English schools in Texas and New Mexico, and German-English schools in Wisconsin reflect the

linguistic diversity of those regions as well as their desire to balance English education with a language spoken by parents. However, at the same time, native languages were banned from schools in the interest of assimilation. In the early 20th century, Spanish was likewise banned from many schools in California and other states and communities with large Latin American populations.

In the 1960s, civil rights movements such as the Chicano Walkouts in East Los Angeles led to a push for both: (a) an effort to hire Spanish-speaking teachers and include more Spanish materials in schools with predominantly Latino students; and, (b) a push to improve English language education for English Learners (ELs). Dual Language Immersion schools emerged in major cities in the 1960s and 1970s as a response to both these demands. For example, "the Coral Way Bilingual Elementary School in Miami brought together Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students in a program that sought to help all students become bilingual (responding, in part, to parents of English-speaking students, including those of Cuban descent, who wished to give their children access to bilingual education)." (Boyle et al., 2015, p. 5).

In the 1980s, native-English families began to invest in Dual Language Immersion programs, seeing the benefits of learning a second language in an increasingly multilingual United States. Funding and initiatives at both local and state levels continued to foster Dual Language immersion programs in the 1990s, and with the clearly positive effects for both ELs and native-English speakers, they have continued to proliferate throughout the 21st century (Christian, 2011).

In regards to the positive effects for ELs, Alanís and Martinez find that Dual Language Immersion programs foster greater equity for EL students who are Native Spanish speakers for myriad reasons. First, they are not segregated in pullout groups or separate classes, as they may be in non-immersion schools; second, EL students have more cultural connection to the classroom materials as they are taught in students' native language; and third, because Dual Language programs foster student involvement, classroom discourse, and students' self-identity (Alanís & Martinez, 2008).

Further, in a study comparing different cohorts of students in which some students were in an immersion program and others were not, Steele et al. (2017) found that students who were enrolled in the immersion program performed better on reading in English, despite the target language of the program being Spanish. Moreover, the students enrolled in immersion programs were more likely to be exited from English Language status than the control group. Finally, while there was no evident improvement to math and science test scores for the immersion group, there was no apparent detriment either. Steele et al., recognize that the success of this immersion program may be difficult to replicate on a larger scale, but concludes that "promoting equitable access to [immersion] programs seems critical, not only to protect the integrity of two-way models, but also to ensure that academic benefits are fairly distributed within a community" (Steele et al., 2017, p. 303s).

Keeping with the national trend, Minnesota has seen a rapid increase in the number of schools and students enrolled in Dual Language immersion programs. In the Twin Cities alone, there were 19 member schools of the Minnesota Advocates for

Immersion Network for the 2018-19 school year, plus several non-affiliated and private immersion schools as well.

Research Questions

The overarching research question for this paper is: What are best practices for teaching social studies in the secondary immersion setting? Considering the large scope of this question, five accompanying questions guided the research. Each of these five questions is specific to the biggest challenges faced by social studies teachers in the secondary immersion setting: (1) What are best practices for teaching historical thinking skills?; (2) What are best practices for teaching oral communication?; (3) What are best practices for teaching written communications?; (4) What are best practices for developing students' "inner voice" and "inner ear"?; (5) What are best practices for teacher collaboration, professional development, and teacher education and training?

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature Search Procedures

This Literature Review was conducted primarily using the ERIC Academic Journal Search Database, EBSCO MegaFile, and the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition database. The parameters of the research time-period were from 1980 to 2019. Key words used in the search for relevant studies within the aforementioned databases included: "dual language immersion", "secondary social studies education", "primary source framework", "content and language integration", "best practices", and "secondary immersion programs".

The research reviewed includes work by leading professors in the education field, doctoral candidates, and education writers who have summarized academic research. While peer-reviewed journals and empirical studies were preferred, several literature reviews, academic framework proposals, and phenomenological studies have been included given their relevance to the subject matter.

This chapter is further divided into five sections. Each section covers a major challenge faced by secondary social studies teachers in the Spanish Dual-Language Immersion setting, and provides relevant studies that either explore those challenges or provide solutions to them. The first section will explore the challenge of creating authentic historical activities in Spanish that build students' historical thinking skills and their Spanish language abilities. The third section focuses on best practices for teaching oral communication within the history immersion classroom. The third section focuses on best practices for teaching written communication within the history immersion

classroom. The fourth section will explore the importance of developing immersion students' inner voice and inner ear and strategies for doing so. The fifth and final section focuses on how secondary immersion staff should collaborate to ensure consistent practices for immersion students.

Teaching Historical Thinking Skills in the Immersion Setting

One of the principal challenges for social studies immersion teachers is to teach historical thinking skills in the target language. Higher-level social studies courses such as AP or IB academic programs have no official resources in Spanish. Many social studies immersion teachers are left to either translate English assignments or start from scratch in creating fresh materials with little guidance or available resources. This section will further explore the unique challenge immersion teachers face in teaching historical thinking skills, and analyze two academic frameworks teachers can use to improve their teaching of historical thinking skills.

De Jong and Bearse (2012) analyze the organizational structure of schools in which immersion education is only a strand (typical of most secondary schools into which immersion elementary schools feed). Their study analyzed teacher interviews, student surveys, and focus groups to compare how well the administrative goals and expectations align to the immersion program. In their report, they describe the immense challenge facing DLI Social Studies teachers because the "lack of appropriately leveled materials that were aligned with the grade level curriculum made high-quality instruction challenging" (De Jong & Bearse, 2012, p. 25). Teachers are often left to translate the English source material themselves, or to import expensive textbooks from

Spain or Latin America that may not align with the appropriate standards in the USA. The authors argue that this challenge reflects the conflict that exists in many schools academic administrations and immersion programs in schools where not all students are enrolled in the immersion program.

Additionally, social studies courses are increasingly leaning away from single-author textbooks as the backbone of their courses, relying instead on a multiple-source approach that includes political cartoons, maps, photos, primary and secondary sources from multiple perspectives. Shanahan (2016) studies the effect that using a specific framework for historical analysis had on the social studies classes for just one 6-12 teacher. Shanahan discusses that students need to address historical questions by employing reading strategies such as sourcing, contextualizing, corroborating, and close reading. The expectation of memorizing historical facts has been replaced with the expectation that students evaluate the validity of different perspectives on historical issues, are able to make historical claims, and can support their historical claims with evidence from source (Shanahan, 2016). Achieving this level of depth requires many sources from many perspectives in Spanish that are not readily available.

Further, for teachers of U.S. History, the desire to analyze a text such as the "Declaration of Independence" translated to Spanish may lose some of its meaning and authenticity. In a paper reviewing challenges and opportunities for Social Studies teachers in the immersion environment, Rodriguez-Valls et al. (2017) observe, "the mythical initial sentence of the Gettysburg address 'Four scores and seven years ago', translated [to Spanish] in diverse sources as "Hace 87 años" or "Hace ocho décadas y

siete años", still does not match the powerful message of the original source and the cultural complexities attached" (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017, p. 6).

Indeed, a common linguistic challenge that arises in the social studies immersion class is the use of phrases that have a historical connotation in English that does not exist in Spanish. Rodriguez-Valls et al. (2017) note that a tier-two phrase such as checks and balances may sound devoid of meaning if simply translated into Spanish (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017). For other tier-two words such as "bias", there are myriad translations in different regions of the Spanish-speaking world that can lead to confusion on behalf of students.

To combat these issues, it is recommended that middle- and high-school administrations be strategic about which social studies courses to offer as a part of their immersion program. It is thus advised that courses such as U.S. Government and U.S. History be taught in English, as many of the concepts, vocabulary, and sources cannot be effectively translated without losing their authenticity and meaning. Meanwhile, courses such as Philosophy, World History, or Economics are a core component of social studies education in Spain and Latin America. Thus, not only is there a greater amount of high quality academic resources in Spanish that can be used by the immersion teacher, there are also far fewer tier two words or concepts that lack an adequate Spanish translation.

Ortega and Byrnes' 2008 book analyzes the long-term effects of language development, reviewing a wide variety of research on language acquisition and education. The review includes investigations including descriptive, qualitative, and

quantitative longitudinal methodologies. Although many of the findings of this book are immaterial to this paper, they conclude that social studies courses taught in a second language should explicitly connect language use to sociocultural context (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). They state it is imperative that the specific courses, texts, and activities offered in a second language program be carefully considered so that they align with the content itself.

Still, social studies teachers in the immersion setting still have a unique challenge of creating materials based on primary source analysis. For English social studies teachers, several education programs such as the Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) and Gilder-Lehrman institute of American History, offer a wealth of pre-selected primary source sets and accompanying lesson plans. While SHEG has begun to introduce some materials in Spanish, there is still a dearth of materials available. In the absence of ready-to-teach primary source lessons, there are two research-supported methods for teaching primary-source analysis that—while they do require additional planning, preparation, and possible translation on behalf of the teacher—are much more accessible to teachers in the immersion setting.

The first is a "Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking", as proposed by Drake and Brown. This approach involves the designation of three types of primary sources and extensive analysis of each. The three designations are: "the *essential* document (1st-order), *supporting and contrasting* documents (2nd-order), and documents *students find* (3rd-order)" (Drake & Brown, 2003, p. 478).

The 1st-order document should be a text source that the teacher considers the "epicenter" of the historical theme or topic being taught. Drake and Brown suggest "the teacher must lead a discussion of this 1st order document based upon a broad, open-ended question" (Drake & Brown, 2003, p. 467). Further, the 1st-order document must represent the heart of a historical issue or period, and must express a clearly argued position (a historical claim) that can be disputed or corroborated by other documents. Finally, the 1st-order document should be presented or edited to clearly present to students the necessary sourcing information, such as: *Who is the author? When was it written? Who was the intended audience?*

The 2nd-order documents, also selected by the teacher, must provide students an opportunity to corroborate or dispute the claim(s) made by the 1st-order document. Drake and Brown suggest that the 2nd-order documents should provide viewpoints from different geographical regions and ideological camps, but remain within the same historical period whenever possible. As with the 1st-order document, the 2nd-order documents should provide students' with clear sourcing information. This sourcing information should also provide students the opportunity to predict how the 2nd-order documents' point of view or bias may influence their likelihood to corroborate or dispute the claims made by the 1st-order document. Of course, these conditions are non-binding, as the authors recognize the apparent impossibility of finding perfect sources, and suggest that, in the absence of clear sourcing information, history teachers may probe students to infer that information based on the document itself.

The 3rd-order documents are to be discovered and sourced by the students themselves. These documents should serve as further grounds for discussion of the original claim made by the 1st-order document or provide a new outlook or claim for the same historical time period. Drake and Brown recommend that teachers heavily scaffold this work; the first time students undertake finding their own sources, the teacher should provide a list of potential databases to find the documents or perhaps even a list of the potential documents themselves (Drake & Brown, 2003). This eliminates the oft-overwhelming feeling students face when tasked with doing independent research.

Drake and Brown's systematic approach requires students to think critically and think like historians. Through the use of *Sourcing Heuristics, Contextualization Heuristics,* and *Corroboration Heuristics*—three series of questions that enables students to echo historical skills in their source analysis—teachers have a meaningful way to structure their historical discussions and explorations with students that can be repeated through different time periods and historical themes. Indeed, the authors also recognize that this approach works best when repeated several times throughout the school year—a minimum of twice per semester—as students build their historical skills.

There is no existing research on the application of Drake and Brown's method in the immersion setting. However, social studies teachers in the Spanish immersion setting should consider this approach for three reasons. First, the historical thinking skills and cognitive rigor demanded by this framework ensure students' further develop the aforementioned inner voice. Second, the *heuristics* questions can be repeated for each iteration of this document-analysis activity, meaning immersion teachers can

spend less time in the tedious writing and translating of unique questions for each document. Third, with appropriate selection of 1st- and 2nd-order sources, teachers have the opportunity to connect language use to historical or social context as previously recommended by Ortega and Bynes (2008). A limitation of this approach may be the student-selection of 3rd-order documents, given the limited databases and archives for primary sources available in Spanish.

The second framework necessary for effective teaching of history in the immersion setting comes from Marguerite Snow's 1989 paper, "A Conceptual Framework for the Integration of Language and Content in Second/Foreign Language Instruction." This paper lays the groundwork for the content-obligatory and content-compatible designations that have become extremely useful guides for teachers planning their history courses in the immersion setting.

Snow et al. (1989) define content-obligatory language as "language essential to an understanding of content material" and content-compatible language as "language that can be taught naturally within the context of a particular subject matter and that students require additional practice with" (Snow et al., 1989, p. 201). These definitions have remained the guiding language for the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. They expand upon these original definitions, explaining that content-obligatory language should be: "necessary to learn the key content concepts for the lesson/unit; more readily identifiable; directly supportive of the "big idea" or "essential understanding" [being taught]; essential to complete the lesson's content objectives; and, the "Meat and potatoes" or "bare bones"

language of the lesson." In contrast, content-compatible language should: "expand students' language learning beyond more academic forms and functions; provide an opportunity to sequence language instruction by reviewing previously introduced language and previewing language yet to come; provide 'extra language' or 'filler' to round out students' language development" (Fortune & Tedick, 2019, p. 1).

Snow et al. (1989) explain that history teachers in the immersion setting must be conscientious of the content-obligatory and content-compatible language that will be needed in a given unit, topic, or lesson, and provide clear opportunities for students to learn the terms before diving into more linguistically-demanding activities such as the aforementioned primary source analysis. They describe the need for this framework as history teachers in the immersion setting are, in reality, content *and* language teachers.

Further, while teachers may feel the need to focus more heavily on content-obligatory knowledge, later research has noted the need to put equal focus on content-compatible language as it is typically more transferrable across different social and academic settings (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012, p. 263).

Teaching Oral Communication

Both native and non-native Spanish speakers struggle with effective oral communication in the social studies context. This section will review best practices for teaching Oral Communication in the Immersion setting, including studies from the United States, Spain, and Australia.

While still lagging behind many of its European counterparts in the percentage of its population demonstrating multilingualism, Spain has seen its English proficiency

increase dramatically thanks to an investment in in English immersion education in its public education system in the past 20 years. However, many Spaniards remain concerned that the emphasis on early learning in English has hindered students abilities' to understand core subjects, science in particular. In this context, the Spanish academic community has focused greatly on how to improve their students' academic outcomes within the immersion environment.

One study particularity relevant to improving students' oral production in a second language for a given content is Llinares and Peña's (2015) analysis of the *genre approach* and its effect on students' oral production. Llinares and Peña analyze two schools in Spain using the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) model in which students take their history classes in the foreign language of English. The researchers aimed to identify the genre of questions teachers were asking students (recount, account, explanation and argument), and to measure the complexity of the students' responses in the foreign language.

To begin, it is important to understand the idea of historical genres, as it is foundational to this research. Llinares and Peña suggest that "In order for students to become literate in their school subjects, they need to learn about the different genres that characterize those subjects, as this is the only way in which they will be able to read and produce texts successfully in the different fields of knowledge" (Llinares & Peña, 2015, p. 18). In their work, historical genre is defined as the way in which a historical text is written and structured.

The researchers point to a logical and sequential progression of historical genres by difficulty. The first, and least grammatically complex, type of historical genre is non-chronological genres, in which the author explains the characteristics of a given place and/or time. The second are recording genres, composed of recounts and accounts. Recounts, either biographical, autobiographical, or historical, require the explanation of different events and trends through time. Accounts involve an explanation for why things have changed through time. The third are explanation genres, which are divorced from chronology and involve "either referring to the factors that contribute to a phenomenon (factorial) or to its consequences (consequential)" (Llinares & Peña, 2015, p. 19). Finally, arguing genres are the most complicated genres as they demand interpretations of historical figures or trends that require high cognitive and linguistic rigor. In sum, the 4 types of history genres (non-chronological, recording, explanation, and arguing) each increase in their cognitive and linguistic demands.

However, Llinares and Peña's research suggests that far too many teachers stay grounded in the two lowest-complexity history genres, non-chronological and recount. The researchers suggest that this hesitancy on behalf of teachers may be due to "CLIL teachers' perception of students not being prepared yet for complex genres" (Llinares & Peña, 2015, p. 27).

Additionally, Llinares and Peña tracked and analyzed the types of questions teachers asked students when given specific prompts rooted in different history genres. In other words, the researchers provided the teachers with specific prompts, ranging in difficulty from "(1) What are some characteristics of ancient civilizations?" to "(7) Do

you think Philip II was a good or a bad monarch?" Teachers then created their own specific questions to ask students in the aims of answering the provided prompt question.

The researchers classified teacher questions in five categories in order of complexity: facts, explanations, reasons, opinions, and mea-cognitive. Unsurprisingly, they found that teachers working with the lower genres asked a much higher percentage of fact-based questions. For example, when working within the period-study (Non-Chronological Genre), 83% of the teachers' questions were fact-based, such as "Q: Who lived around the roads of ancient civilizations? A: The rebels". By contrast, the most complex genre of Historical Argument elicited only 33% of fact-based questions, and 48% opinion-based responses.

The researchers suggest that the higher-genre prompt forced students and teachers alike to manage more difficult language, but not to the extent that they believe to be sufficiently rigorous given the grade level and students' cognitive capacities. They state, "All in all, questions for facts were clearly the most frequent ones, regardless of the types elicited by the different genres" (Llinares & Peña, 2015, p. 26).

Their results indicate the need for teachers to ask questions that trigger more complex grammatical responses better in line with the four genres, and for teachers to avoid "history as fact" presentations of material. Llinares and Peña's results also demonstrate that most of the CLIL history teachers' questions ask for facts, regardless of the genre elicited by the prompt. They find that teachers concentrate on a history as fact approach as it has a history within the secondary level in the Spanish curriculum, or

focus on cognitively and linguistically easier questions and responses for the students' sake. Both of these recommendations would lead to more complex oral responses by students, and thus are very applicable in a secondary social studies classroom in the Spanish immersion context as well (Llinares & Peña, 2015).

Another study that is particularity relevant is De Courcy and Mård-Miettinen's (2015) analysis of late-partial secondary immersion programs in Australia. The focus of the study was the extent to which immersion students felt successful in "output"—their own production of the foreign language—and what factors contributed to that success. De Courcy and Mård-Miettinen's study involved analysis of student interviews, classroom observations, and student questionnaires. The 79 students involved in the study were part of a late-partial secondary immersion program in which students take some of their classes in a foreign language; however, they did not come from primary immersion schools. This gives the study the unique advantage that students can compare their experience in a traditional language classroom to the immersion-based content classes.

After conducting student interviews, classroom observations, and student questionnaires, the researchers found that specific teacher strategies were very effective in improving student output. Students had overwhelmingly positive results in the late-immersion program when compared with their traditional foreign-language courses. The researchers also identified five pedagogic strategies that proved most useful for improving students' foreign language output in the study. The best practices were to, "(1) create a classroom and school context with clear expectations for second

language use; (2) acknowledge that neither rewards nor punishments affect behavior positively; (3) set language learning objectives; (4) develop non-academic vocabulary; (5) Organize classroom activities and provide opportunities that maximize students' second language output (use group and pair activities, develop an activity-centered classroom, plan for creative expression in the second language)" (De Courcy & Mård-Miettinen, 2015, p. 107).

Beyond these general best practices, De Courcy and Mard-Miettenen touch on a particularly controversial subject within language education: error correction. When students make errors in a foreign language, teachers are encouraged to correct the error either implicitly, by rephrasing what the student has said correctly moments later, or explicitly, by more directly pointing out the student's error and explaining why it is incorrect. Traditional thinking on the topic suggests that implicit error correction is preferred as explicit error correction can be embarrassing or psychologically damaging to the student and can lead to anxiety or discomfort when speaking in the future. To the contrary, De Courcy and Mard-Miettenen suggest that "at least in late immersion, the students seem to expect to be explicitly corrected in their language." This finding is corroborated in the work of Roy Lyster, who suggests that error correction does not have the effect of producing anxiety (Lyster, 2002).

A challenge that some social studies teachers in the immersion context confront is when, if at all, to use English. Some argue that teachers using English sends a signal to immersion students that using English is acceptable when a meaning cannot be communicated in Spanish, which in turn encourages them to abandon Spanish at

moments of difficulty. This, needless to say, can be crippling for oral language development. Others argue that English can be used appropriately to draw meaningful contrasts between the way certain English words are used compared with their Spanish counterparts in a way that helps students further their language understanding and, in turn, their oral output. However, in a critical literature review of high-level foreign language classes, Warford (2012) finds that American teachers are underutilizing the target language to the detriment of their students. He finds myriad reasons for this, including unclear standards from national language boards in the United States that suggest "Maximal" use of L2 without defining what "Maximal" actually means. In contrast, the Language Teaching standards in the United Kingdom call for "virtual exclusion" of English in the classroom, which has encouraged teachers to avoid classroom dialogue in students' native language (Warford, 2012).

Finally, an important element of oral production is the use of evaluative language. Evaluative language, in short, is students' ability to judge texts, phenomena, or ideas in positive or negative terms (Martin & White, 2005). In a longitudinal study that took place within a secondary English Immersion program in Spain, Morton and Lllinares (2018) tracked four students' speech over the course of four years. Their quantitative results showed that "three of the four students showed a sharp increase [in their frequency of use of evaluative language] from grade 7 to 9, but dropped in grade 10" (Morton & Lllinares, 2018, p. 505). Morton and Lllinares credit this increase to their development in the language, and posit that the drop in grade 10 was the result of a more abstract and difficult history course. Morton and Lllinares concede that the results

of this study should be treated cautiously due to the small sample size, but advise that immersion programs should "move away from an 'EFL' approach in which a grammatical syllabus is grafted onto the subject matter content, towards a much more integrated approach in which linguistic items are focused on for the functions they carry out in making meaning in ways appropriate to the discipline" (Morton & Llinares, 2018, p. 507).

Teaching Written Communication

Another important challenge facing social studies teacher in the Dual Language Immersion context is improving students' writing ability. There is a wealth of research about students for whom English is a second language that is relevant in improving this instruction.

Uysal (2007) examines the teaching of writing in a foreign target language (L2). She identifies several barriers and issues that currently inhibit students from advancing their writing skills in target language. First, the professional training for L2 writing is limited if it exists at all. Second, there is not coherent and comprehensive theory on best practices for teaching L2 writing. Third, most teachers tasked with teaching L2 writing were taught traditional writing methods when they themselves were students, and have little practical experience on which to base their teaching. Finally, many L2 writing teachers lack passion for writing and admit anxieties and disinterest in the writing process in both L2 and L1. This lack of passion translates to poor teaching (Uysal, 2007).

Uysal suggests a two-step approach to improve L2 writing instruction. First, she suggests that L2 writing teachers actually partake in authentic writing activities during

their professional teacher training, such as teacher-student conferencing, peer feedback, and applications of process-approach writing theory. Second, she proposes that L2 writing teachers focus on action research projects and reviews of teacher narratives to help them strengthen their grasp of writing instruction in the target language (Uysal, 2007).

Whittaker et al. (2011) provide another analysis of the CLIL courses developed in Spain. Their study analyzes two state secondary classrooms in Madrid, Spain, where students take 30% of their courses in English, the foreign language. Their research focuses on students' timed-written responses to prompts that were designed to assess students' cumulative knowledge at the end of a given unit. The two classrooms' responses were tracked over the course of a 4-year period to monitor changes and improvements in student writing and content in the foreign language. The written topics covered in each year were: Ancient Civilizations (year 1), Feudal Europe (2), Philip II and the Modern State (3), and the First World War (4).

Whittaker et al. (2011) tracked students' use of a wide variety of grammatical and language features, and showed development in those features over the four years. Specific attention was paid to students' use of phrases and words signaling the (a) presentation of a new person or time, (b) presumption of a previously mentioned thing, and (c) comparison between two or more things. Presentation was tracked by students' frequency of use of articles and indicators (such as *a, an, one, some/someone, etc.).* Presumption was tracked by students' frequency of use of Pronominal indicators (1st, 2nd, and 3rd person pronouns), and Nominal indicators (specific names or determined

groups such as *the soldiers, the empire).* Comparisons were tracked by frequency of mention of comparative words or expressions (previous, different, same, etc.) (Whittaker et al., 2011, p. 351). They also tracked student miscues, or grammatical mistakes, and other semantic features to track students' writing progress over the four-year period.

The results of the study show three interesting trends. First, "when CLIL students are given the opportunity to write short compositions on their subjects, they show that they are increasingly able to make choices in the foreign language that create more cohesive and coherent texts" (Whittaker, 2011, p. 358). The authors argue that this is in part due to extended and advanced exposure in the target language to cohesive and coherent texts. The second trend shows a general improvement in students' grammatical abilities, as demonstrated by a decreased reliance on pronouns and unmodified nouns in year 2 of the study and increased use of pre- and post-modified nominal groups in years 3 and 4. The authors note that these students' grammatical development in their second language was comparable with a study showing the grammatical development of students in their native language. The third notable trend is that students' writing abilities, especially the ability to write abstractions, continued to lag behind their grade level peers who were taking the course in their native language. The authors suggest that with a stronger emphasis in the CLIL courses on textual coherence or nominal group building, this gap could be lessened. Finally, the authors credit the teachers in the study for having provided students ample

opportunities to orally practice the content, language, and skills demanded for the written prompts in the days preceding the exam.

In a phenomenological study of three different immersion teacher's lived-experiences, Cammarrata and Tedick (2012) provide suggestions to address the unique challenges that immersion teachers face in teaching their students how to communicate in writing.

First, they refute the common misconception held by many in the immersion community that, if teachers are using language correctly as a means to deliver content, students will learn the grammatical and vocabulary skills by osmosis. They point to a need on behalf of stakeholders in the immersion community to abandon the misguided assumption that, "when language is used as the vehicle to teach content, children learn the content and they acquire language without a particular focus on language itself" (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012, p. 262). To the contrary, they suggest that "optimal language learning in immersion requires careful attention to form within the meaning-driven context of specific content instruction" (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012, p. 262). Thus, in the discipline of writing, immersion teachers need to provide extra lessons or pair closely with their Language Arts colleagues to ensure that the language goals are adequately covered.

Second, they implore schools employing immersion programs to "better support teachers in developing language-specific objectives for their daily classroom practice" that be included in the teachers' evaluation rubrics (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012, p. 263). Additionally, they state, "a language scope and sequence connected to content

outcomes, as well as clear and high-challenge language benchmarks and well-developed assessments, are also critically needed" (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012, p. 263). In the current framework, practically no such supports exist, incentivizing many teachers to focus solely on content knowledge to the detriment of their students' writing development.

Third, they suggest the need for immersion teachers to develop their students' language and writing skills by applying an "hourglass" model. In this model, the top of the hourglass represents *learning through language:* emphasizing meaning and knowledge construct. As it narrows, the teacher shifts the focus to language details such as spelling, grammatical foci, text structures, or the aforementioned history genres. It is essential that this portion of teaching be relevant and meaningful for students in the context of the history being learned, and not merely a side lesson on grammar. Finally, as the hourglass widens to the hole, students apply their understanding in written form through meaning and knowledge (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012).

Instead of grammar, Morton (2015) focuses on the explicit vocabulary instruction and its effect on students' communication skills in the immersion setting. Data from this study comes from 4 experienced content teachers in English-immersion high schools in Spain's CLIL program. The observed courses were 50-minutes long, included history, geography, biology, and technology content, and ranged from 6-9th grade students. Classes were video recorded, written as transcripts, and then edited to analyze 100 examples of specific "focus on form" vocabulary instructions. Morton describes "Focus on Form" (*FonF*) as "brief attention, either planned or incidental, to

problematic language items within a larger communicative context" (Morton, 2015, p. 257).

Morton finds ample evidence that *FonF* instruction breaks provided students with enhanced opportunities to understand and express the course content, regardless of the course material. Many teachers used the whiteboard to highlight unfamiliar vocab and provide necessary explanations to clarify meaning. However, the research found that overwhelmingly, the vocabulary explanations came up organically in class as opposed to being anticipated and pre-planned by the teachers, thus leading to students deriving only one understanding of a word in a very content-specific context. Morton suggests teachers incorporate lexical *FonF* explanations into content lessons in a seamless way that builds their understanding of key vocab in multiple contexts (Morton, 2015).

Finally, in an essay outlining best practices for second-Language teachers, Tarone (2012) notes the importance of training Language teachers to analyze their students' language usage, to note the differences between non-native and native speakers, and to modify and differentiate their instruction based on the needs of the individual students. She also describes the need to strongly avoid a textbook-based approach to teaching, as it ignores the different language development needs of students in the interest of simplicity (Tarone, 2012).

Developing Students' Inner Voice and Inner Ear

One of the biggest challenges for teaching history in the secondary immersion setting is developing students' "inner voice" and "inner ear" in the second language (L2).

Many second language learners may be familiar with the concept of an inner voice as the narrator of one's thoughts. Indeed, for many second language learners, the moment in which they begin to think in the second language is seen as a watershed moment.

For the purposes of this section, we will use the definition of inner voice as developed by Tomlinson in his seminal work, *Talking to yourself: The role of the inner voice in language learning.* Tomlinson defines the inner voice as the "silent," "private," or "inner speech" that occurs in one's head. He states that it is important to develop as it grants learners the ability to visualize the world mentally, initiate ideas, plan and problem solve through the voice of the target language (Tomlinson, 2000).

While many teachers may mistakenly believe that the development of an L2 inner voice comes naturally for students who are exposed to a second language enough, there are several studies that highlight the importance of pedagogical strategies in developing students' inner voices, and the reasons for doing so. This section will analyze three of those studies. Although these studies were not performed in the social studies secondary classroom, the findings are nonetheless particularity relevant in that domain.

In their study, *Enhancing Academic Language Proficiency in a Fifth-Grade Spanish Immersion Classroom*, researchers Cohen and Gomez (2004) provide the first analysis of the development of students' "inner voice" in the target language of an immersion program. To start, Cohen and Gomez note that the lack of an inner voice for students in their second language inhibits their ability to perform math, science, and history tasks. Specifically, they note that "if students lacked the ability to think about the particular problem in academic terms in the target language, this slowed down their

thoughts and even retarded their creativity" (Cohen & Gomez, 2004, p. 4). The researchers thus sought out to create a pedagogical intervention that would improve students' inner voices in the L2.

In their 5-month experiment in a 5th grade classroom, the classroom teacher and an educational assistant (both native speakers of Spanish), repeatedly modeled how they think through academic problems out loud to their students, using the specific academic vocabulary that students would be expected to use, before having students attempt their own academic tasks. A key component to the study was having students speak out-loud where they normally would think internally, either to a fake cell phone or a mirror, thus forcing students to vocally express their thought processes in the target language. In each situation, students were provided a specific set of academic vocabulary, both orally and visibly posted in the classroom, to guide their speech.

Cohen and Gomez (2004) found that this intervention was largely successful in improving students' ability to complete difficult academic tasks and explain how they completed them in the target language. The intervention had a positive effect on students' ability to express Spanish academic language in a nuanced and clear fashion. Although the researchers note that the intervention did not considerably improve students' grammatical composition, students were able to speak with more accuracy and precision in the target language across all language proficiency levels and learning styles after the intervention (Cohen & Gomez, 2004).

Cohen and Gomez's work includes several important pedagogical implications for the immersion teacher, regardless of their level. First, it reiterates the importance of

teachers modeling and doing “think-alouds” for students in the target language. Second, it reinforces the need for teachers to provide the specific academic language needed for students to perform the cognitive tasks required in the target language. Third, it demonstrates the need for students themselves to have time to develop their inner voice by actually speaking and practicing their thought-processes in the target language. Finally, having students focus and work on academic language improves their abilty to define terms, make associations, and use academic language appropriately and effectively (Cohen & Gomez, 2004).

Cohen and Gomez’s research represents the first intervention specifically tailored to improve students’ inner voice in an immersion program. Ridgway’s (2009) literary review and analysis of the process of speech recoding, however, notes that the inner voice *and* inner ear are essential parts of developing an L2 in early and intermediate stages.

Ridgway defines the inner ear as separate from inner voice insofar as it is possible to hear sounds before being able to pronounce them. For example, many native English speakers are able to hear and recognize the rolled -R sound well before they are linguistically capable of orally producing it. Additionally, he provides several useful pedagogical suggestions for improving students’ inner voice and inner ear.

Ridgway’s review underscores the importance of developing both inner voice and inner ear in students as he points out that a strong inner ear facilitates one’s ability to read more difficult texts as it “[provides] extra cognitive space for the processing of difficult texts” and “possibly facilitating semantic access by providing prosodic clues”

(Ridgway, 2009, p. 56). In other words, having a strong inner voice allows the reader to focus less on vocal aspects such as pronunciation and intonation when reading, allowing the reader to devote their full attention on meaning.

He also points out several pedagogic strategies to help teachers develop their students L2 inner voice and inner ear. First, Ridgway suggests, that teachers should introduce the written form of words after having them presented orally. Indeed, no new language should be presented in reading if it can be presented orally first. He also suggests that the first stage in developing inner voice and ear ought to be through listening; students should not be expected to produce public speech before having ample time to familiarize themselves with the material. This aligns well with Cohen and Gomez's (2004) suggestion that teachers should model academic language before students use it.

Perhaps the most extensive analysis of Inner Voice development in a second language, however, is Shigematsu's book, *Second Language: Inner Voice and Identity (2010)*. In the book's conclusion, he states that an "exposure to naturalistic learning contexts is crucial because the genesis of the L2 inner voice appears to be associated with gaining a sense of how the target language is utilized by native speakers in relation to their contexts" (Shigematsu, 2010, p. 194).

This conclusion is important to note for immersion teachers who are *non-native speakers* of the L2. For said teachers, these findings underscore the importance of using audio recordings of native speakers performing the academic tasks, and enabling the

students in two-way programs who are themselves native speakers to model activities and read aloud as much as possible.

In sum, Cohen and Gomez's study shows the tangible positive effects of helping students develop their inner voice within the L2 in both language development and problem solving skills; Ridgway notes the importance for lower and intermediate level students to develop their inner voice and inner ear through a variety of pedagogical practices; and Shigematsu underscores the need for students to hear native speakers in their development of the inner voice in a foreign language.

Collaboration and Teacher Training for Secondary Immersion Teachers

The final challenge for many immersion social studies teachers is two-fold: (1) building meaningful collaboration and team-norms across immersion departments, and (2) the lack of professional development and teacher training available or provided.

In many schools where instructors spend collaborative time with other social studies instructors instead of their immersion cohort, students may find large fragmentation and discrepancies across their different immersion courses (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017). This can be particularly confusing for students if their immersion teachers have different expectations regarding grammatical norms, vocabulary, and dialect, as there are immense grammatical and vocabulary differences between Castilian and Latin Spanish, as well as within each country or even within countries. Further, as Corcoran and Silander point out, "The organization of departments by subject matter… [reinforce] understandings and beliefs about instruction and learning commonly associated with specific disciplines" (Corcoran & Silander, 2009, p. 160).

Rodriguez-Valls et al. (2017) propose a strong model of cross-curricular collaboration between Spanish Language Arts (SLA) teachers and Spanish social studies teachers to avoid this fragmentation and confusion. As they note, "[DLI] students receive exposure to various language styles, domains, regional or national accents, vocabulary, and jargons. By means of this tight collaboration and articulation across disciplines in middle school, what is a source of fragmented language input becomes a source of linguistic improvement as well as subject matter enrichment" (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017, p. 8).

Collaboration between language arts and social studies teachers is also recommended as it provides an opportunity for appropriate language development and scaffolding in both classes. Applebee, Adler and Flihan (2007) note the importance of integrating language exercises in the social studies domain as it helps develop language skills in context. Paez et al. (2007), point out the need to develop speaking skills and production of academic language, as many students at the middle school and high school level are far more able to comprehend tier-two and tier-three vocabulary than to produce it themselves (Paez, Tabors, & Lopez, 2007, p. 205-206).

In the collaboration model proposed by Rodriguez-Valis et al. (2008), the importance of building and transferring language skills between both the History and SLA course is paramount. As they state, "The SLA class establishes the foundations to be transferred, implemented, and practiced in the Spanish Social Studies class. The history class, then, provides for a content-based, highly academic environment to put into practice, develop, and fully acquire language concepts introduced in the SLA class.

Through collaboration, practices are implemented horizontally, and language acquisition reinforced daily from various classes" (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017, p. 6).

In the interest of improving collaboration and cohesion across secondary immersion departments, Mabbot (2012) points to the need to improve teacher licensure programs. Increasingly, teacher licensure programs focus on pedagogical training and techniques across different content courses, with less coursework devoted to the specific content area of teacher candidates. Mabbot's study of Mississippi language teachers found that teachers' success in implementing the Mississippi Foreign Language Curriculum Framework was dependent more upon their content area skills than their pedagogical training. The author recommends that state licensure programs for teachers of Foreign Language focus more on language study itself than on pedagogical courses (Mabbot, 2012).

CHAPTER III: DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Summary of Literature

Current academic research suggest that secondary social studies teachers in the Dual Language Immersion setting have myriad challenges. To begin, many such teachers have few available resources and materials to build their curriculum (Call et al., 2018; Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; De Jong & Bearse, 2012). Further, the resources and materials that are readily available in the target language are often not aligned to national or state standards within the US or not appropriately rigorous for the grade level (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; De Jong & Bearse, 2012).

Secondary history departments are increasingly encouraging students to engage in primary-source analyses and historical thinking skills while becoming less dependent on single-textbook narratives (Shanahan, 2016). With the proliferation of Spanish Dual Language Immersion programs (Boyle et al., 2015), there is a strong need for academic organizations to invest in Spanish language materials.

It is not logical for all social studies courses at the secondary level to be offered in Spanish. Courses such as U.S. History and U.S. Government derive nearly all their primary sources from English; thus, teaching these courses in Spanish risks jeopardizing the meaning of foundational texts and confusing students with mistranslations (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017). The social studies courses offered in Spanish should have a tradition of being taught in Latin-American and Iberian countries and should link the language used in class to the sociocultural context of the course (Ortega & Bynes, 2008).

Social studies teachers in the immersion environment should employ two strategies to improve their students' historical thinking skills. First, the *1st-order, 2nd-order, 3rd-order* classification of primary sources and accompanying analytical heuristics offered by Drake and Brown provides a repeatable framework that builds historical thinking skills and can be easily modified from unit to the next (Drake & Brown, 2003). Second, the classification of language for each unit as *content-obligatory* and *content-compatible* serves to provide the bare-bones language needed for students to succeed in their historical analyses, as well as the transferrable social language necessary to improve their oral and written output (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Snow et al., 1989).

Research suggests that many students in the secondary immersion environment struggle to express themselves orally (De Courcy & Mård-Miettinen, 2015; Llinares & Peña, 2015). To improve students' oral communication, social studies teachers should scaffold the historical genres taught throughout the school year in sequential order, demanding higher levels of questioning with each unit (Llinares & Peña, 2015). Additionally, teachers should create clear rules and incentives for using the target language, employ maximal use of the target language themselves, and explicitly correct students' oral mistakes (De Courcy & Mård-Miettinen, 2015; Lyster, 2002; Warford, 2012). A longitudinal study tracking immersion students' oral production shows a need for embedding language lessons and applications in content instruction (Morton & Llinares, 2018).

Teaching written communication poses many challenges in the immersion context, as many teachers were never properly trained in teaching L2 writing, lack the

appropriate confidence to do so effectively, and have no access to comprehensive theory or best practices (Uysal, 2007). Best practices for improving written communication in the immersion setting include extended exposure to advanced texts in the target language, grammatical practice with textual coherence and nominal group-building, and more in-depth study of fewer topics than surface-level coverage of many topics (Whittaker et al., 2011). Teaching effective written communication also requires a particular focus on language conventions, such as the "hourglass" model that emphasizes students learning through language (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012). In classroom settings with diverse linguistic abilities and academic needs, a differentiated approach to teaching written communication is necessary, as well as anticipated and pre-planned *FonF* vocabulary explanations (Morton, 2015; Tarone 2012).

For effective comprehension and production of historical material in the immersion setting, students must develop an "inner ear" and "inner voice" in the target language as it allows students to process information in the target language more quickly because they do not need to focus on the pronunciation or intonation when reading texts (Ridgway, 2009; Tomlinson, 2000). To develop students' "inner ear" and "inner voice", teachers should: (1) model appropriate language use and provide audio or video examples of native speakers doing so if they themselves are not native speakers; (2) provide specific academic language necessary for the content and grade-level appropriate; and (3), provide students ample space to speak and think in the target language before being asked to do so publicly (Cohen & Gomez, 2004; Ridgway, 2009; Shigematsu, 2010).

Many students within secondary immersion programs observe great disconnects across their different immersion classes due to lack of teacher collaboration and sufficient professional development for immersion teachers. These fragmentations manifest themselves in students being expected to follow certain dialectical or grammatical norms in one classroom that may be completely different from another, and can be damaging and confusing for students' language development (Corcoran & Silander, 2009; Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017).

Well-planned teacher collaboration across the immersion cohort can net the positive results of reinforcing vocabulary and language exercises across multiple classes, improving students' L2 production, and transfer of linguistic skills (Applebee, Adler & Filhan, 2007; Paez, Tabors, & Lopez, 2007; Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017). Two-way collaboration model proposed by Rodriguez-Valls et al., calls for the Language Arts class to establish foundations of language and then for the history class to reinforce and practice those foundations in a content-based and academically-rigorous context (Rodriguez-Valls et al., 2017).

Finally, the need for better professional development and educational training for content teachers in the foreign-language setting is evident. Research suggests that not enough attention is given to language-specific training in educational licensing programs, and that school administrations should provide professional development more opportunities from experts in the field (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Mabbot, 2012).

Limitations of the Research

There are significant limitations to this research. To begin, with the relatively recent introduction of Dual Language Immersion programs to the United States, there is a lack of research on the specific topic of social studies classes in this context. For example, searching “secondary social studies dual language immersion” into the EBSCO MegaFile and ERIC Academic Journal Search Database only produced 11 hits; of those results, only three had studies or information relevant to this thesis.

This Literature Review was conducted primarily using the ERIC Academic Journal Search Database, EBSCO MegaFile, and the University of Minnesota’s Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition database. The parameters of the research time-period were from 1980 to 2019. Key words used in the search for relevant studies within the aforementioned databases included: “dual language immersion”, “secondary social studies education”, “primary source framework”, “content and language integration”, “best practices”, and “secondary immersion programs”.

Many of the journal articles included in this literature review cited or mentioned other studies which, in turn, provided further and equally relevant results. As previously stated, while peer-reviewed journals and empirical studies took precedent, literature reviews, academic framework proposals, and phenomenological studies also provided meaningful best practices, solutions, and further definitions of problems in the context of social studies immersion classroom.

Implications for Future Research

There is clearly a need for more case studies and academic research on secondary dual language immersion education. In the context of the social studies immersion classroom, more research is needed in three areas. First, on the impact of primary-source analyses framework (Drake & Brown, 2003) on improving historical thinking in the target language. Second, while much research has been done on the need for the introduction of *content-obligatory* and *content-compatible* vocabulary, there is a need for further research on the impact of this pedagogical tool on social studies students' ability to comprehend and produce content material. Third, research is needed to determine best practices for social studies courses in Spanish and Latin-American universities and high schools and the applicability of those practices to immersion social studies courses.

Implications for Professional Application

I chose this topic because of its personal relevance to my profession. I teach World History in Spanish with Richfield High School's Spanish Dual-Language Immersion program. Like many other teachers in similar positions, I struggled to create an effective curriculum that would challenge my students' historical thinking skills, build upon their Spanish communication skills, and take advantage of the numerous strengths and challenges present in my student population. The research highlighted in this paper will provide me with some practical and proven strategies as I strive to improve my teaching; I hope it will do the same for others as well.

I plan to implement the best practices discussed in sections 1 through 4 of the literature review during 2019-2020 school year, and advocate the best practices in teacher collaboration, training, and professional development as discussed in section 5.

While trends in history education have seen teachers abandoning textbooks in favor of primary-source analyses, there is still a lack of viable materials to support this pedagogical shift in Spanish and other foreign languages. Personally, I found it extremely challenging to create authentic and meaningful primary-source analyses activities this past year. Thus, I look forward to applying Drake and Brown's framework for primary source analysis in each academic unit, along with Snow's Content-Obligatory and Content-Compatible framework.

Teaching oral communication in the Dual Language Immersion setting is also extremely challenging because of the disparate needs of non-native and native speakers. Common immersion activities such as practicing the pronunciation of common words or tongue twisters can be imperative for non-native speakers while simultaneously patronizing for native speakers. This highlights the need for the application of research that is effective for both native and non-native speakers. Specifically, I will scaffold historical genres throughout the curriculum in a way that builds in complexity; model appropriate modeling of oral academic language; and collaborate with the Language Arts teacher to embed language-specific lessons to complement course content.

Native English students have become more reliant on using Google Translate and other translation software to formulate their written communication. This betrays the

purpose of immersion education and effective immersion teachers must use the research-supported methods to ensure students have the skills in the target language to create their own meaningful written discourse in the target language. Thus, I aim to provide my students with ample exposure to advanced texts in the target language, modeling of complex language and grammar, and extended practice opportunities, as supported by the research.

Finally, the research highlighted in section five points to the need for a shift in thinking within the immersion community at large. Greater collaboration is needed within immersion departments, and clearer expectations need to be provided for teachers in immersion settings. Far too often, immersion teachers are left to make crucial pedagogic decisions without direction from administration. Immersion districts need to invest in teacher training and professional development for their immersion teachers. Parents, teachers, and immersion stakeholders need to advocate for these changes.

Conclusion

While there is undoubtedly a need for more research on the specific topic of teaching social studies in the secondary Dual-Language Immersion environment, the literature reviewed in this paper provides practical and proven best practices to address the biggest challenges of teaching in this context. It is imperative that social studies teacher in the immersion environment carefully consider how they teach historical thinking skills, oral and written communication, develop students´ inner voice and ear, and communicate clear goals to their immersion colleagues and administration. The

conclusions of this paper should not be seen as one size fits all, as each Dual Language Immersion program has its own intricacies including students´ language proficiency, school district expectations, and myriad other factors. However, the research provided in this paper should serve as a roadmap for teachers trying to navigate this uniquely difficult position.

References

Alanis, I., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2008). Sustaining a Dual Language Immersion Program: Features of Success. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7(4)*, 305–319.

Applebee, A. N., Adler, M., & Flihan, S. (2007). Interdisciplinary curricula in middle and high school classrooms: Case studies of approaches to curriculum and instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*, 1002–1039. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207308219

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual Language Education Programs: Current State Policies and Practices.* American Institutes for Research. Washington, D.C.

Call, A., Rodriguez, M.M.D., Vazquez, A.L., & Corralejo, S.M. (2018). Predicting participation in dual language immersion using theory of planned behavior. behavior*, Bilingual Research Journal.* 23-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1425935

Cammarratta, L., & Tedick, D. (2012). Balancing Content and Language in Instruction: The Experience of Immersion Teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 96, ii* https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01330.x

Christian, D. (2011). Dual language education. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning, vol. II.* 3–20. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cohen, A., & Gómez, T. (2004). Enhancing academic language proficiency in a 5th grade Spanish immersion classroom. (4th ed.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Corcoran, T., & Silander, M. (2009). Instruction in high schools: The evidence and the challenge. *The Future of Children*, *19*, 157–183. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.0.0026

de Courcy, M., & Mård-Miettinen, K. (2007). Output-Related Teaching Strategies Emphasized by Late Immersion Students. *Voice and Vision in Language Teacher Education*, 93-110.

De Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2012). Dual language programs as a strand within a secondary school: Dilemmas of school organization and the TWI mission. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17,* 15–31.

Drake, F., & Brown, S. (2003) A Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking Skills. *The History Teacher. Vol. 36, No. 4*, 465-489.

Llinares, A., & Peña, I. (2015) A genre approach to the effect of academic questions on CLIL students' language production. *Language and Education, Vol. 29, No. 1,* 15-30. http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.924964

Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher-student interaction*. International Journal of International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 237–253.

Mabbot, A. (2012). Program assessment based on second language teacher education standards. *Bridging Contexts, Making Connections.* 81-108. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Morton, T. (2015) Vocabulary explanations in CLIL classrooms: a conversation analysis perspective, *The Language Learning Journal, 43:3,* 256-270, https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1053283

Morton, T. & Llinares, A. (2018). Students' use of evaluative language in L2 English to talk and write about history in a bilingual education programme, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21:4,* 496-508. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1192101

Ortega, L & Byrnes, H. (2011). The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities: An introduction. p. 3-20. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203871652.

Páez, M. M., Tabors, P. O., & López, L. M. (2007). Dual language and literacy development of Spanish-speaking preschool children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *28,* 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2006.12.007

Palmer, D. (2007). A dual language immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10,* 752–768

Ridgway, A. (2009) The Inner Voice. *International Journal of English Studies (IJES), 2009, Vol.9(2),* p. 45-58

Rodríguez-Valls, Fernando, Solsona-Puig, Jordi, Capdevila-Gutiérrez, Maria & Schwieter, John W. (2017) Teaching social studies in Spanish in dual immersion middle schools: A biliterate approach to history, *Cogent Education, 4:1* https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1326202

Shanahan, C . "Deepening what it means to read (And write) like a historian: progressions of instruction across a school year in an 11th grade U.S. History class." Grantee Submission, 01 Feb. 2016. EBSCOhost,

ezproxy.bethel.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED565428&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Shigematsu, B. K. (2010). Second language inner voice and identity. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Snow, M., Met, M., & Geese, F. (1989) A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *Vol. 23, No. 2*, 201-217

Steele, J., Slater, R., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J.,Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. 2017. American effects of dual-language Immersion Programs on student achievement: evidence from lottery data. *Educational Research Journal*. 282S–306S. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216634463

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*, 125-144. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (2015). Equipping teachers to be language explorers: exploring language in the classroom*. Bridging Contexts, Making Connections,* 7-22. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Tomlinson, B. (2000). Talking to yourself: The role of the inner voice in language learning*. Applied Language Learning, 11 (1),* 123-154.

Warford, M. (2012). Teaching in the target language: a pedagogical value under attack*? Expanding Our Horizons: Language Teacher Education in the 21st Century,* 81-100, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Whittaker, R., Llinares, A., & McCabe, A. (2011) Written discourse development in CLIL at secondary school. *Language Teaching Research 15(3)*, 343–362

White, P. R. R., & Martin, J. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation—Appraisal in English.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.