

## ***Part I. Program Design and Articulation & Student Population/Demographics***

### A. Program Model & Program Effectiveness

Main Questions: ***'Are TWI programs effective'*** and ***'Are TWI programs more effective than other models to teach NES and minority language speakers (mostly NSS)?'*** These two questions continue to be asked and are consistently answered in the affirmative through a few large-scale studies and many smaller scale studies around the nation (Collier & Thomas, 2009; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Like 10 years ago, the primary outcome measures are related to standardized tests in reading and math and to a lesser extent science or social sciences. Oral language, if included, tends to be assessed through more subjective rating scales. Writing is still an area that remains under-researched.

#### More Recent Directions

- Focus on upper elementary and secondary TWI programs and/or follow-up students, who have attended an elementary TWI program, in later years. Findings are positive in terms of developing and maintaining positive attitudes, supporting academic achievement, and TWI students taking advanced placement courses in high school. Positive impact may vary for majority and minority language speakers by subject areas. Examples: Cobb, Vegas, & Kronauge (2006); Lindholm-Leary (2005).
- An additional question *"Is there a difference in outcomes between 50:50 and 90:10 TWI models?"* It is often difficult to directly compare the two models due to differences in student characteristics. General finding: both models can be effective, with the 90:10 model having a slight edge particularly in the area of (oral) language development in the minority language. Example: Lindholm-Leary (n.d.)

### B. Refining the Effectiveness Question

Additional question: *"Which TWI model is effective for which groups of students in reaching program goals of bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural competence."* Focus on special target groups within TWI. For example,

- *What are the experiences of students with special needs?*  
The picture that emerges from the few studies conducted with this target groups is that students with special needs are performing in comparable ways to students with special needs in non-TWI programs. Examples: Myers (2009); Perez (2010). Millian & Pearson (2007) is a small case study of three students with visual impairments and focuses on teacher perspectives and experiences.
- *What are the experiences of groups other than Latino or monolingual EuroAmerican students, specifically African American students?*  
Positive achievement patterns have been noted early on but there are cautionary notes regarding African American students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and TWI programs' inclusion of issues of race and non-standard English in program design, curriculum, and instruction. Examples: Anberg-Espinosa (2008); Boone (2008).
- *How well do students from different socioeconomic background perform in TWI?*  
Traditional differences in educational achievement between lower/higher SES also tend to surface in TWI programs, with students from higher SES outperforming those from lower SES. However, students from lower SES in TWI perform better than similar students in non-TWI programs, arguing that being in a high-quality TWI program mediates social class issues (e.g., Collier & Thomas, 2009).
- *How effective are non-Spanish-English TWI programs?* While still under-researched, evidence supporting TWI program effectiveness with other language groups is emerging for Korean (e.g., Bae, 2007) and Chinese (e.g., Lindholm-Leary, 2011).

### C. Other Ways of Examining Program Structure

While the program effectiveness question continues to dominate the area of *Program Structure and Design*, a few other emerging areas of research can be noted. For example,

- *What impact does being a strand within a school have on TWI programs?*  
Only 98 out of 422 TWI programs listed in the CAL directory are whole-school programs; yet few studies consider this question. Palmer (2007) and de Jong and Bearse (in press) express concern about TWI programs being to carry out their mission when embedded but not integrated in English-dominant schools.
- *What is the nature of leadership that effectively supports educational reform that includes TWI?*  
Studies confirm the central role that knowledgeable leadership (administrators, principals) has on engaging in transformative leadership for TWI, TWI program design, implementation, and maintenance of program integrity against sociopolitical forces. Examples: Hunt (2011).

#### D. Program Features

The effectiveness studies emphasize the important of 'high-quality' TWI programs and the literature has identified a number of common features that characterize 'good' TWI programs (Howard & Sugarman, 2007; Howard et al, 2009). While many of these features each have been researched separately as they relate particularly to effective schooling for minority language speakers in general and English language learners in particular, research that directly establishes these relationships for TWI program outcomes is still an area that needs further exploration.

#### Some Emerging Themes & Future Research:

- ✓ *What contextual, organizational, and program features best support specific TWI program outcomes (bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement in reading/Language Arts, Science, Social Sciences, cross-cultural competence) for different groups of students?*
- ✓ *What are the performance patterns in academic achievement, language and literacy development in the languages of instruction as well as intercultural competence over time?* (need for longitudinal studies)
- ✓ *"What are the experiences of different groups of minority language speakers and English speakers in TWI?"* Lindholm-Leary & Hernandez (2011) is a notable study as it compares the achievement of ELLs, former ELLs, initially dominant English speakers and their oral language proficiency and reading performance in English and Spanish. They find significant difference between the three groups with reclassified ELLs consistently performing better than ELLs. Parental education appears to one important factor in these patterns.
- ✓ *"Are there gender differences in TWI programs?"* This question has received minimal attention though it has been previously noted that girls tend to score higher than boys.
- ✓ *"What are the experiences of trilingual learners in TWI" and "What happens in TWI programs that add a third language?"* The experiences of trilinguals (including non-standard variety speakers) and/or what happens in trilingual programs is an area that needs more research.
- ✓ *"What role do/will/can charter or private schools play in supporting TWI?"* The number of charter and private schools listed in the CAL directory is 39, with another 105 listed as magnet schools (out of a total of 422 TWI programs). The number of TWI programs in such settings is growing and we need to understand more about what these settings can and cannot afford TWI students and parents.

## ***Part II. Intercultural Competence and Bi/Multilingual and Cultural Identity***

#### A. Culture as a program outcome

Focus on attitudes: towards the students' own language, the partner language, bilingualism the program/school and towards people with diverse backgrounds. Findings point to positive attitudes in these areas with few differences between English/Spanish dominant Hispanics and Euro-Americans who attended TWI programs. Some significant differences emerge, however, when comparing TWI students with non-TWI minority language students. Examples: Block (2011); de Jong & Bearse (2011); Gerena (2010); Lindholm-Leary & Borsato (2005).

#### B. Parental Attitudes

While parents' attitudes towards bilingual education in general are well-documented, studies that specifically focus on TWI parents and their experiences are slowly increasing. These studies consider the various motivations

that different groups of parents have for placing their children in a TWI program and their attitudes towards the programs. Examples: Giacchino-Baker & Piller (2006); Whiting, Feinauer, & VanDerwerken (2012).

**C. Student Integration – Building Intergroup and social relationships**

Despite the fact that integration is a core component of TWI the dynamics of native and non-native speaker integration or collaboration has received comparatively little attention (de Jong & Howard, 2009). When the focus of study, it has primarily been examined from a language perspective. Questions have included: *how do NS-NNS help each other with the partner language, what language is used to communicate between students in pairs or small groups*. Although the importance of the use of cooperative learning tasks for TWI is noted to encourage student interaction, group member status issues as suggested by the work by Elizabeth Cohen on complex instruction or social relationship building and collaborative skill building for students from diverse backgrounds to support academic and language development have received much less attention.

**D. Identity Construction**

Reyes and Vallone (2007) argue for the need to include identity and how identities are constructed in TWI classrooms as a fourth dimension of TWI programs. This research calls for qualitative, classroom-based research that considers how teachers support students' identities through language use, interactions and tasks. Examples: Palmer (2008); Fitts (2009)

**Some Emerging Themes & Future Research:**

- ✓ *Which identities are afforded in TWI classrooms? E.g., linguistic (bilingual?), ethnic/racial, academic identities*
- ✓ *How are identities constructed in TWI classrooms for example, through teacher-student interactions, through curriculum and material choices?*
- ✓ *How do TWI students' identities and attitudes develop over time?*
- ✓ *How does the culture dimension connect with the social justice agenda as a desired outcome for TWI students?*
- ✓ *How do TWI teachers negotiate the multicultural education agenda within state frameworks that do not promote such an agenda?*

**Selected References**

- Anberg-Espinosa, M. (2008). Experiences and perspectives of African American students and their parents in a two-way Spanish immersion program. Unpublished dissertation. University of San Francisco.
- Bae, J. (2007). Development of English skills need not suffer as a result of immersion: Grades 1 and 2 writing assessment in a Korean/English two-way immersion program. *Language Learning*, 57(2), 299-332.
- Block, N. (2011). The impact of two-way dual immersion programs on initially English-dominant Latino students' attitudes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34 (2), 125-141.
- Boone, S. K. (2008). *Successful African American students in two-way immersion programs: Parent and student perceptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Cobb, B., Vega, D., & Kronauge, c. (2006). Effects of an Elementary Dual Language Immersion School Program on Junior High Achievement. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 1(1), 27-47.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Dual Language Education of New Mexico.
- de Jong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. Tedick, Christian, D., Fortune, T.W. (Ed.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 104-122). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fitts, S. (2009). Exploring third space in a dual-language setting: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(2), 87-104.
- Gerena, L. (2010). Student attitudes toward biliteracy in a dual immersion program. *The Reading Matrix*, 10 (1), 55-78.
- Howard, E. R., & Sugarman, J. (2007). *Realizing the vision of two-way immersion: Fostering effective programs and classrooms*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Publishing.

**2012 Dual Language and Immersion Researcher Convocation October 17, 2012**  
**Overview prepared by Ester J. de Jong, University of Florida, [edejong@coe.ufl.edu](mailto:edejong@coe.ufl.edu)**

- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2003). *Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research. Report 63*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR). Available at <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report63.pdf>
- Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hunt, V. (2011). Learning from success stories: leadership structures that support dual language programs over time in New York City. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 14 (2), 187-206.
- Giacchino-Baker, R. & Piller, B. (2006). Parental motivation, attitudes, support, and commitment in a Southern Californian two-way immersion program. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 5(1), 5-28.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2005). Hispanic high schoolers and mathematics: Follow-up of students who had participated in two-way bilingual elementary programs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 641-652.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (n.d.) *90:10 vs. 50:50 Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs*. Presentation retrieved 10/15/2012 at <http://www.lindholm-leary.com/present&handout/9010v5050Info.pdf>.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2011). Student outcomes in Chinese two-way immersion programs: Language proficiency, academic achievement, and student attitudes. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 81-103). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43-60.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(6),531-545.
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J., & Howard, E. R. (2008). Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism. Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. (pp.177-200). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Milian, M., & Pearson, V. (2005). Students with visual impairments in a dual-language program: A case study. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, November, 715-720.
- Myers, M.L. (2008). *Achievement of children identified with special needs in two-way Spanish immersion programs*. Unpublished dissertation. George Washington University.
- Palmer, D. (2007). A dual immersion strand programme in California: Carrying out the promise of dual language education in an English-dominant context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 752-768.
- Palmer, D. K. (2008). Building and destroying students' 'academic identities': the power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(6), 647-667.
- Parkes, J. 2008. Who chooses dual language education for their children and why. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 11(6), 635-60.
- Perez, M. H. (2010). *A quantitative analysis of the achievement of children with special needs in two way immersion programs and English as a second language in Texas*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Texas a&M University-Kingsville
- Reyes, S. A., & Vallone T. L. (2007). Toward an expanded understanding of two-way bilingual immersion education: Constructing identity through a critical, additive bilingual/bicultural pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives* 9(3), 3-11.
- Whiting, E., Feinauer, E., VanDerwerken, D. (2012). Taking a closer look at Latino parents at one Spanish-English two-way immersion charter school. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(5), 497-510.