Theory Into Practice

Success And Challenges In Dual Language Education

Kathryn Lindholm-Leary [a]

[a] San José State University

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Kathryn Lindholm-Leary

Success And Challenges In Dual Language Education

This article presents research that highlights the success of dual language education for student participants, both native English speakers and English language learners, from a variety of demographic backgrounds at both the elementary and secondary levels. However, there are a number of challenges that can impede the quality of implementation in dual language programs. This article identifies and discusses some of these important challenges facing dual language programs, including issues related to program design, accountability, curriculum and instruction related to biliteracy, and bilingual language development. In addition, implications for practice are presented to address some of these challenges.

Kathryn Lindholm-Leary is a professor Emerita at the San José State University.

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, 285 Mountain Home Drive, Grants Pass, OR 97527. E-mail: klindholmleary@mac.com

DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION (DLE) programs, also known as two-way immersion, integrate English language learners (ELLs) from a common native language background (e.g., Spanish, Mandarin) and native English-speaking (NES) students in the same classroom for academic instruction through both languages. In these programs, the partner language (e.g., Spanish, Mandarin, Korean) is used for a significant portion (from 50% to 90%) of the students' instructional day. For both groups of students, the goals include high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural competence for all students.

With the surging popularity of DLE programs in the United States has come an increasing variety of articles written on DLE (for reviews of this research, see Bickle, Hakuta, & Billings, 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; for a directory of DLE programs, go to http://www.cal.org/twi/directory/index.html). Because most of this research has documented the success of DLE programs in promoting the language proficiency and academic achievement of both ELL and NES students, many educators and parents assume that merely

adopting the DLE name, and some components of the model, will automatically confer successful student outcomes. However, successful outcomes require a clear understanding of the DLE program and full implementation of the various characteristics associated with high quality programs. Thus, it is important to examine some of the successes, as well as challenges, identified in the research on DLE programs, along with some implementation issues that are associated with high quality programs and can impact student outcomes.

Description of DLE in the United States

Two major variants of the DLE model exist—usually referred to as the 90:10 and the 50:50 models. The principal factors distinguishing these two elementary-level program variations are the distribution of languages for instruction and the language in which reading is taught. The amount of time spent in each language varies across the grade levels in the 90:10, but not 50:50, design.

In the 90:10 model, at the kindergarten and first grade levels, 90% of the instructional day is devoted to content instruction in the partner language (the language other than English that is used for instruction, for example, Spanish or Korean), with the remaining 10% of instruction provided in English. All content instruction occurs in the partner language, and English time is used to develop oral language proficiency and some preliteracy skills. Reading instruction begins in the partner language for both the native speakers of that language and the native English speakers. At each successive grade level, the percentage of English instructional time increases until fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, where students' instructional time is balanced between English and the partner language.

In the 50:50 model, students receive half of their instruction in English and the other half of their instruction in the partner language throughout all of the elementary years. Literacy instruction varies slightly in this model. At some school sites, students learn to read first in their primary language (e.g., English speakers learn to read in

English and Spanish speakers learn to read in Spanish) and then add second language literacy at grade 2 or 3. At other school sites, students learn to read in both languages simultaneously.

Successes in DLE Programs

Most of the research on DLE programs has been conducted to document the outcomes of students in DLE programs. Although the great majority of the research focuses on academic achievement, there is some limited research on oral language development and other student outcomes. It is important to recognize that the research on DLE programs includes large-scale longitudinal and comparative studies, as well as smaller studies of a small group of students in one or more classrooms. Three major sets of findings emerge from this research.

DLE Programs Promote Successful Outcomes for Both ELL and NES Participants

Research from a variety of studies (for reviews, see Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008) demonstrates that: (a) students in DLE programs perform at or above grade level on standardized reading and mathematics tests in English; (b) they score similar to their statewide peers by about grades 5–7, if not sooner; (c) ELLs close the achievement gap with NES students in English-only classrooms by about fifth grade; and (d) they achieve at or above grade level in reading (and math) tests measured in the partner language. Even though most of this research has focused on NES and ELL students in Spanish/English DLE programs, the results extend to studies of Chinese and Korean DLE students, as well (Garcia, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2011).

DLE programs are also successful at the secondary level. Compared to their peers in English mainstream programs, DLE middle and high school students are: (a) as or more likely to be enrolled in higher level math courses (Lindholm-

Leary & Borsato, 2005), (b) as or more likely to pass the high school exit exam (Lindholm-Leary, 2010), (c) less likely to drop out of school (Thomas & Collier, 2002), and (d) more likely to close the gap with NES peers by the end of high school (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Students Develop High Levels of Proficiency in Two Languages

In research reviewed by Lindholm-Leary and Howard (2008), most DLE students were rated as proficient in their two languages, particularly by the upper elementary grade levels, and students made excellent progress in both languages across the grade levels in both 90:10 and 50:50 programs. However, as a group, the native Spanish-speakers experienced a subtle shift from slight dominance in Spanish in third grade to comparable scores in English and Spanish by the end of fifth grade, but the NESs were typically dominant in English. Moreover, students had higher levels of Spanish proficiency, and therefore bilingualism, in 90:10 than 50:50 programs (Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008).

Furthermore, ELL students were as or more likely to be classified by state assessments as proficient in English if they were participating in DLE programs than if they were enrolled in English mainstream programs (for reviews, see Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010).

DLE Successful Outcomes Extend to Students of Diverse Cultural, Socio-Economic, Linguistic, and Special Needs Backgrounds

What is compelling about these results of success for DLE students is that the findings have emerged from a variety of studies with different authors, in different parts of the country; with different types of communities (urban, suburban, rural) and socio-economic backgrounds (high, medium, low income communities); and with students of different ethnic, linguistic, socio-economic, and special education needs. These re-

sults even hold for DLE students in schools with almost all economically disadvantaged Hispanic students (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010). In all this research, comparing DLE students to their peers (i.e., similar in socio-economic or ethnic or linguistic background), who are typically in English mainstream programs, DLE students do at least as well, and often better than, their peers (for a review, see Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Taken together, data from these various studies indicate that DLE programs are capable of promoting academic performance for students of different backgrounds, including those subpopulations identified as at risk for academic difficulty.

Challenges in DLE Programs

Even though the research on DLE programs demonstrates student success, there are also important challenges in DLE that can impact the quality of these programs; that is, how well the programs are designed and implemented. These concerns include issues related to program design, accountability, curriculum and instruction as related to biliteracy, and bilingual language development. These are not the only challenges, but these are the challenges that will be briefly discussed here.

DLE Program Design

Challenge. One issue that can impact DLE program design concerns the allocation of time given to each language. There is an expectation on the part of many administrators and educators that more exposure to English in school will result in greater English proficiency than will less exposure. This time-on-task rationale often results in pressure for DLE programs to add more instructional time in English or to dissolve the program altogether.

Implications for practice. Research findings on both ELLs learning English and on NES students learning the partner language indicate that amount of time or exposure alone cannot

explain the language-learning outcomes that have been documented for NES students in these programs (see Genesee, 2004, for a review). Similarly, studies of the English language development of Spanish-speaking ELLs in the United States indicate that the level of proficiency that ELLs achieve in English is not related to amount of exposure to English in school in a simple correlational fashion. In other words, more exposure to, and instruction in, English in school does not result in higher levels of proficiency in English (for a review of this research, see Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). Thus, students in 90:10 DLE programs, where students receive very little exposure to English in the primary grades, exhibit levels of proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking English that are just as advanced, or more so, than those of ELLs in 50:50 DLE programs or English mainstream programs.

Accountability Challenges

Challenge 1. Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act requires that states show that all students, including students from a variety of subgroups (e.g., major ethnic/racial groups, ELLs, special education students), make adequate yearly progress on state assessments of reading/English language arts and content areas. All students in grades 3 to 8 are expected to meet state standards for reading and subject matter competency and all ELLs who have been in the United States for 1 year or more must be included in these assessments. These accountability requirements raise two concerns. One accountability problem for DLE programs relates to the amount of time that DLE programs have to demonstrate grade-level competence in their participants. Research indicates that NES students in a DLE program may need 1 or 2 years to catch up to their NES peers on achievement tests in English (Genesee, 2004). More problematic is that studies show that 5 to 7 years may be necessary for ELLs to close the gap between their test scores and those of their NES peers (Thomas & Collier, 2002; for reviews of this research, see Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Lindholm-

Leary & Genesee, 2010). Evaluations conducted in the early years of a program (kindergarten through grade three) typically reveal that students in DLE programs scored below grade level (and sometimes very low), or either lower than or equivalent to comparison group peers. This apparent lack of progress in grades 2–3 can lead administrators to put pressure on the DLE program administrators and teachers to add more English or to eliminate the DLE program altogether.

Implications for practice. Most studies conducted at the end of elementary school or in middle and high school have found that the achievement of DLE students was as good as, and usually higher than, that of comparison groups of students (e.g., Block, 2007; Burnham-Massey & Piña, 1990; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lopez & Tashakkori, 2006; Ramirez, 1992; see Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010, for reviews of research on ELL students). Thus, although the research shows that, over time, DLE students show comparable or higher achievement than their peers, they may demonstrate lower achievement and progress in the early years of a program. DLE administrators and teachers need to prepare for this accountability concern and use accountability data to ensure that their NES and ELL participants are making expected progress. That way, they can argue that their students are on track to show similar or higher achievement compared to their peers in English mainstream programs (see Lindholm-Leary & Hargett, 2007).

In addition, effective DLE programs use assessment measures that are aligned with, and include, accountability for the DLE program's vision and goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. This means that the program utilizes multiple measures in both languages to assess students' progress toward meeting bilingual and biliteracy goals (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007).

Challenge 2. Even though DLE programs have a stated goal of biliteracy, there is often little accountability for demonstrating grade-level reading skills in the partner language. In fact, and

unfortunately, many DLE programs do not even assess literacy skills in the partner language. As a result, it is unclear whether students are making adequate progress in the partner language.

Implications for practice. Research with DLE programs, consistent with the literature in bilingual education in the United States, shows that, especially for ELLs, reading achievement in English is highly correlated with reading achievement in the partner language (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005, 2006; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). Thus, the best readers in English had the highest reading scores in Spanish, and correspondingly, the lowest readers in Spanish also had the lowest reading scores in English. These results, which also extend to reading in Chinese and English (Lindholm-Leary, 2011), ought to lead DLE educators to: (a) measure literacy in the partner language, (b) promote high levels of literacy in the partner language to see higher levels of literacy measured in English, and (c) use student outcomes in the partner language as a way to gauge overall literacy skills; if students are low in literacy skills as measured in their primary language, that should signal the need for instructional modification or interventions in that language (e.g., Artiles & Ortiz, 2002).

Curriculum and Instruction Challenges

Challenge. There is little research into the development of oral academic language proficiency and literacy within DLE programs, and especially into how to promote high levels of biliteracy, which are stated goals of DLE programs. State and local standards and corresponding curricula are developed for teaching students through one language; thus, they do not provide assistance in how to promote literacy in two languages. Further, there is insufficient research to guide educators as to how to promote biliteracy.

Implications for practice. Many researchers have examined biliteracy and have found that language and literacy skills in the primary language do play an important role in the second language (e.g., August & Shanahan, 2010; Genesee & Riches, 2006; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005, 2006) and there is research on the skills that appear to transfer from one language to another and on instructional approaches or strategies that may be most beneficial for promoting literacy in a second language (e.g., August & Shanahan, 2010; Genesee & Riches, 2006; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). It would be helpful for administrators and teachers at DLE sites to explore this research and develop collaborative relationships with university researchers with the goal to translate this research into more effective practice at the school site. (For further information about effective characteristics of DLE programs, see the Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education at http://www.cal.org/twi/guidingprinciples.htm)

Bilingual Language Development

Challenges. Even though research does show that students make good progress toward high levels of proficiency in the two languages, studies of student language use in the classroom clearly shows that there are challenges to address in this area. Potowski's (2007) observations of fifth- and eighth-grade students in a Spanish/English DLE program showed that although students did develop bilingual skills, they did not develop highly proficient or balanced bilingual skills, because they were more dominant, and felt more comfortable speaking, in English than in Spanish. In addition, DeJong and Bearse (2011) have also shown that secondary DLE students feel that they do not receive sufficient opportunity or support to develop high levels of Spanish within the DLE classroom.

This research points to challenges in developing high levels of bilingual proficiency across the grade spans within DLE programs. It may also reflect the reality of the accountability challenges discussed previously in that accountability is usually associated with demonstrating language proficiency and academic success as measured in English, and language proficiency and literacy skills in the partner language may be considered

an added benefit, but not critical to demonstrating student achievement according to NCLB, state, and local requirements. It may also reflect the paucity of research on the oral language skills that are necessary for promoting high levels of literacy and school success (Saunders & O'Brien, 2006). Or it may be due to the lack of language benchmarks that characterize many DLE programs.

Implications for practice. Research shows that effective programs utilize a number of approaches that can help promote higher levels of bilingualism (Howard et al., 2007). These programs (a) have a vision and goals associated with bilingualism; thus, language instruction is integrated within the curriculum, and language is developed across the curriculum to ensure that students learn the content as well as the academic language associated with the content; (b) provide both structured and unstructured opportunities for oral production; (c) establish and enforce a strong language policy in the classroom that encourages students to use the instructional language and discourages students from speaking the noninstructional language; (d) utilize grouping strategies to optimize student interactions and language practice; and (e) provide professional development around the DLE model and second language learning strategies.

Conclusions

DLE programs have become very popular due to the consistent research that has documented its success in promoting bilingual language proficiency and academic achievement of both ELL and NES students from a variety of language, ethnic, and socio-economic backgrounds. However, an important point presented in this article is that merely adopting the DLE name and some components of the model will not necessarily result in successful student outcomes. Rather, successful outcomes require a clear understanding of the DLE program and full implementation of the various characteristics associated with high quality programs. This article has addressed some of the successes and challenges identified in the

research on DLE programs in the hope that DLE programs can be implemented according to the principles associated with high quality programs and thereby yield successful student outcomes.

References

Artiles, A. J., & Ortiz, A. A. (Eds.). (2002). *English language learners with special education needs: Identification, assessment, and instruction*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2010). Effective literacy instruction for English learners. In California Department of Education (Ed.), *Research on English language learners* (pp. 209–249). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press.

Bickle, K., Hakuta, K., & Billings, E. S. (2004) Trends in two-way immersion research. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.; pp. 589–604). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Block, N. (2007). *Dual immersion programs in predominantly Latino schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA.

Burnham-Massey, L., & Piña, M. (1990). Effects of bilingual instruction on English academic achievement of LEP students. *Reading Improvement, 27*, 129–32.

DeJong, E. J., & Bearse, C. I. (2011). The same outcomes for all? High school students reflect on their two-way immersion program experiences. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 104–122). Avon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Garcia, Y. (2003). Korean/English two-way immersion at Cahuenga Elementary School. *NABE News, 26*, 8–11, 25.

Genesee, F. (2004). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 547–576). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2011). The education of English language learners. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Educational psychology handbook* (pp. 499–526). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in

U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 10*, 363–385.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of empirical evidence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Genesee, F., & Riches, C. (2006). Instructional issues in literacy development. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 109–175). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007). *Guiding principles for dual language education*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education and National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from www.cal.org/DLE/guidingprinciples.htm

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Avon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2010). *PROMISE Initiative student outcomes*. San Bernardino, CA: PROMISE Design Center.

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). Avon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm, K., & Aclan, Z. (1991). Bilingual proficiency as a bridge to academic achievement: Results from bilingual/immersion programs. *Journal of Education, 173*, 99–113.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low-SES Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*, 1–18.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Borsato, G. (2005). Hispanic high schoolers and mathematics: Follow-up of students who had participated in two-way bilingual elementary programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*, 641–652.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Borsato, G. (2006). Academic achievement. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.) (pp. 176–221). *Educating English Language Learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English language learn-

ers. In California Department of Education (Ed.), *Research on English language learners* (323–367). Sacramento: California Department of Education Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hargett, G. (2007). *Evaluator's toolkit for dual language programs*. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/twi/EvalToolkit/whytoolkit.htm

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Howard, E. (2008). Language and academic achievement in two-way-immersion programs. In T. Fortune & D. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to bilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 177–200). Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Lopez, M., & Tashakkori, A. (2006). Differential outcomes of TWBE and TBE on ELLs at different entry levels. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*, 81–103.

Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual-immersion school*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M., August, D., & Snow, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking children reading English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 246–256.

Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M., August, D., & Snow, C. (2006). The intriguing role of Spanish language vocabulary knowledge in predicting English reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 159–169.

Ramirez, J. D. (1992). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education program for language-minority children (Executive Summary). *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*, 1–62.

Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (2010). Research to guide English language development instruction. In California Department of Education (Ed.), *Research on English Language Learners* (pp. 21–81). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press.

Saunders, W., & O'Brien, G. (2006). Oral language. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian, D. (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 14–63). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Retrieved from http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html

TiP