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This dissertation study investigated parents of students in Korean-English two-way immersion (TWI) programs in the Los Angeles area. For this study, I collected surveys from seven elementary schools’ Korean-English TWI programs, and a total of 454 parents of children in the programs participated in the study.

Using the survey data, I documented parents’ demographic features, focusing on parents’ race and ethnicity, native languages, countries of origin, English proficiency, education levels, and annual household income levels. Next, I explored parents’ perceptions regarding their child’s language development in both English and Korean. I also examined parents’ views on their
child’s experiences to relate to students of other races and cultures and parents’ own experiences with fellow parents. I then explored parental participation in Korean-English TWI programs and in school. Finally, I investigated parents’ overall evaluation of their child’s Korean TWI programs and their plans to be committed to the program.

To explore these topics of interest, survey data were analyzed by multiple regression analyses, where I investigated relationships between topics of interest and other parent-related variables. I also presented descriptive statistics for individual topics and performed rank sum tests to compare Korean parents in the survey to non-Korean parents to examine group differences.

Findings showed that although nearly three-quarters of survey respondents were of Korean descent, there was a wide range of diversity in terms of native languages and countries among survey participants, implying that the vast majority of survey respondents were immigrants or were from immigrant families. Regarding reasons for choosing the Korean TWI program, findings indicated that developing bilingual abilities, academically performing better, and enhancing child’s abilities to integrate were primary enrollment reasons that respondents pointed out. Non-Korean respondents, in particular, highlighted better academic success and enhancement of abilities to relate to other races and cultures. With respect to language development, non-Korean participants were more content than were Korean parents in the survey, and Korean participants, on average, addressed higher concerns over both English and Korean instruction in comparison to their non-Korean counterparts.

Additionally, regarding parents’ satisfaction with their child’s experiences to relate to different races and cultures, survey respondents, in general, were satisfied with their child’s integrative experiences, yet Korean parents in the survey were less positive than were non-
Korean respondents. As for parents’ own experiences, findings illustrated that non-Korean respondents perceived integration among parents themselves more positively than did the Korean group, and integration among parents was closely connected with integration among children. With regard to parental involvement, regression analysis results indicated that parental participation was positively associated with their interactions with other parents, English proficiency, integration among children, and program evaluation. Finally, as for overall school evaluation, respondents evaluated their child’s Korean TWI program fairly favorably, and the measure of evaluation was linked with parent satisfaction with their child’s language development, integration among children, integration among parents, and parents’ interactions with other parents. As for parents’ plans to be committed to the Korean TWI program, nearly 40% of respondents stated they would be committed to the program until fifth or sixth grade, and interestingly, more non-Korean parents in the survey addressed their desire to be committed to the program for a longer period than did Korean respondents. Korean parents’ limited commitment to the Korean TWI program, in particular, needs to be examined carefully because it can undermine the program’s goal and efficacy as a TWI program and may condemn it to be a transitional bilingual program.

The study’s findings call upon researchers and educators to attend to Korean TWI programs and TWI programs in general to ensure quality dual language instruction for all students and foster integration in the program. Although Korean TWI programs have significant potential in offering inclusive environment where students as well as their families interact with diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic groups, this study also evokes the significance of conscious and purposeful efforts for integration, which should be attended to continuously.
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The inflow of immigrants from various countries to the United States has increased at a remarkably rapid rate over the past several decades. Newly arrived immigrants during the 1990s outnumbered those of all previous decades (Capps et al., 2005), and since 2001 the number of legal permanent residents has exceeded one million for every year except 2003 and 2004 (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2013). Moreover, as of 2012 one-quarter of children under age 18 in the U.S. were from families where either one of their parents was an immigrant (Nwosu, Batalova, & Auclair, 2014). As a result of the surge of immigrant population, diversity of the U.S. society has been on the rise and is expected to continue increasing. For example, the diversity index — a quantitative measure on a scale from 0 to 100 that reflects the racial diversity in society — has escalated from 20 to 55 in the last half century and is projected to reach 71 in 2060 (Toppo & Overberg, 2014). In addition to racial diversity, language diversity became salient as well. There are over 150 languages spoken at home other than English in the U.S., and the number of students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs) was more than 5 million in the late 2000s (Batalova & McHugh, 2008).

Notwithstanding the increasing racial and linguistic diversity across the nation, policies that embrace and promote diversity have been sparse. In fact, support for native language education for ELLs was withdrawn in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB); some states enacted English-only policies that restricted bilingual education. The changes in language-related policies are not only problematic but also are against the global trend that emphasizes multilingualism for pragmatic, economic, political, and ideological reasons (Gándara et al., 2010).
Yet, in spite of the unfavorable language policies that suppress bilingual education, there has been a rising trend of two-way immersion (TWI) programs in which instruction occurs in two languages — usually English and a partner language (e.g., Spanish). The TWI program is designed for both ELLs and native speakers of English; students in the program develop bilingualism and multicultural understanding and seek academic excellence simultaneously. Since the 1960s, the number of TWI programs in which English and a non-English language are used to educate children has steadily spread across the U.S.; the programs also have become diversified in recent years by using Asian languages (e.g., Mandarin Chinese, Korean, Japanese, etc.) for partner languages. The interests in Asian languages reflect the growing inflow of Asian immigrants that have outnumbered Hispanic immigrants since 2010 and overall popularity of TWI programs among parents in the United States.

Considering the rising diversity in terms of race and language in U.S., the increasing attention to TWI instruction seems reasonable. However, under the restrictive language policies, the escalating trend of the TWI program seems paradoxical and thus raises a question, which motivates this study. In this dissertation, focusing on Korean TWI programs, I identify parents’ reasons for choosing a TWI program, parents’ perspectives toward the program, parental involvement in the program, and their opinions on integration among children and among parents. I further investigate how these factors are associated with one another.

Additionally, I choose to examine Korean programs for several reasons. The first and foremost reason is that non-Spanish TWI programs are under-researched. Even though research on TWI programs has delved into parents of students in TWI programs, a vast majority of the studies have focused on Spanish TWI programs. Given the increasing diversity in society, however, we need information not only on Spanish TWI programs but also on non-Spanish TWI
programs. Second, Korean immigrants have intriguing features that make the group distinct from other immigrants. Even compared to other Asian groups, Korean immigrants stand out for their high educational levels, strong emphasis on children’s education, and ardent desire to maintain their heritage language (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Third, except Spanish, Korean is the most popular language for TWI instruction in Los Angeles. In fact, one-fifth of Korean immigrants in the U.S. reside in the Los Angeles area (Terrazas & Batog, 2010); accordingly, Korean TWI programs have been developed in the area since the early 1990s. Fourth, given that this study examined multiple school sites, accessibility was a critical research factor. Korean TWI programs in the Los Angeles are located within one hour of drive from University of California, Los Angeles, and this feasibility is one of the reasons that made me focus on Korean programs. Fifth, my bilingual ability in Korean and English was another reason that encouraged me to examine Korean TWI programs. Although this study was based on a survey method, I always talked to parents whenever I visited schools. When I conversed with Korean parents, in particular, by speaking the same language, I felt parents feeling more comfortable with sharing their perspectives and attitudes toward the TWI programs and their experiences with other parents. Finally, my personal experience also added motivation. I was a volunteer teacher for a Saturday Korean cultural school in Koreatown, Los Angeles for nearly two years between January, 2011 and February, 2013. Because this school focused on culture, rather than language, the school had children from diverse backgrounds, including a child whose father or mother was of Korean descent, a child who was born in South Korea but migrated to the U.S., a second- or third-generation Korean child who was not familiar with Korean culture and language, and a non-Korean child who lived in the neighborhood of the school. Exposure to this diverse group in a typical immigrant community made me ponder over several issues among immigrant families,
and language education was one of the salient problems that immigrant parents addressed. While interacting with these parents and children, I became more interested in what language instructional model would be effective for serving children from immigrant families.

A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the U.S. as an Educational Right

Despite the lengthy history of immigration in the United States, it was not until a half-century ago that the nation stipulated the 1964 Civil Rights Act that outlawed discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, interpreted to encompass language. Starting with this legislation, the educational discrimination of non-English speaking students became unconstitutional in the United States. However, education for language-minority students was not discussed sufficiently even at the pinnacle of the civil rights era; fifty years ago not many people envisioned this diverse society of the current United States. In fact, the nation at that time was predominantly white with slightly over 10% of African Americans; Latinos and Asians represented a miniscule minority in the U.S. (Orfield, 2014).

The U.S. demographics changed substantially after the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act. As immigrant groups became diversified by including people from various continents, such as Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, the educational right of the children from immigrant families gradually emerged. For example, the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA) was enacted as the first federal legislation to pay attention to the needs of language-minority students, although it was symbolic, in general (Gándara et al., 2010). Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed the educational right of language-minority students in the *Lau v. Nichols* case (1974); the decision elucidated that non-English speaking children have equal access to the same curriculum as their English-speaking peers.
Additionally, in response to desegregation efforts, enrolling native speakers of English in bilingual programs was encouraged and championed by judicial actions. For example, in *Serna v. Portales* (1972) and *United States v. Texas Education Agency* (1972), the courts decreed that bilingual programs enroll native English speakers to alleviate discriminatory effects on English language learners (de Jong & Howard, 2009). Furthermore, in the *Plyler v. Doe* case (1982), the Supreme Court declared that all children in the U.S. have the equal right to public education regardless of students’ immigration status, and as a result of this major decision, the educational right for every student, including a considerable number of undocumented immigrants and language-minority students, was guaranteed. However, a systematic institutional support for non-English speaking students did not continue. Even during the civil rights era, bilingual education for language-minority students was discussed mainly by focusing on the educational right issue, and their languages were not recognized as cultural assets that society needed to promote and maintain.

Antagonism against bilingual education increased in the end of 1970s, and simultaneously, the English-only movement spread, which could be interpreted in the similar context of the Americanization movement of the early twentieth century based on the anti-immigration sentiment (Wiley & Wright, 2004). The surge of immigrants also strengthened the hostile atmosphere toward bilingual and multicultural education, and it has lasted since the 1980s (Gándara et al., 2010). Furthermore, three states, including California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, implemented English-only policies for English learners. For instance, in 1998, the majority of voters in California passed Proposition 227, an initiative that severely restricted the use of another language other than English for instructing English learners. Following California, Arizona passed Proposition 203 in 2000, and Question 2 of Massachusetts was
legislated in 2002. Consequently, the statewide emphasis on English-only instruction has caused controversy between advocates and opponents of bilingual education (Valdez, 2001), and children in these states have attended schools where language diversity and bilingualism are defined as a problem and a political challenge (Combs et al., 2005; Gándara et al., 2000; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Álvarez, 2000).

**Trend of Two-Way Immersion Education in the U.S.**

*Two-way immersion (TWI) programs,* also referred as *dual immersion programs* or *dual language programs* in the United States, enroll language-minority students (e.g., Spanish-speaking students) and language-majority students (e.g., English-dominant students); the two groups must be integrated for a significant portion of instructional time during which content and language instruction takes place in a major language (e.g. English) and a partner language (e.g. Spanish). Although a further explanation of the terminology regarding dual language programs and TWI programs will be presented in the following chapter, I will use ‘TWI programs’ in this dissertation study to refer to dual language programs that include both language-minority students and language-majority students in the same classroom. If a program does not enroll the two language groups or if student enrollment information is not clear, I will use ‘dual language programs,’ which is a general terminology to refer to the program.

Despite the chronic debates over bilingualism, TWI programs have received increasing attention in the past decades in California as well as in the nation (Gándara & Orfield, 2010). In the last 40 years, for instance, the number of TWI programs that teach literacy and academic content in English and a partner language rose continuously, with closely 450 programs...
documented (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2011a). However, because the TWI directory of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) was generated in the self-reporting method and has not been updated since 2011, the actual number of TWI programs in the United States must be greater than 450 (Morales & Aldana, 2010). To exemplify, the CAL directory includes only 25 TWI programs in California, but the state alone reports 201 TWI programs at its website (California Department of Education, 2014). In fact, the state’s directory is also self-selected and evidently includes incorrect information about TWI programs in California, as the California Department of Education also claims there are approximately 320 immersion programs in the state (Yang Su, 2012).

**Why Two-Way Immersion Programs Flourish?**

Considering unfavorable views toward bilingual education in some parts of the United States, the increasing trend of TWI programs across the nation is a paradoxical phenomenon. The steady demand for TWI education reflects (1) growing interests in TWI instruction and the increasing significance of bilingual abilities, (2) changes in views toward bilingualism, (3) benefits of both English speakers and ELLs in the program, and (4) the continuous inflow of immigrants.

First, the interests in TWI programs and the awareness of the importance of bilingualism have grown. For instance, a statewide effort has been made to introduce TWI programs for public education in Utah. In order to address the needs for bilingual abilities in business, government, and education, an initiative that created funding for implementing TWI programs

---

1 Data from the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) need to be used with caution, because there was a substantial difference in the number of TWI programs between CAL and California Department of Education (CDE). For example, according to CAL, there were about 25 schools in California that offer dual language programs, whereas CDE reported 201 schools (California Department of Education, 2014). Moreover, CDE data did not reflect the most current data, either, which also differed from the data that individual school districts distributed (e.g., Los Angeles Unified School District and Glendale Unified School District). Thus, readers should be careful when referring to the CAL data, which need crosschecking with state data or district data.

2 184 Spanish programs, 8 Koreans programs, 8 Mandarin/Cantonese programs, and 1 Japanese program.
was passed in Utah in 2008. Aiming to enroll 30,000 students by 2015, five different immersion programs (Chinese, French, German, Spanish, and Portuguese) have been implemented on the 50/50 model basis. The state of Utah expects students in the programs to benefit from the immersion instruction in terms of attaining high proficiency in two languages, achieving academic excellence, developing cognitive skills, raising cultural competency, and becoming prepared for the global community in the 21st century (Utah State Office of Education, 2008).

Even under the restrictive English-only language policies in some states, there were ongoing efforts to preserve TWI programs. For instance, some schools in California (e.g., Edison Language Academy in the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and Gates Elementary in the Saddleback Valley Unified School District) obtained charter statuses in order to maintain their TWI programs without having to submit waivers for ELLs under Proposition 227. These schools were located in relatively affluent areas where parents were keenly interested in their child’s education, but there was another school in the Los Angeles Unified School District, which successfully protected its TWI program. For example, the TWI program at Grand View Elementary — located in an area with the high concentration of immigrant and low-income populations — survived due to the school’s dedicated staff and parents who supported bilingual education for their children (Linton & Franklin, 2010). In spite of policy obstacles and debates over bilingual education, these continuous efforts to preserve current TWI programs or to newly implement TWI programs reflect not only interests in TWI programs but also major changes in views toward bilingualism.

Second, with respect to changes in views on bilingualism, research has presented that parents in TWI programs clearly perceive the advantages and potential of the programs and value bilingual abilities; parents’ positive views on bilingual education motivate both English-speaking
parents and parents of a partner language group to enroll their child in TWI programs or bilingual education programs (e.g., Gerena, 2011; Linton & Franklin, 2010; Schmidt, 2007; Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Shannon & Milian, 2002; Lee & Jeong, 2013; Lao, 2004; Lee, 2003; Young & Tran, 1999; Shin & Kim, 1998; Shin & Lee, 1996). In fact, bilingualism, in general, is symbolic of an educated person, and Lessow-Hurley (2005) comments this is why TWI instruction is often adopted by private education sectors. Moreover, when the first immersion instruction was implemented at St. Lambert in Canada nearly a century ago, a group of parents with social and economic resources played a crucial role in submitting a proposal to the local school board. (Hernández-Chávez, 1984). As this case shows, promoting bilingualism for children is one of the key educational interests among middle class or upper-middle class parents in Canada. In the United States, too, educated Cuban refugees played a significant role in introducing TWI education for both Cuban children and English-speaking children in Miami in 1963. Also, statistics for the Hispanic population show that Latinos with higher education are more likely to be bilingual in English and Spanish (Hakimzadeh & Cohn, 2007), implying that the more educated Latinos are, the more likely their children are to be raised in bilingual settings.

Third, unlike other bilingual programs used in the U.S., two-way immersion programs are the only instructional model that offers bilingual education for native English speakers. When the Canadian immersion model was imported to the U.S., immersion programs in the U.S. replicated the Canadian one-way immersion setting where monolingual speakers were instructed in a target language. However, the introduction of two-way immersion instruction — in which both language-minority students and English-speaking students are educated in the same classroom — expanded students populations served in the programs. Instructed in the same classroom, neither group has to cede its educational right; rather, they benefit from each other in that language-
minority students receive quality instruction and native speakers of English learn a second language (García, 2005).

Fourth, a quality instruction model is required to serve a growing number of immigrants, and two-way immersion instruction is considered a compelling alternative to the traditional bilingual education models (Lambert 1990; Christian, 1994; Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Currently, one-in-four children in the U.S. is from an immigrant family (Nwosu, Batalova, & Auclair, 2014), and most of these families speak non-English languages at home (Capps et al., 2005). Moreover, ELLs also increased 56% between 1995 and 2005 (Batalova, Fix, & Murray, 2007), and the academic achievement of this increasing ELL population is influential on the education level of the country as well (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). Therefore, ensuring quality education for immigrant children and ELLs is associated with escalating the overall education level of the U.S., and TWI instruction shows great potential to instruct language-minority students.

In regard to the increasing immigration trend, we also need to pay special attention to the bipolar features of educational backgrounds of the immigrant population. In comparison to native-born Americans, current immigrants comprise more educated and less educated groups. Intriguingly, immigrants with high-level of schooling are mainly from East and South Asian nations, while immigrants with less education come disproportionately from Latin American countries (García, 2005). Although the Hispanic immigrant community is relatively less educated compared to native-born Americans and Asian immigrants, a recent survey result presents that the Latino population prioritizes education for their children as the most important issue (Krogstad, 2014). The result implies that providing high-quality education is the most significant matter for Latino parents as well. Considering the inflow of highly educated immigrant population from Asian countries and Latino community’s avid interests in education,
TWI programs can be considered a competent instructional model where language-minority students develop bilingual abilities and interact with native speakers of English while receiving high quality instruction.

**Diversifying Partner Languages for TWI Programs**

Since TWI programs started to be implemented in the United States, Spanish has been the most common partner languages for immersion instruction (Christian, 1996). Yet, as immigrant populations became diverse and interests in dual immersion instruction increased for the past decades, other partner languages also emerged, such as Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Portuguese, and Italian. Of various language programs, Asian language programs, in particular, have been on the rise in recent years (CAL, 2011b). For earlier Asian language immersion education, Japanese and Hawaiian languages were used; however, the appearance of other Asian languages — for example, Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Vietnamese — expanded the diversity of immersion programs. Of course, the trend reflects the growing number of Asian immigrants, but given that two-way immersion programs attract not only Asian immigrant parents but also English speakers and non-Asian populations, the phenomenon seems noteworthy, implying changes in views on bilingual education and interests in Asian languages or Asian attitudes toward education.

**Rise of Asian Americans in the U.S.**

The growing number of TWI programs using Asian languages manifests the burgeoning inflow of Asians immigrants, especially in the last ten years. In general, immigrants in the U.S. were predominantly Latinos for several decades, but recently, the number of immigrants from Asian countries has outnumbered Hispanic immigrants. For example, of newly arrived immigrants in 2000, roughly 60% were Latinos, and 20% were Asians. However, in 2010, 36% were Asians, and 31% were Latinos (Pew Research Center, 2013a).
Compared to the general public in the U.S., Asian Americans are the highest-income and best-educated group, but there is a wide variety among Asian groups. With respect to Asian population, there are slightly over 17 million Asian immigrants in the U.S. Asians in the country also tend to reside in the West in comparison to the overall American populations; approximately half of Asians live in Western states. As for countries of origin, Chinese immigrants are the largest group, which comprises 23% of the Asian group. Filipino (19.7%), Indian (18.4%), Vietnamese (10.0%), and Korean (9.9%) immigrants consist of the rest of the Asian population. Yet, considering the overall populations of countries of origin, South Korea is the top sending country of immigrants in the U.S. For example, as of 2014 China’s approximate population is 1.4 billion, while South Korea’s population is closely 50 million. Given that the South Korean population is merely one-thirtieth of the Chinese population, a considerable number of Koreans have migrated to the United States in comparison to other Asian countries.

If we look at the features of current South Korea, the substantial influx of Koreans to the U.S. seems understandable. Like other Asian countries, South Korea’s modern and contemporary history has contained various hardships and political turmoil at the international and domestic levels, such as Japanese colonialism, occupation by the U.S. and Russia (then the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Korean War, military dictatorship, and continuous democracy movements. In spite of a series of historical ordeals, South Korea has accomplished remarkable success in its economy and democratization. The country has played a pivotal role in the Asian economy since the late 1980s and has become a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the G-20, which is a forum for the governments and central bank governors from 20 major economies. In addition, the country stands out for the educational performance of young students. For example, the results of the 2012 Programme for
International Student Assessment (PISA) — in which 15-year-old students in nearly 70 nations participated — indicate that South Korean students were ranked third in mathematics, reading, and science, following Chinese and Singaporean students (Schleicher, 2014). South Korea’s economic growth and intense interests in education are also reflected in the characteristics of Korean immigrants in the U.S.

Characteristics of Korean Immigrants in the U.S.

Koreans in the U.S. have prominent characteristics that distinguish the group from other Asian populations in terms of educational backgrounds, views on their heritage language (Korean), and relations with other racial groups.

First, the Korean population in the U.S. consists of highly educated people and skilled workers, and Korean parents in the U.S. are known for putting high pressure on their children’s education. In a recent survey, closely 40% of Asian Americans, on average, responded that Asian parents put a great amount of pressure on children’s academic performance in school, whereas 60% of Koreans do on their children (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Korean parents’ emphasis on children’s education can be associated with their own education levels (Zhou & Kim, 2007). For instance, the percentage of Korean Americans with a bachelor’s degree or higher is 53%, which is overwhelmingly higher than the average value for the U.S. population (28%). Moreover, 70% of recent Korean immigrants who entered the U.S. in the last 10 years have a bachelor’s degree or higher, which is markedly higher compared to earlier Korean immigrants (Pew Research Center, 2013a).

Starting in the 1960s, skilled professionals looked for better opportunities outside South Korea because job opportunities were not sufficient for skilled workers in the country despite the rapid growth in the economy. Many migrated to the U.S. and founded small businesses. For
example, Korean immigrants have the highest self-employment rate among Asian immigrants in the U.S. Moreover, unlike other Asian groups — except Indian immigrants — who usually arrive on family-sponsored visas, nearly half of Korean immigrants who received green cards in 2011 were on the employer sponsorship basis, which requires advanced skills in professional fields (Pew Research Center, 2013b).

Second, Korean Americans stand out for their least positive intergroup relations among Asian populations. In a recent survey about Asians’ views on intergroup relations, the share of Korean respondents who state that they get along with very well with individual racial groups is 13% for whites; 14% for other Asians; 3% for Latinos, and 4% for African Americans (Pew Research Center, 2013a). This result is much lower in comparison to overall Asians’ responses to the same question about intergroup relations with: whites (26%), other Asians (24%), Latinos (16%), and African Americans (15%) (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Koreans are also distinguished from other Asians in terms of their exclusive social networks; nearly 60% of Koreans are likely to have all or most of their friends from the same racial group, which is three times higher than are their Japanese counterparts (21%).

Third, in comparison to other Asians in the U.S., Koreans address the highest interest in their children’s speaking the heritage language (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Over three-fifths of Korean immigrants state that it is very significant to them that their offspring living in the U.S. speak the Korean language. In general, second-generation Asian Americans are less likely to retain their ancestral languages, especially compared to their Hispanic counterparts. A survey result demonstrates that nearly 80% of second-generation Hispanics can speak Spanish either very well or pretty well, while merely 41% of second-generation Asians report that they can speak the language used in their country of origin either very well or pretty well (Pew Research
Center, 2013b). Koreans are not an exception. Notwithstanding the strong desire to maintain the home language for future generations, Korean Americans experience the attrition of their native language (Lee & Shin, 2008; Lee, 2002; Shin, 2005). To exemplify, the analysis of American Community Survey (ACS) data demonstrates that an overwhelming number of second-generation Koreans were English monolinguals; 57% of male respondents and 53% for female respondents in the ACS data were monolingual English speakers (Kim, 2013). In contrast, 38% of Korean males and 43% of Korean females responded that they were fluent bilingual speakers in Korean and English (Kim, 2013). Accordingly, the Korean community is encountering the situation where they need to make tangible efforts to raise awareness of learning the heritage language for future generations of Koreans.

In conclusion, Korean immigrants in the U.S. are distinguished from other Asian immigrant groups in terms of high educational background, strong emphasis on children’s education, ardent desire to maintain the heritage language, and relatively less positive intergroup relations. These characteristics may be reflected in some ways in the Korean TWI program in which (1) students from various language backgrounds are integrated, including Korean speakers, English speakers, and other language speakers, (2) English and Korean are equally important as the means for literacy and content instruction, and (3) all students seek academic excellence through immersion education.

**Limitations of Current Research on Parents of Students in Two-Way Immersion Programs**

As TWI programs have increased across the nation, so have the interests in research on the programs. Of various topics in TWI programs, one strand of research has identified parents in the programs in regard to a wide variety of topics, such as demographic and social characteristics of the parents, reasons to enroll, perspectives and attitudes toward bilingual education, satisfaction
or concerns regarding the programs, and parental involvement. However, given the vast majority of TWI programs in the U.S. offer Spanish-English instruction, the previous research has exclusively focused on Spanish TWI programs to explore parents (e.g., Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Parkes, 2008; Gerena, 2010; Schmidt, 2007; Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Shannon & Milian, 2002; Ramos, 2007; Ryan, et al., 2010; Whiting, & Feinauer, 2011) and therefore has not sufficiently examined Asian language immersion programs that have a relatively short history compared to Spanish or French and English programs in the U.S.

Additionally, much of the previous research that investigates parents is based on small-scale qualitative studies. Although there are some quantitative studies that explore parents’ characteristics and attitudes based on survey methodology, they focus on Spanish-English TWI programs (e.g., Shannon & Milian, 2002; Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Parkes, 2008; Parkes & Ruth, 2011). Also, the majority of research investigates one single school; a handful of studies include multiple school sites (e.g., Shannon & Milian, 2002; Parkes, 2008; Parkes & Ruth, 2011). With respect to Asian TWI programs, virtually no research studies explore parents in the programs by encompassing multiple school sites located in different neighborhoods, even though there are a few studies that explore parents in bilingual programs, which are different from TWI programs (e.g. Lee, 2005; Lao, 2004; Shin & Lee, 1996; Young & Tran, 1999). Especially, considering the escalating immigration trend of Asians and the rising interests in TWI programs, it is necessary to explore Asian language programs in depth to diagnose who the programs serve, so that research can address the specific needs of both language-minority students and language-majority students in Asian language TWI programs.
**Intent of the Dissertation**

In order to expand the scope of research on TWI instruction and to add information on Asian language TWI programs, I explore the Korean TWI program with a special emphasis on parents. Specifically, I examine who choose Korean TWI programs and what motivates them to enroll; I then delve into parents’ views on Korean TWI programs, including their satisfaction with language development and concerns over receiving instruction in two languages. Next, I investigate integration issues of children and parents, respectively because integration is one of the key factors that make TWI instruction successful. Integration is also closely associated with the development of multicultural competency of children. I then examine overall parental participation in Korean TWI programs and explore how parents evaluate the programs. With respect to these topics of interest, I compare Korean parents to non-Korean parents to examine differences between the two groups and perform multiple regression analyses to uncover complex relationships among several parent-related factors. The primary questions that guide this dissertation study are:

1. What are the general demographic features of parents of students in Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs in Southern California?
2. What motivates these parents to choose Korean TWI programs?
3. To what degree are these parents satisfied with their child’s language development in English and in Korean, respectively?
4. To what degree are these parents satisfied with integration among children and among parents?
5. To what degree are these parents involved in school?
6. Overall, how do these parents evaluate their child’s Korean TWI programs?
7. Regarding the questions above, how do Korean parents and non-Korean parents differ?

This study includes nearly 450 parents of children in seven elementary schools’ Korean TWI programs in the Los Angeles area. Of the participants, nearly one-quarter were non-Korean parents, and there was a wide range among them in terms of native languages and countries of origin. I administered survey questionnaires in English, Korean, and Spanish and collected data between December, 2013 and April, 2014.

Outline of the Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation comprises nine chapters. Chapter 2 provides an overview of TWI programs, including program history and instructional types. I also review literature on parents in TWI programs and critical comments on TWI programs. I then present theoretical perspectives that frame this study. Chapter 3 lays out the methodological approaches and analytic strategies that this study employs. This chapter also describes variables used for this study and presents preliminary analysis results, including correlations and path analysis by using the variables of interest. I then describe the research contexts of this study.

Chapters 4 through 9 present the findings from the Korean-English TWI program parent survey data. Chapter 4 explores who choose the program by examining parent demographics. Chapter 5 explains what motivates parents to enroll. This section also includes comments from an open-ended question for non-Korean parents regarding how Korean-English TWI programs can be beneficial for their heritage maintenance. Chapter 6 demonstrates parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development in English as well as in Korean. In the next chapter, I describe findings about the integration issue in Korean-English TWI programs. Chapter 8 presents findings about parental involvement in their child’s school and in the TWI program. Finally, Chapter 9 demonstrates how parents assess their child’s TWI programs, which can be a
useful indicator of the program performance. Chapter 10 summarizes the findings presented in this study and discusses the study’s limitations and implications.
In this chapter, I explore literature on parents of students in two-way immersion (TWI) programs and theoretical frameworks that guide this dissertation study. Before I present the previous literature, I examine general features of bilingual education programs to identify how TWI instruction differs from traditional bilingual programs. Next, I discuss a brief overview of a dual language program in terms of its types of instruction, history, and development. I then summarize previous research that examines parents of students in TWI programs and review critical comments on TWI programs to be aware of the underlying challenges in the TWI programs. Finally, I outline three theoretical perspectives that frame this study: theoretical underpinnings of TWI programs, parental involvement as social capital, and intergroup contact theory.

**Different Types of Bilingual Education**

In light of the continued debate over bilingual education and the shifting attitudes toward bilingualism over time, it is evident that bilingual education has a long history in the United States. Although a legal discussion about bilingual education for language-minority students began in the 1960s during the civil rights movement era, initial records regarding the use of non-English languages for religious services, community newspapers, and even school instruction date back to the eighteenth century (Ovando, 2003). In the long history of bilingual education, different instruction models were suggested depending on goals of the programs, student characteristics, student grades served, length of student participation, teacher qualifications, and instructional materials. Boyson et al. (1999) offer five different bilingual education models used in the U.S. schooling context, though it is important to note that this is only one typology and others differ in specific ways: (1) sheltered instruction in English, (2) newcomer program
instruction, (3) transitional bilingual education, (4) developmental bilingual education, and (5) TWI education.

**Sheltered Instruction in English**

The *sheltered instruction (SI) program* is developed for English Language Learners (ELLs) in all grades with limited or no English proficiency. In the program, ELLs are expected to acquire academic English proficiency as well as understanding of American culture. The program lasts for one to three years, and the academic goal for ELLs is the same as for other students in regular programs. Teachers of this program need English as a Second Language (ESL) certifications, and bilingual teachers are preferable, but not mandatory. Mainstream teachers who received the SI training also can participate in this program. Instructional materials used for the SI program are in English, simplified to meet the linguistic needs and the cultural backgrounds of ELLs, and the program does not normally use the secondary language for instruction.

**Newcomer Program Instruction**

The *newcomer program* is designed for newly arrived students to help them develop English proficiency and adjust to different experiences and expectations of the U.S. schooling. Compared to other bilingual programs, the newcomer program is relatively short, which lasts for one to three semesters. This program is open to students in all grades, but the main target population is students at the middle-school and high-school levels. Students in this program have limited or no English proficiency and are from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. The academic goal for students is varied from school to school. Like the SI program, bilingual teachers are preferable, but not required; however, training in SI is compulsory for teachers. Mainstream teachers participate in this program, and they also need to receive the SI training. Instruction takes place in student’s first language (L1) or in English with appropriate modifications.
**Transitional Bilingual Education**

As its name stands for, the *transitional bilingual program* is developed for helping students transfer to English mainstream programs. The program is available to students at the primary or elementary levels, but students need to be enrolled between kindergarten and second grade. In this program, students with no or limited English proficiency from the same language background are expected to develop English proficiency and to raise their understanding of American culture, and the instruction usually lasts for two to four years, on average. Like the sheltered instruction and the newcomer program, mainstream teachers participate in this program but must receive training in sheltered instruction in advance. Teachers in this program are required to hold certificates in bilingual education. Students are instructed in L1 and English, and English materials are adapted to students’ English proficiency.

**Developmental Bilingual Education**

The *developmental Bilingual Education* program is designed to develop bilingual abilities of students from the same language background and to help them integrate into the American culture as well as maintain home/heritage culture at the same time. Even though students have no or limited English proficiency, the academic goal for this program is the same as for regular programs. The program is open to students in all grades, but it is desirable for students to enter this program from kindergarten to second grade and receive instruction in this program for 12 years from kindergarten through twelfth grade in order to acquire bilingual abilities. Teachers in the developmental bilingual program need to have bilingual-multicultural certificates with bilingual proficiency. Instruction in this program takes place in L1 and English. Like other bilingual programs mentioned earlier, English materials are modified depending on students’
English proficiency. This program is sometimes classified under the immersion instruction category by some scholars (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011).

**Dual Language Education**

The dual language program – also referred as a *two-way immersion program* – is developed based on the research-based results in second language acquisition and cognitive psychology (Lindholm, 1990). The language goals of this program are to develop full bilingualism and biliteracy for both language-minority students and language-majority students, and at the same time students are encouraged to integrate into the mainstream American culture as well as to appreciate other cultures. This program has the same academic goal as other regular programs and serves students in grades K-6, K-8, or K-12. For receiving TWI instruction, students need to be enrolled between kindergarten and first grade, so that they can stay in the program for at least six years — preferably K-12. Mainstream teachers who received special training can participate in this program, but their participation varies from school to school. Teachers in this program need to obtain bilingual/immersion certifications with multicultural training, and they should be bilingual in a major language and a partner language of the program. Instruction occurs in English and a partner language (e.g., Spanish, French, Chinese, Korean, etc.), and language instruction takes place through regular curriculum content. In some settings (e.g. *side-by-side model*), students are instructed by two monolingual teachers (e.g. an English-speaking teacher and a Spanish-speaking teacher) (CAL, 2011c).

In conclusion, unlike other bilingual education programs serving for merely language-minority students, TWI education is the only bilingual instruction model that can serve native English speakers and ELLs, while pursuing bilingualism and biliteracy for all students. In addition, this program concentrates not only on development of bilingual abilities but also on
appreciation of diverse cultures as well as integration of language-minority students and language-majority students. Because TWI education is distinctive from the previous bilingual programs described earlier and is considered the most effective bilingual education model for both language-minority students and language-majority students, I further examine this program in depth to explore the types and history of the program.

Dual Language Instruction: Evolving Bilingual Education Model

Types of Dual Language Instruction

Dual language programs differ in terms of student populations by language, program goals, when to initiate immersion, and the amount of instruction using a partner language. For example, Fortune and Tedick (2008) identify three dual language program types: one-way immersion, two-way immersion, and indigenous language immersion. On top of these three types, Tedick, Christian, and Fortune (2011) add a developmental bilingual education program as the fourth type of dual language instruction — explained earlier as one of bilingual education programs used in the U.S. — and claim that the program is similar to one-way foreign language immersion in that students in the developmental bilingual education program are from the same language background and pursue bilingualism and biliteracy in the program.

First, in regard to student populations, there are two kinds of dual language programs: (1) the one-way immersion program (also known as enrichment immersion or foreign language immersion) and (2) the two-way immersion program. The one-way immersion program enrolls a linguistically homogeneous group (e.g., all native speakers of English) to develop bilingualism in students’ first language and a partner language, whereas the two-way immersion program consists of linguistically heterogeneous groups (e.g., English speakers and French speakers),
seeking both groups to become bilingual and biliterate in two languages and to promote cross-cultural understanding of each other (Fortune & Tedick, 2008).

Second, from the international perspective, another significant type of dual language education is *indigenous language immersion*, which focuses on the reinvigoration and maintenance of endangered languages and cultures. Indigenous language immersion is found worldwide, such as in Oceania, Scandinavia, North America, and South America, and the instruction is organized through one-way immersion or two-way immersion depending upon a local community’s student population (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune 2011).

Third, there are three types of instruction models depending on when to initiate immersion instruction: *early immersion*, *mid-immersion*, and *late immersion programs*. In the early immersion model, students are instructed in a target language from the first day of his or her schooling (e.g., kindergarten or first grade). Early immersion can be also specified as partial immersion or total immersion based on the amount of time spent on immersion instruction in students’ second language (L2). Next, mid-immersion and late immersion programs do not start immersion instruction until fourth or fifth grade and until sixth or seventh grade, respectively, so that children can fully develop their first language by the time when immersion instruction begins (Swain & Johnson, 1997).

Finally, as for the amount of instruction using a partner language, there are two models of dual language education: the 50/50 model and the 90/10 model. In the 50/50 model, a major language (e.g., English) and a partner language (e.g., Spanish) are equally used for instruction at all grade levels. In contrast, in the 90/10 model, 90% of the instruction is devoted in a partner language usually for earlier two years, and the use of the partner language gradually decreases to 50% by third grade, in general (CAL, 2011c).
**Dual Language Education as an Umbrella Term**

As the various forms of dual language programs reflect, there should be distinct terminologies to refer to different types of dual language education. However, according to CAL (2011c), dual language education is used as an umbrella term that generally encompasses other terminologies, such as one-way immersion (or *enrichment immersion / foreign language immersion*), two-way immersion, and indigenous language immersion (or *heritage language immersion*). Nonetheless, strictly speaking, individual programs differ from each other in terms of language goals and student population, as characterized above. Of these terminologies, in particular, dual language education is considered a synonym of *two-way immersion (TWI) education*, but CAL specifies that a two-way immersion program is a dual language program that includes both language-majority students and language-minority students, with both groups representing at least one-third of the program enrollment.

Despite the distinction *dual language education* is often used synonymously with *two-way immersion education* in reality, especially in the United States. For example, one district that this study examined uses both ‘dual language programs’ and ‘two-way immersion programs’ as official terms, while the other district uses ‘dual immersion programs.’ Also, California Department of Education uses ‘two-way immersion programs’ as an official term to refer to dual language programs in the state.

In this dissertation, I follow the terminology that other researchers use for their studies and reports but use ‘Korean two-way immersion (TWI)’ programs to refer to Korean dual language programs that this study examined. The programs enroll both English speakers and Korean speakers (partner-language speakers). Although the ratio of English-speaking students to
Korean speakers differed from school to school, both groups represented roughly at least one-third of the total enrollment, which met the criterion of the TWI program.

**Emergence of Dual Language Programs**

TWI education commenced approximately 50 years ago in Canada and the United States. Although dual language instruction emerged around the same period of time in the two countries, there are differences in terms of the motives to introduce dual language instruction and the context of developing the program. Furthermore, there is a distinction in terms of sociopolitical and socioeconomic status of participants in immersion programs between Canada and the United States.

**Immersion Education in Canada**

There were five noteworthy factors that made immersion education successful in Canada: (1) parental needs for solid immersion education, (2) institutional support in terms of funds and legislations, (3) research institutions’ consistent interests in immersion education, (4) English speakers’ growing awareness of the importance of French as economic, political, and social means, and (5) concentration on one single language program, which was French.

Canada became interested in dual language education prior to the U.S., and the program was launched due to a parent-driven proposal to the local school board. The original form of dual language education started in the name of *immersion education* based on an experimental attempt by a group of Anglophone parents in Quebec, Canada during the mid-1960s (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). Speaking French was crucial to survival for English-speaking people of the community in Quebec where the official language was French ³. Yet, French as a Second Language (FSL) classes in school that focused on grammar and rote memorization were not
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³ Still, French is the official language of Quebec.
sufficient enough for students to attain French proficiency in order to interact with native
speakers of French in real life.

In this situation where English-speaking people were acutely aware of the evolving
significance of learning French, a group of parents at St. Lambert in Quebec began to meet to
search for alternative models of bilingual instruction and came to consult with scholars in
bilingualism at McGill University (e.g., Wallace Lambert of the Psychology Department and
Wilder Penfield of the Montreal Neurological Institute). Based on the consultants’ results, the
parents submitted to their school board a proposal that included a dramatic change of the then
FSL classes to French immersion classes where English-speaking children were instructed in all
French from the first day of their kindergarten (Swain & Johnson, 1997). In the classes, the
amount of time spent for French declined as grades increased, so that the ratio of the use of
French to English became balanced by sixth grade. To be precise, the model used for the first
immersion education at St. Lambert was a one-way immersion program (or enrichment
immersion), in which students from the same language background (English) were instructed in
L2 (French).

In the late 1960s, immersion education in Canada was strengthened by the support of the
Canada’s federal government and research-based results. Additionally, the economic, political
and social importance of knowledge of French became more salient among middle- and upper-
middle-class Anglophone Canadians (Swain & Johnson, 1997). First, the federal government
took systematic actions to support immersion education, such as legislating the Official
Languages Act, appointing a Commissioner of Official Languages, and supporting funds for
research on immersion education and dissemination of the program information. At the same
time, the success of the immersion program at St. Lambert was widespread across the country
through media and academic journals. As a result of this institutional support and good reputation of St. Lambert’s program, the immersion education began to be implemented by numerous schools in Canada, although there were some variations in terms of instruction formats (e.g., early immersion, mid-immersion, and late immersion depending on when to start French instruction). Consequently, French immersion became popular at a rapid rate between the late 1970s and the early 1980s, and by the late 1990s, closely 7% of students in Canada received immersion instruction (Swain & Johnson, 1997). Furthermore, as the number of immersion programs has grown, so have the research interests in immersion instruction. For instance, Cummins (1991) states that there were approximately 1,000 research studies regarding immersion education accumulated by the 1980s in Canada alone. The success of immersion education in Canada also inspired the U.S., but dual language programs in the U.S. were developed in different ways from Canada, which will be examined below.

**Immersion Education in the United States**

During the 1960s and 1970s, immersion education was spread nationwide in Canada based on parents’ increasing perception of the importance of French language acquisition and the Canada’s federal government’s financial and legal support for immersion programs. Around the same time, immersion education was initiated in the United States as well. First, immersion programs in the U.S. were developed to meet the needs of language-minority students from non-English speaking families. Also, inspired by the Canadian immersion instruction, people became interested in immersion education for teaching a second language or heritage language. Finally, immersion instruction was employed as part of efforts to assuage segregation issues, which were sometimes driven by parents voluntarily or by districts. However, in contrast to the Canadian example, the U.S. was in quite a different situation when initiating and developing dual language
programs. Specifically, the institutional support for bilingual education was scarce, and the general public’s perception toward bilingualism was not favorable.

First, in the 1960s bilingual education started to surface as one of the civil rights agendas in the U.S. to address the needs of language-minority students who spoke another language other than English. Accordingly, immersion education was paid attention to as one of the forms of bilingual education. For example, educated Cuban refugees in Florida who escaped from the 1954 Cuban revolution needed a program where their children could receive instruction in their own language, which was Spanish. Targeting middle-class population, Coral Way Elementary in Dade County, Florida launched a bilingual program in 1963 that served both Cuban children and non-Spanish speaking children, seeking to help every student in the program become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural (Christian, 1994), and the program was “neither compensatory nor remedial.” (Lessow-Hurley, 2005, p. 8).

Second, in the early 1970s some English-speaking parents started to be interested in bilingual education, especially in the form of two-way immersion where English-speaking children and language-minority children are instructed together in the same classroom to help both groups become bilingual and biliterate in two languages. These parents, who were usually well-educated English-speaking parents living in university communities, considered a two-way immersion program to be an effective instruction model to teach their child a second language (Genesee & Gándara, 1999). For example, James F. Oyster Bilingual Elementary School in Washington D.C. implemented a two-way immersion program in 1971 and enrolled both English-speaking students and Spanish-speaking students (Christian, 1994). Including Oyster Elementary, most TWI programs at that time placed strong emphasis on fostering cross-cultural understanding as the program’s chief objective (Genesee & Gándara, 1999).
Additionally, inspired by the Canadian enrichment immersion, immersion education as a way to teach a heritage language began in the 1970s as well (Lambert, 1984). For example, the first French immersion program started to be offered in Montgomery County, Maryland in 1974 (Institut français, 2014). Other schools randomly selected from predominantly Franco-American areas in Maine also implemented French immersion instruction in the 1970s, in which one-third of curriculum was instructed in French (Lambert, 1984). These French immersion programs showed great potential of dual language instruction in the United States. After a few years’ trial, a study that followed up Franco-American students in this immersion program reports that the students academically outperformed their counterparts in control classes who did not receive immersion instruction. Furthermore, the results present that the students became more positive in their identity in terms of being both American and French (Lambert, Giles, & Picard, 1975).

Third, dual language programs were employed to ameliorate school segregation by race and language (Lessow-Hurley, 2005; Wilson, 2011). Inspired by the Canadian enrichment immersion model, starting in the early 1970s, some U.S. schools implemented immersion programs where monolingual students were immersed in a second language (L2). For instance, the Culver City Spanish immersion program was established in 1971 to instruct English-speaking students in Spanish. This type of enrichment programs originated from voluntary desegregation efforts and worked as “magnets” that attracted various groups of students, including middle-class white students and working-class black students (Lessow-Hurley, 2005). Similar efforts were found in Tucson, Arizona where TWI magnet programs were used to desegregate schools by engaging white students in schools that included a considerable number of language-minority students (Wilson, 2011). Besides, TWI programs were implemented based on the collaborative support of research institutions and school districts to address desegregation efforts. For example,
Edison Language Academy in Santa Monica launched a TWI program in 1986 with the support of the California State Department of Education and the Center for Language Education and Research at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) (Linton & Franklin, 2010).

**Sociopolitical and Sociolinguistic Perceptions toward Immersion Education in Canada and the U.S.**

As examined above, immersion instruction in Canada and the U.S. was developed for different purposes and was implemented in different ways. The way immersion education unfolded in distinctive manners is related to populations served and languages taught in immersion programs. More specifically, the two nations differed in terms of (1) social and political perspectives toward the populations in the programs and (2) the social, political, and economic status of target-language speakers and partner-language speakers. In this sense, it is significant to compare dual language programs in the two countries from sociopolitical and sociolinguistic perspectives to better understand the current situation of dual language instruction in the U.S., in which society is confronting increasing diversity due to the surge of immigrants from various countries.

**Sociopolitical Comparisons**

First, the sociopolitical status of target language speakers in dual immersion instruction in Canada was distinctive from the U.S. Specifically, English-speaking parents who actively led and participated in introducing French dual immersion programs in Canada were members of the majority population (Hernández-Chávez, 1984), and they had ultimate control over educational resources (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). In contrast to the Canadian situation, language-minority populations in the United States were from non-white racial groups, in general, which maintained low social and political resources in comparison to their white counterparts (Hernández-Chávez, 1984).
In addition to the sociopolitical status, the economic status of students in immersion programs in Canada and the U.S. differed. Students in Canadian immersion were mostly from middle-class backgrounds, while it was not the case in the United States (Hernández-Chávez, 1984). Because the driving force stemmed from parents with more sociopolitical and economic power in Canada, the immersion program was developed to satisfy the needs of these parents. In contrast, Hernández-Chávez (1984) asserts the immersion education in the U.S. was designed to instruct the majority in the U.S. society, in other words, for English speakers. Furthermore, students in the Canadian immersion program have more positive views on their own cultural background, whereas language-minority students in the U.S. immersion program may feel that their culture is subordinate to the U.S. culture (Oller & Pearson, 2002).

Moreover, discussions on bilingual education and bilingualism for ethnic minorities in the U.S. have often been interpreted as a threat that can dismantle the national, political, and cultural unity of the United States (Gándara et al., 2010; Linton, 2009; Swain & Lapkin, 2005). The U.S. does not have any official language policy at the federal government level (Gándara et al., 2010; Linton, 2009) unlike its neighboring country, Canada, which maintains both English and French as national languages.

**Sociolinguistic Comparisons**

In addition to sociopolitical aspects of Canada and the U.S. in developing dual immersion instruction, it is equally important to pay attention to sociolinguistic perspectives toward languages used for immersion education in the two countries. In fact, sociolinguistic perceptions are closely related to sociopolitical contexts in that speakers of particular languages are situated in different political and economic statuses (Hernández-Chávez, 1984).
First, French was a language with economic value and was authorized as an official language in Canada, and the language was supported by its government and institutions. Of course, Canada, too, has numerous immigrants from various language backgrounds. However, in Canadian classrooms, none of the languages of the immigrant or indigenous populations was used for immersion instruction; instead, immersion instruction has concentrated on French only (Swain & Lapkin, 2005). Moreover, although English-speaking population was the majority of the country, the French language and culture were fully cultivated in particular regions and communities. Children were also encouraged and lauded to develop their French identity in society, and resources could be accessed with ease by children and those who wanted to know about the French language and culture (Hernández-Chávez, 1984). In contrast to the Canadian situation, partner languages used for immersion instruction in the U.S. were (and still are) subordinate to English, and the non-English languages were neither valued nor approved in the U.S. society. Moreover, non-English languages were considered nonstandard; thus, they were not accepted as a medium for academic learning (Hernández-Chávez, 1984).

In summary, although the Canadian immersion model has been used by English-only advocates to legitimize English immersion for immigrant children, different sociopolitical and sociolinguistic statuses of the partner language groups in dual immersion programs in Canada and the United States, dual language programs were situated and used in different ways in the two countries. Moreover, in the United States, dual language programs were developed in a context where bilingual education was viewed as a “remedial program” for immigrant children. In such a context, it was inevitable that political and social dynamics have affected language education over time.
Emergence of Korean TWI Education in the U.S.

As Wiley (2005) asserts, heritage language education has occurred in various ways (e.g., afterschool or weekend programs), even though it was not explicitly acknowledged. Korean language instruction takes places in multiple communities in the United States. First established in 1906, informal or non-public school Korean heritage language programs have reached nearly 1,200 with approximately 60,000 students enrolled. Compared to other Asian groups, the Korean community has a greater number of heritage language schools due to the community’s strong connection with churches (Min, 2000). In fact, most Korean language programs are affiliated with churches and local communities (Lee & Shin, 2008).

Despite the long history of the informal Korean language programs, the history of Korean TWI programs is relatively short. Korean TWI instruction was first implemented 22 years ago as a public school program in Los Angeles, which has the highest concentration of Korean population in the United States. The program commenced in 1992 by enrolling 30 students in kindergarten at Cahuenga Elementary (Sohn & Merrill, 2008). Following Cahuenga, other schools (e.g., Denker Avenue and Wilton Place) started to implement the Korean TWI programs as well (Merrill, 2002), and currently, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) has nine schools that officially offer Korean TWI programs (LAUSD, 2014).

However, considering the large number of Koreans in the U.S., Korean TWI programs have expanded relatively slowly. In fact, the 2010 U.S. Census data indicate that there are more than 1.4 million people claiming Korean ancestry in the nation, and over one-fifth of them live in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Additionally, the 2011 American Community Survey (ACS) data show that Korean is one of the eight languages spoken by at least one million people in the U.S. More specifically, there are 1.1 million people who speak Korean at home (Ryan, 2013),
and California alone has nearly 350,000 Korean speakers (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Therefore, the relatively small number of Korean-English TWI programs in comparison to a large Korean population raises a question, which could be related to the issue of attrition of the language (Lee & Jeong, 2013; Au & Oh, 2009; Lopez, 1996).

**Parents and TWI Education**

The literature review comprises two sections. First, I explore research on parents of children in TWI programs, including parents’ reasons for choosing a TWI program, their attitudes toward bilingualism, and satisfaction with and concerns over TWI programs. Next, I discuss critical advice on TWI programs and seek to call upon researchers and educators to ensure quality TWI instruction for all students.

**Parents of Students in TWI Programs**

As the number of TWI programs increases continuously, more and more scholars pay attention to parents in TWI programs. A growing body of research examines parents by focusing on different topics, such as parents’ motivations for choosing the program, satisfactions with and concerns over the TWI program. Most research has explored Spanish-English TWI programs (e.g., Parkes & Ruth, 2011; Parkes, 2008; Gerena, 2010; Schmidt, 2007; Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Shannon & Milian, 2002; Ramos, 2007; Ryan, et al., 2010; Whiting, & Feinauer, 2011), whereas there have been a few research studies that surveyed parents of children in Asian bilingual programs, including TWI programs (e.g., Lao, 2004; Lee, 2003; Shin & Kim, 1998; Shin & Lee, 1996; Young & Tran, 1999). For both Spanish TWI programs and non-Spanish bilingual programs, findings are fairly consistent, especially with respect to reasons parents choose the program and their attitudes towards and perceptions of bilingual education.
Nevertheless, concerns raised by parents vary depending upon school contexts and language programs.

Motivations to Enroll

Research on parents of students in TWI programs (hereafter TWI parents) has questioned parents’ reasons and motivations for choosing the program, and the findings seem consistent with the expectations and perceptions of advantages that previous research on bilingual education has demonstrated. Given the growing popularity of TWI instruction across the nation, several studies have investigated TWI programs in different states, such as California, New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, and Utah.

First, in a survey study that included 30 parents of an elementary school’s Spanish TWI program in Southern California, Giacchino-Baker and Piller (2006) report that both English-speaking parents and Spanish-speaking parents responded they chose a Spanish TWI program because they valued bilingual abilities and acknowledged the advantages of bilingualism. Specifically, language-minority parents were more aware of bilingual advantages than were English-speaking parents in terms of reading and writing abilities in two languages, getting a better job in the future, and becoming bilingual in society (Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006). In addition, the motivations that both Spanish-dominant and English-dominant parents stated included being able to speak both languages, being able to read and write both languages, and getting a good job in the future. Preserving a home language and translating for family were significant reasons for Spanish-dominant parents as well (Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006).

Another study examined a newly established Spanish TWI program in Southern California based on the focus group interview method by including eight Spanish-speaking parents, six English-speaking parents, and one Spanish-English bilingual parent. In this study,
Gerena (2010) presents that both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking groups expected advantages of bilingualism in terms of greater job opportunities in the future, global connections, interpersonal relationships, cross-cultural understanding, and societal benefits. The Spanish-dominant group also emphasized the maintenance of home language and culture, which would allow their child to maintain personal contact with their culture, family members, and traditional values (Gerena, 2010).

In another interview-based study that examined parents of students in a Spanish TWI program in Central Texas, López (2013) interviewed eight mothers of children in the program and presented results in her study focusing on five mothers: three Spanish-dominant parents and two English-dominant parents. López reports that the most common reason mentioned by the parents was increased educational and occupational opportunities, which can be interpreted as an economic or instrumental motivation. López also comments that the parents were aware of cognitive benefits of bilingualism and expected increased ability to communicate across cultural and intergenerational differences. The Spanish-dominant mothers also highlighted the importance of maintaining cultural raíces — meaning “roots” in English — and addressed their desire for their child to be connected to Mexico (López, 2013, p. 220).

In addition to these very small studies, a survey study that explored parents in South Florida gathered data from 366 parents of children in a pre-K-5 school’ Spanish TWI program. In the study, Ramos (2007) points out top three reasons for choosing the TWI program that parents emphasized: developing a strong bilingual-bicultural identity, ensuring academic quality, and increasing career-related advantages. Similarly, Whiting and Feinauer (2011) present parental reasons for choosing a Spanish TWI program of an elementary school in Utah. In their survey study with 243 respondents, 47% spoke English as their primary language, and 53% were
Spanish speakers. The analysis of the data showed that there were six overarching reasons that parents underscored when enrolling their child in a TWI program: bilingualism/biliteracy, educational experiences, future and career opportunities, cultural immersion and diversity, heritage maintenance, and proximity to home (Whiting & Feinauer, 2011).

Shannon and Milian (2002) examined parents of children in Spanish TWI programs in multiple schools in Colorado using a survey questionnaire with a couple of open-ended questions. 1,043 parents participated in this study in which they addressed what they considered when choosing a TWI program for their child. Shannon and Milian (2002) assert that the parents in the survey put strong emphasis on the values and benefits of bilingualism, the significance of being bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural, and future benefits in terms of employment. The respondents also commented on the importance of learning a second language and maintaining language and culture of the home (Shannon & Milian, 2002).

Similarly, Parkes’ (2008) survey study that explored 724 families of multiple Spanish TWI programs in New Mexico demonstrates that nearly 95% of respondents stated they chose a Spanish-TWI program because they wanted their child to be able to speak, read, and write in two languages. The respondents also addressed a wide variety of expectations, such as being successful in a global society, being more academically successful in school, being comfortable with relating to different people and cultures, being able to speak with teachers in native language (Parkes, 2008).

Finally, Schmidt (2007) interviewed 13 Anglo parents in the Midwest to determine how they decide to enroll or not enroll their children in a TWI program. Of the parents, eight enrolled their children in a Spanish TWI program, and five did not choose the program. Among the parents in her study, only one parent was able to speak a good amount of Spanish; the other
parents were monolingual speakers. Schmidt (2007) states that the parents who chose the TWI program addressed both “non-material” and “material” benefits. The non-material benefits were related to developing well-rounded characteristics, providing exposure to others, becoming comfortable with relating to other races and cultures, and becoming open-minded. The parents in her study also addressed material benefits in regard to greater opportunities for future (e.g., language requirements for entering college and more chances for lifelong learning), positive academic challenges for advanced students, and employment opportunities in the future (Schmidt, 2007). At the same time, there are concerns raised by the parents of students in non-TWI programs. The parents who did not choose a TWI program stated that they were not fully sure about the efficacy of the TWI programs and commented on potential fear of academic delay in the TWI program (Schmidt, 2007). Even though these opinions came from the parents whose child was not enrolled in a TWI program, we should pay close attention to this feedback as well.

**Attitudes toward Bilingualism and Bilingual Education**

The perceptions of English-dominant and non-English speaking parents who choose TWI programs are consistent. For example, Schmidt (2007) states that parents considered bilingual abilities as a gift that parents could give to their child, and thus they enrolled their child in the TWI program. Schmidt (2007) also reports some parents’ senses of regret regarding their monolingual status. In her interview study with 13 Anglo parents in Midwest, some monolingual parents confessed they had not had any opportunity to learn a second language but hoped their child would be able to be bilingual (Schmidt, 2007).

Moreover, parents considered being bilingual and biliterate to be not just a gift, but a necessary skill. In a large-scale survey study with some open-ended questions, in which 1043 parents of students in two Spanish TWI programs in Colorado participated, nearly one-third of
the respondents stated they valued bilingualism, and the participants responded that to become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural was necessary in today’s society (Shannon & Milian, 2002).

Parents’ positive views on bilingualism are also confirmed in other studies that examined parents of students in bilingual programs. In general, parents agree that their child will benefit from bilingual education and bilingual skills (e.g., Parkes, 2008; Lao, 2004; Shannon & Milian, 2002; Young & Tran, 1999; Shin & Kim, 1998; Shin & Lee, B., 1996). In Young and Tran’s (1999) survey study with over 100 Vietnamese parents, two-in-three parents stated that they believed bilingual education did not impede their child’s progress in learning either language. Parents also believe that their child will develop better cognitive function while learning two different languages (e.g., Schmidt, 2007; Lao, 2004). For example, in a study that examined 86 parents of a Chinese-English bilingual preschool in San Francisco, both Chinese-dominant and English-dominant parents responded that a high level of bilingualism would result in superior cognitive development, and the expectation was more salient among the English-dominant group (Lao, 2004). Of course, the attitudes toward bilingualism may vary depending on parents’ personal experiences and immigration history, and there may be disparities in viewing bilingualism among different language groups as well. For instance, Santos (1985) examined 137 parents from diverse groups in Northeast Texas by using a survey questionnaire in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese and compared differences in attitudes toward bilingualism across different racial groups. In her study, Santos (1985) included 37% Hispanic parents, 33% Anglo parents, 12% Asians, 7% blacks, and 11% racially unidentified parents. Of these parents, some enrolled their child in bilingual programs, and some did not. Based on the survey analysis, Santos (1985) presents that Latino parents in her study, on average, addressed stronger and more positive attitudes toward bilingualism than did Vietnamese respondents.
In summary, research has found that TWI programs attract parents for various reasons, but the foremost reason that parents address is becoming bilingual and biliterate in two languages. Parents who choose a TWI program also acknowledge the advantages of bilingualism in terms of enhancing abilities to relate to other races and cultures, increasing future educational and occupational opportunities, developing well-rounded characteristics, building a strong identity, and maintaining home cultures and languages for non-English speaking students. Furthermore, parents also emphasize academic reasons, such as providing quality instruction and performing better in school.

**Satisfaction with TWI Programs**

Research has explored TWI parents in terms of their satisfaction with their child’s language development and TWI programs in general. This topic is significant in that parental satisfaction is an indicator of school or program success and can be a measure of school effectiveness (Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Griffith, 2000). Parental satisfaction is also related to multidimensional factors, such as school’s overall environment, their child’s academic achievement, child’s school experiences, and parent’s own school experiences (Fan & Chen, 2001).

First, the *Dual Language Database Project of New Mexico* examined 724 parents of Spanish-English TWI program students from nine public schools in New Mexico in 2005 to investigate parents’ satisfaction with (1) their child’s skills or knowledge and (2) their child’s TWI program. The findings demonstrate that parents in the study, in general, were highly satisfied with their child’s language skills (e.g., reading/writing in home language and in second language, math ability, and ability to relate to different people and cultures), and there was no statistically significant difference between the English dominant group and the Spanish-dominant group (Parkes & Ruth, 2011). As for overall satisfaction with the TWI program, nearly 97% of
the parents were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with their child’s TWI program (Parkes & Ruth, 2011).

Ramos (2007) reports similar results. In his survey study that explored 366 parents of children enrolled in a Spanish-English TWI program in South Florida, Ramos (2007) found that respondents, on average, were content with the academic rigor of the TWI instruction and the program in general. 82% of the parents stated that the program gave children access to subject matter, although 7.7% of the respondents were not sure about and 6.3% disagreed with the statement. Also, over four-fifths and two-thirds of the respondents reported that the program helped their child develop English reading and writing abilities, respectively (Ramos, 2007). Finally, nearly 90% of the respondents in his study stated that they would recommend the Spanish TWI program to others (Ramos, 2007).

Similarly, Gerena (2010) conducted a focus group study in which eight Spanish-speaking parents, six English-speaking parents, and one Spanish-English bilingual parent participated. In her study, Gerena originally observed 19 students in a newly established Spanish TWI program; however, four students left the program due to program because of relocation out of the school district or school attendance area. In her interviews with 15 parents of the students in the TWI program, Gerena found that parents, on average, expressed a high level of satisfaction with their child’s TWI program, but the reasons slightly differed by groups. Specifically, Spanish-speaking parents were satisfied with the fact that their child enjoyed the school more, while English-speaking parents were pleased that their child came to learn cultural awareness, which would be beneficial for their child in a global society.

Additionally, Lee and Jeong (2013) examined six Korean-American families of a newly established Korean TWI program in California for a year through observations and semi-
structured interviews. According to Lee and Jeong (2013), the participants addressed satisfaction in terms of teacher-parent communication in their native language, the TWI program environment that functioned as a *stepping stone* where immigrant students could navigate a new system without having to encounter excessive fear or pressure, and a variety of child’s experiences in the TWI program, which might have not been available in a regular program.

**Parents’ Concerns over TWI Programs**

Although previous research has demonstrated a high level of parents’ satisfaction with their child’s TWI programs in general, some of the research studies have reported concerns and challenges as well. It is meaningful to confirm parents’ satisfaction with TWI programs, but at the same time to contemplate their concerns about the programs is essential to enhancing TWI programs. First, Lee and Jeong (2013) highlight several significant issues in their study that examined a Korean-English TWI program. Lee and Jeong (2013) state that Korean parents raised issues regarding their child’s slow English development, the lack of consideration of different language levels for individual students, and an unbalanced student body that had more Korean students. Lee and Jeong (2013) also present the issues addressed by parents as well as by teachers, including tensions between Korean parents and non-Korean parents, Korean-American teachers’ imperfect proficiency of the Korean culture and language, insufficient support for the programs, and the absence of rules for students’ language use for English and Korean instruction.

In the Parkes and Ruth’s (2011) survey study, the researchers allowed parents to share their concerns in an opened-ended question. Although only 6.7% of the respondents commented on their concerns, these concerns raise a serious question regarding their child’s language development in TWI programs. As for language and literacy development, Parkes and Ruth (2011) state that an English-speaking parent in their study was worried about her child’s
difficulty with speaking Spanish, while a Spanish-dominant parent said that her son needed more help in English. The other concerns included insufficient home-school communications, English-dominant parents’ lack of knowledge in Spanish, and less rigorous academic curriculum in some classes.

In another survey study, Giacchino-Baker and Piller (2006) state that 73% of the concerns they gathered were from the English-dominant group and that 23% were from Spanish-dominant parents. More than half of the concerns were associated with the future of the program, such as continuation through elementary school and future program policies (Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006). This was a school-specific issue because the study examined a school where its TWI program was newly established for students in kindergarten through first grade. The other concerns raised by parents were the availability of a TWI program at the middle-school and high-school levels, parents’ lack of knowledge in “alternate language” (e.g. Spanish for native English speakers and English for Spanish-speaking parents), child’s frustration about the “alternate” language, and continuous evaluation of child’s progress (Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006).

In brief, the scholarly work on TWI parents consistently demonstrates that TWI parents are well cognizant of the purposes of the programs. Most of the previous research consistently reports that parents put the greatest emphasis on bilingual abilities, and this is one of the foremost reasons that parents highlight when enrolling their child in a TWI program. Parents also expect multiple short-term and long-term benefits in terms of achieving academic success, maintaining heritage language and culture, and enhancing intergroup relations, although the level of expectations varies in different contexts. Previous studies provide valuable information in terms of understanding parents’ motivations to choose a TWI program and overall attitudes.
toward the program and bilingualism. Nevertheless, only a handful of research has examined TWI language programs by including several schools that operate in different social and demographic settings. In addition, there is little research on parents’ own experiences in their child’s TWI programs, such as their interactions with other parents. Furthermore, virtually no studies explore Asian language TWI programs in more than a single school. Therefore, additional research on Asian TWI programs is necessary at this point and is urgent at the same time given the increasing interests in Asian language TWI programs.

**Critical Approaches to TWI Programs**

Research on TWI programs has addressed cautions about TWI programs, including educational problems that the language minority group confronts other than language issues, intergroup relations, unequal status of language and power in the program, students’ language development, and teacher quality. Acknowledging these concerns is crucial to a better understanding of TWI programs.

Two-way immersion programs serve both English-speaking students and language-minority students, ideally in balanced numbers from the two groups in the same classroom where both groups must be integrated, and instruction in the programs takes place in English and a partner language (Howard & Christian, 2002). The goals of the TWI program are (1) to help language-minority students learn English and help native English speakers learn a second language, (2) to seek academic excellence for all students, (3) to raise understanding of American culture as well as diverse cultures of the language minority group, and (4) to enhance intergroup relations among students from various racial, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
However, the demographics of students in the programs show that language-minority students are more likely to be ethnic/racial minorities living in poverty and to have parents who have received limited formal education, even though significant variation exists from program to program (Gárcia & Cuellar, 2006). Moreover, TWI programs comprise students at different language levels in terms of English and a partner language. Given various backgrounds of students in the program (e.g., socioeconomic status, immigration history, language proficiency, and parents’ education levels), we need to pay careful attention to TWI programs with respect to program efficacy and complex dynamics amongst students, parents, teachers, and school staff at multiple levels.

First, although a TWI program is a competent alternative to traditional bilingual education programs, it is not a panacea that cures intrinsic educational problems. Of course, research has demonstrated that students in TWI programs, on average, achieve greater academic gains and success (e.g. Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Genesee et al., 2006; Umansky & Reardon, 2014; Collier & Thomas, 2004; de Jong, 2002; Bikle, Billings, & Hakuta, 2004). Yet, educators and parents should be cautious not to think of TWI programs as an automatic remedy to ameliorate educational problems of language-minority students (Valdés, 1997; Snow, 1990). For example, some language-minority students in the U.S. are in disadvantaged situations where they confront multiple issues other than language barriers, such as fewer educational resources, less academic attention from parents, and poorer health condition (Oller & Pearson, 2002; Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). Thus, educators need to place equal emphasis on general educational problems surrounding TWI programs and language-minority students.
Second, some language-minority students from immigrant families need explicit support and attention (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). According to Gándara and Rumberger, the students need increased instructional time for attaining English; they also need specific instruction in academic English and the culture and norms of the U.S. society. Gándara and Rumberger also assert that language-minority students need explicit information to navigate the U.S. educational and occupational systems. Furthermore, due to migrant experiences, some students need additional emotional and social attention as well (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). Also, considering that some language-minority students enter school far behind compared to their English-speaking counterparts due to disadvantaged socioeconomic situations or migrant experiences, there needs to be additional instructional time for and attention to these students, so that they can catch up with English skills and schooling in general (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009).

Third, a conscious awareness of intergroup relations is required in TWI programs. Previous research has shown that TWI programs can promote positive relations among different racial groups, assuming that the two languages as well as the two groups (language-minority students and language-majority students) are equally valued in the classroom (e.g., Cazabon, Lambert, & Hall, 1993; Reyes, Laliberty, & Orbanosky, 1993; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Whitmore & Crowell, 2006; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). Developing positive interracial relations is especially important in a globalized society or in a community that has multicultural, multiracial, and multilingual settings where interactions among different racial groups occur on a daily basis in various ways (e.g., school, work, business, neighborhood, etc.).

Regarding intergroup relations in school, Genesee and Gándara (1999) point out the potential of bilingual or TWI programs to promote a multilingual and multicultural environment
that can reduce prejudice against different racial groups. At the same time, they also emphasize the significance of status equalization in the classroom (Genesee & Gándara, 1999). However, in reality English-speaking students are more likely to be in higher status than are their non-English speaking counterparts, and language-minority students may struggle with feelings of inferiority and low self-esteem (Genesee & Gándara, 1999). Valdés (1997) also warns that external social factors can affect the dynamics of students’ interactions with other students. For example, Freeman (1996) reports that some students in TWI programs tended to get along better with students of the same race and from similar socioeconomic backgrounds, which suggests that external factors can influence the school setting. As Gordon Allport (1954) argues in his classic book, “The Nature of Prejudice,” status aspects of contact play a significant role in assuaging prejudice toward other groups and in promoting intergroup relations. In terms of status aspects of contact in TWI programs, the conditions of equal-status contact should be carefully monitored in order to develop constructive intergroup relations.

Fourth, language development of both language-minority students and native English speakers must be continuously monitored, and carefully designed educational strategies and opportunities for language interactions must be made by teachers. Although TWI programs are created to develop bilingualism and biliteracy for both language-majority students and language-minority students, simply introducing TWI programs does not necessarily yield effective outcomes that parents and educators expect. For example, a study that examined a Spanish TWI program in Southern California demonstrates that interactional spaces in which both English and Spanish are used interchangeably by the same speaker did not take place without focused efforts (Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Gillispie, 2008). Furthermore, Lee et al. (2008) assert that simply putting two different language groups in the same classroom does not necessarily create interactional
spaces where students develop their bilingual competence; thus, purposeful efforts need to be addressed by teachers.

Researchers also have questioned if language-minority students and native English speakers can reach similar levels of proficiency in two languages. García (2005) argues that Spanish-speaking students tend to attain strong skills in English while native English speakers are not likely to reach the same level of proficiency in Spanish. For instance, Christian (1994) reports a study that examined the Spanish TWI program at the Francis Scott Key Elementary School in Virginia, in which merely half of English speakers in grades four and five demonstrated Spanish fluency. In contrast to this, 100% of Spanish-dominant third-grade students were fluent in English (Christian, 1994). Oller and Eilers (2002) also assert that the different levels of language development in English and Spanish can be attributed to students’ overall preference for speaking English. In their study that observed English immersion programs, TWI programs, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs in Miami, students in all programs performed better on all kinds of tests for English than for Spanish, and Oller and Eilers argue that Hispanic students showed a strong preference for speaking English in classrooms and hallways even when given the choice.

Similarly, de Jong and Bearse (2011) claim that the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy for all students seems more demanding at higher grade levels. In their study that examined a high school’s Spanish TWI program in a medium-sized district in the Northeast, Anglo students responded they felt more confident in English than in Spanish in terms of reading and writing skills, while Latino students felt strong in both languages (de Jong & Bearse, 2011). Regarding the discrepancy between the two groups, de Jong and Bearse (2011) assert that without addressing language status issues purposefully, it is challenging for TWI programs to maintain
language status equalization, especially in the secondary TWI programs. Valdés (1997) also claims that the level of Spanish taught in TWI programs is lower, so Spanish proficiency is easier to attain compared to English proficiency. Valdés further argues that the unequal status of English and a partner language in TWI programs entails strong out-of-school effects on language development.

Fifth, educators must attend to the issue of language and power in TWI programs. Inspired by social reproduction theory (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Collins, 1971), scholars in critical language awareness theory (Fairclough, 1989, 1992; Tollefson, 1991) have questioned if curriculum and teacher practices of TWI programs can mitigate social inequalities. Gándara et al. (2010) argue, “Minority languages are always culturally subordinated to the majority or “official” language and thus so are their speakers. Such cultural subordination always carries economic consequences” (p. 22). For example, in de Jong and Bearse’s (2011) study that examined a Spanish TWI program in a high school, they observe that native Spanish speakers seemed to achieve cross-cultural understanding and biculturalism by learning two languages, but their English-dominant peers did not. This probably can be attributed to unequal status of English and Spanish in society and reflects social issues outside of the TWI program. Considering the different levels of political, economic, linguistic, and cultural capital that language-majority and language-minority families possess in society, several structural factors can affect the power dynamics in the TWI program; the dynamics appear at different levels among multiple entities of the school community, including students, parents, and teachers as well as school staff.

Sixth, because of the discrepancy in power and resources between parents of language-minority students and parents of English-speaking students, some argue that TWI programs may be developed to serve primarily the English-speaking group (Valdés, 1997; Delgado-Larroco,
1998; Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005). In addition, Morales and Aldana (2010) point out a critique that asserts successful TWI programs tend to have students from more privileged backgrounds, such as white families and middle-class families. In this case, students’ overall academic success in the TWI program can be associated with socioeconomically advantaged backgrounds as well as the program’s effects (Morales & Aldana, 2010). In fact, language-minority students can benefit from the social and cultural capital of language-majority students, and the overall educational outcomes of both groups can be improved. Yet, further inquiry is required to examine if academic achievement is related to the effects of TWI pogroms or to the positive effects of a larger amount of social capital that white and middle-class families possess, or a combination of both.

Finally, ensuring quality teaching staff is crucial in TWI programs, and this is more significant in a society where monolingualism is prevalent, such as in the United States (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011). In regard to this issue, Tedick et al. (2011) assert immersion programs in the U.S. encounter challenges when recruiting teachers for TWI programs; program administrators tend to make a compromise between teachers’ pedagogical skills and their proficiency of English and a partner language. As for this issue, researchers also point out the limitations of current teacher preparation programs, which usually do not provide sufficient and appropriate education for teachers who can teach in TWI (e.g., Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Indeed, teachers for immersion programs need to acquire appropriate teacher credentials (e.g., bilingual certificates), and simultaneously they should be exposed to immersion-related knowledge and teaching skills. For these reasons, educators and researchers of TWI programs call for the enhancement of current teacher preparation programs, so that they can better prepare bilingual
teachers for the highly demanding job of teaching in a TWI classroom (e.g., Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Broner & Tedick, 2011).

In summary, researchers have found both internal and external issues related to TWI programs, such as educational problems that minority students encounter in general (e.g., late school entry, fewer educational resources, traumatic migrant experiences, and poorer health conditions), different language development results of language-majority students and language-minority students, external factors that affect the dynamics of language and power in the programs, intergroup relations among diverse racial groups, and the inadequate system of teacher preparation and its impact on TWI programs. However, much of the advice is based on the context of Spanish-English TWI programs and thus may or may not be applicable to non-Spanish TWI programs, especially TWI programs using an Asian language as a partner language. Given the different contexts of Asian-language TWI programs where students of partner language groups are generally from families with high educational backgrounds and socioeconomic status, a further examination of non-Spanish TWI programs is necessary. Being aware of these critical views on TWI programs, my study adds to the literature by examining if parents in Korean TWI programs address similar apprehensions over their child’s TWI programs.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

This study examines subjects (parents) in a specific research context (Korean TWI programs). Given the intersections between the subject of interest and the specific research setting, I employ multiple theoretical orientations that bolster this study in exploring the particular subject (parents) and the specific study setting (TWI programs) concurrently. First, with respect to the research setting, I explore what criteria define the TWI program and how the program is theoretically supported. Next, I use the notion of *parental involvement as social capital* (McNeal, 1999) and
intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954) to examine the research subject (parents in Korean TWI programs). Employing the notion of parental involvement as social capital, I examine parents’ experiences, participation in school, and interactions with other parents. Additionally, I explore integration among parents of children in Korean TWI program and parents’ views on integration among their children based on the intergroup contact theory.

**Theoretical Underpinnings of TWI Programs**

TWI programs necessitate three critical components in terms of student population, student integration, and program instruction (Lindholm, 1990). I explained earlier different types of dual language programs depending on the features of individual instruction models, such as student demographics and the amount of instruction using a partner language. Of various types of dual language programs, the most popular instructional model currently used in the U.S. is a two-way immersion (TWI) program, which is designed to meet the needs of both language-minority students and language-majority students. Specifically, García (2005) characterizes three major goals of TWI programs: “(1) to help language-minority children learn English and succeed in U.S. schools; (2) to help language-majority children learn a foreign language without sacrificing their own success in school; and (3) to promote linguistic and ethnic equity among the children, encouraging children to bridge the gaps between cultures and languages which divide [the U.S.] society” (pp. 47-48). In order to accomplish these goals, TWI programs must possess three fundamental criteria in terms of population, integration, and instruction.

*Student Population:* The program needs to comprise both native speakers of English and native speakers of a partner language of the program (e.g., Spanish-speaking students) (Christian, Howard, & Loeb, 2000). This criterion is a unique feature of TWI programs as well, and this characteristics makes the program distinctive from other immersion models. It is ideal that the
program includes a balanced number of students from the two groups. Under any circumstances, however, individual groups need to represent between one-third and two-thirds of the total enrollment of the program. Including the two groups in the same classroom is also an essential factor that makes another criterion of integration viable. Additionally, the balanced number of students from two groups is a crucial criterion for creating equal-status environments; this criterion is based on the work of Gordon Allport (1954) and Elizabeth Cohen and Rachel Lotan (1995), in which they assume that children are more likely to learn from one another and to feel motivated to learn from their peers when they are exposed to learning situations where children have equal-status of contacts (Morales & Aldana, 2010).

**Student Integration:** In the TWI program, language-minority students and language-majority students need to be integrated for a significant portion of the students’ instructional time for content and literacy education at all grade levels (Lindholm, 1990). By integrating the two different language groups, the classroom offers a learning environment that increases social interactions among students. In doing so, students in the TWI program have better opportunities for language development (Christian, 1996). This learning environment is theoretically supported by second language acquisition theories, such as input-interaction-output hypothesis (Gass & Mackey, 2006), interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996), acquisition-learning hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), and sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1980).

First, having target-language speakers as peers in the same classroom, students are more exposed to the use of a target language (L2) — English for language-minority students and a foreign/second language for language-majority students — and are more likely to feel motivated to learn the language. In traditional bilingual classrooms or one-way immersion settings, students have difficulty in developing native-like communicative competence in a target language. This
difficulty can be attributed to the absence of opportunity to interact with the speakers of a target language; the limited presence of native speakers can retard the language-learning process, especially for developing oral language skills (e.g., Swain 1985). According to Krashen’s (1982) acquisition-learning hypothesis, — learning (the product of formal instruction) is less important than acquisition (the product of a subconscious process) — the language-acquisition process requires meaningful interactions in the target language through which learners can be involved in meaningful communicative act. From this acquisition-learning theory perspective, TWI programs are ideal places where students can naturally interact with the other language group to learn each other’s language, so that the two groups of students can acquire the target language effectively.

Second, integrating two different language groups in the TWI program gives higher motivation for learners. Motivation is a social-psychological factor, which is used to explain different language achievement results in the second-language acquisition research (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Motivation plays a significant role in terms of predicting language achievement along with language aptitude and other factors (e.g., study habits, a need to achieve language proficiency). Gardner (2001) argues that exposure to the target language group and the extent to which a learner is willing to interact with and become similar to the group are central to language achievement. Even though integration does not necessarily increase learning motivation, it is evident that integrativeness is one of the key components to contribute to successful language learning (Gass & Selinker, 2008).

Third, the integrated classroom can increase interactions among students, and interaction is central to learning from the sociocultural theory perspective (Vygotsky, 1980). By focusing on factors outside the learner rather than the innate aptitude, interaction is an essential factor that
facilitates language learning and brings about acquisition (Saville-Troike, 2006). Interactions occur in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) wherein potential language development can take place with the appropriate level of scaffolding, and the integration of native English speakers and native speakers of a partner language in the TWI program offers an environment of the ZPD where experts in L1 but novices in L2 interact with experts in L2 but novices in L1 (Lindholm, 1990; Christian, 1996).

Fourth, student integration is not only important for language learning but also crucial for enhancing intergroup relations. One of the fundamental goals of the TWI program is to foster linguistic and ethnic equity among children by raising cross-cultural understanding. As Allport (1954) proposes, intergroup contact can abate prejudice in a setting that meets four conditions: (1) equal status between the groups, (2) common goals, (3) cooperation between groups, and (4) institutional support for the contact. Although intentional and conscious efforts are necessary, student integration is central to creating a foundation for these conditions to be achieved.

**Language Instruction:** In the TWI program, all students must be instructed in both English and a partner language for content and literacy instruction (Swain & Johnson, 1997; Swain, 1998, 2001; Lindholm, 1990). Research shows that natural language acquisition occurs in the contextualized learning environment where instruction focuses on content rather than language fragments isolated from the context (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989), which is why TWI programs are better than ESL instruction alone. Content-based language instruction integrates topics or tasks from subject-matter curriculum (e.g., mathematics, social studies) in the context of teaching a target language (Crandall & Tucker, 1990). TWI programs are designed based on the concept of content-based language instruction; accordingly, language instruction in the TWI program occurs through content. Hence, learners in the TWI program are exposed to the
target language through content-based curriculum and are engaged in activities dependent on the
target language. In this learning environment where there is an emphasis on relevant, meaningful
content rather than on the language itself, language is best developed and acquired (Met, 1991;
Curtain & Pesola, 1994). The integration of language and content also helps students learn the
target language in a concrete manner rather than in an abstract way (Snow, Met, & Genesee,
1989).

In addition, research in the cognitive learning theory field indicates that content-based
instruction offers opportunities for learners to participate in intrinsically interesting and
cognitively engaging tasks, which yield better outcomes for second language acquisition (Byrnes,
2000). According to cognitive learning theory (Anderson, 1990, 1993), there are three sequential
stages of language learning: the cognitive stage, the associative stage, and the autonomous stage.
In the earliest stage, learners notice and attend to the target language information in working
memory and engage in basic tasks with the new language they are acquiring. In the next stage,
by the repetitive process of making errors and being corrected, the connections to the target
language are strengthened, and knowledge and skills become proceduralized. In the final stage,
attentional effort is rarely required, and language performance becomes automatic. Following
this cognitive learning theory, content-based instruction in the TWI program is designed to
develop language proficiency in both English and a partner language by experiencing the
cognitive learning process in a covert way.

In summary, the fundamental criteria that define TWI programs are (1) enrolling a
balanced number of language-minority students and language-majority students (2) integrating
two groups of students for a significant portion of the instructional time, and (3) instructing all
students in both English and a partner language for content and literacy instruction. Korean TWI
programs are developed based on these criteria as well, which affect various aspects of the programs, such as student demographics, racial composition, and instructional methods. The present study will examine if Korean TWI programs reflect overall TWI program’s characteristics and how parents in Korean TWI programs perceive the features by looking at their attitudes and experiences.

**Parental Involvement as Social Capital**

Literature on parents in schooling has largely taken granted for parental involvement’s positive impact on child’s schooling. Research has demonstrated that meaningful involvement of parents in their child’s education can improve educational outcomes and enhance learning process (e.g. Comer & Haynes, 1991; Griffith, 1998; López, Scribner & Mahitivanichcha, 2001), and parental involvement is more crucial in migrant households (López, 2001). Moreover, literature on TWI programs has underscored positive school-parent collaboration as one of the critical factors for successful TWI programs (e.g., Lindholm, 1990; Christian, 1994; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Given the importance of parental involvement in the TWI program, especially for language-minority students, I explore parental involvement in Korean TWI programs and investigate how parental involvement varies by parents on the basis of the theoretical perspective that defines parental involvement as social capital.

The notion of parental involvement as social capital is suggested by McNeal (1999) in an attempt to conceptualize the broad concept of parental involvement in the context of social capital theory. Acknowledging the fact that social capital has been identified and employed in various ways (Bourdieu, 1977, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Woolcock, 1998), McNeal (1999) summarizes three primary components of social capital: *form, norms of obligation and reciprocity, and resources*. According to McNeal (1999), *form* refers to structural
features of the social networks and relations, including the quality and quantity of the social ties (e.g., breadth, depth, intensity, and overall nature of the relations). McNeal (1999) also specifies norms of obligation and reciprocity by stating that “[the term] entails some sense of investment with the expectation of a return on that investment owing to a sense of trust, obligation, or norm of reciprocity” (p. 120). Finally, McNeal (1999) claims that resources come from both within and outside the network that one possesses, and resources are imbued through various channels within the network, among network members, and from external connections between members inside the network and members (or entities) outside the network.

McNeal’s (1998) clarification of the three components of social capital is confirmed by the definitions of social capital by Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1988) as well. According to Bourdieu (1986), social capital refers to “the aggregate of actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition — or in other words, to membership in a group — which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word” (p. 251). In regard to social capital, Coleman (1988) also focuses on following concepts: obligations and expectations, information-flow capability of the social structure, and norms accompanied by sanctions. According to Coleman (1988), these three forms of social capital can be found not only within a family but also in a community in which the social capital has value for a young student’s development including academic achievement.

Based on the three fundamental elements that frame social capital, McNeal (1999) argues that parent involvement can be conceptualized in the social capital context. First, McNeal (1999) focuses on dyadic relationships that a parent maintains with a child, a teacher, and other parents,
and he further argues that relationships that one holds with these different entities indicate one’s extended social network that functions as potential sanctioning agents. Especially, the relationship between a parent and a child is based on kinships; thus, parent-child and parent-school relations should be discussed inevitably in the context of obligation and reciprocity (McNeal, 1999). Lastly, McNeal (1999) attends to the relationship between resources and parental involvement. Parents retain diverse levels of physical capital, human capital, and cultural capital with which they support their child’s education; the levels of these different types of capital vary depending on the position where the parent is situated in society (McNeal, 1999). The differences in the amount of capital that one maintains affect the extent to which the parent can be involved in his or her child’s education; hence, one’s resources are indispensably linked with involvement in child’s education as a parent (McNeal, 1999).

In addition, I clarify the terminology regarding parental involvement. In this dissertation study, by parental involvement, I focus on activities that are visible to school personnel (e.g. teachers, principals, coordinators, etc.) and other parents. In fact, the definition of parental involvement has not been apparent because of its multifaceted nature (Fan & Chen, 2001). Previous literature has included a wide range of parents’ activities regarding child’s education both at home and in school for identifying parental involvement (Fan & Chen, 2001). For instance, a body of scholarly work has examined multiple dimensions of parental involvement, such as parental aspirations for their child (e.g., Bloom, 1980), school-parent communication (e.g., Epstein, 1986), parent-child communication about school (e.g., Christenson, Rounds, & Gorney, 1992; Walberg, 1986), parent-teacher communication about children (e.g., Epstein, 1991), and parents’ involvement in school-community collaborations (e.g., Epstein, 1986). Additionally, Epstein (2001) characterizes parent-involvement measures commonly used in
research studies into six distinct areas: parenting, learning at home, volunteering at school, communicating with school, engaging in the decision-making process, and collaborating with the community. However, most definitions of parental involvement highlight (1) parents’ participation in school activities and events and (2) parents’ communication and interactions with other parents and school personnel, which can be discernible (López, 2001; McWayne et al., 2004; Englund et al., 2004), and this study also follows the definition of parental involvement that emphasizes parents’ observable activities in school.

In brief, the present study adds information to the field that explores parents in TWI programs by examining parental involvement in Korean TWI programs and further investigates how parental involvement varies by parents’ characteristics (e.g., demographics and socioeconomic status) based on the notion of parental involvement as social capital. Additionally, I explore integration among parents of children in Korean TWI programs and parents’ opinions on integration among children, and this will be investigated on the basis of the intergroup contact theory, which will be discussed below.

**Intergroup Contact Theory**

With respect to integration issues in Korean TWI programs, I draw from intergroup contact theory to investigate how interpersonal and intergroup contacts in the program are influential on integration among parents and parents’ views on their child’s integration with their peers. Although a TWI program serves both language-majority students and language-minority students by integrating the two groups, there are critiques that the program is designed to serve primarily native English speakers and that not all groups in the program are in equal status due to different dynamics of race, language, and socioeconomic status among parents. In such a context, integration in the program can be undermined, and the program cannot yield positive outcomes.
in terms of intergroup relations, language acquisition, and academic success. Nevertheless, Korean TWI programs have not been examined from this perspective yet. Therefore, using the lens of intergroup contact theory, this study seeks to explore integration issues in Korean TWI programs and how integration is related to other factors, such as demographics, parents’ perspectives, and parental involvement.

Intergroup contact theory is based on Gordon Allport’s (1954) premise that interpersonal contact is one of the most effective ways to diminish prejudice between majority and minority group members. In order to maximize the effects of intergroup contact, Allport (1954) stresses four conditions: equal status in the situation, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support. First, groups should be in equal status within the contact environment where all groups can participate in creating the guidelines of interaction. Second, contact effects will be magnified when groups share common goals. To achieve the goals, the groups should cooperate with each other, and prejudice can be reduced during the process. Third, when groups work together, the setting should not be competitive, but be cooperative. In the supportive setting, groups can build positive relationships by relying on each other to achieve the shared goals, but a competitive setting is not helpful for the groups to develop supportive relationships. Fourth, institutional support is critical to positive contact effects. When intuitional authorities (e.g., school, military, and government) create rules and examples that groups should follow when interacting with other groups, the effects can be amplified (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011).

In regard to the development of intergroup contact theory, although discussions and speculations on the effects of intergroup contact date back to the 19th century when Social Darwinism was pervasive, the major efforts were made after World War II in an attempt to abolish the deplorable legacy left by Adolf Hitler in terms of prejudice toward a particular ethnic
group (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). In early research on intergroup contact, Allport and Kramer (1946) examined the effects of equal-status contact on non-Jewish students’ attitudes toward Jewish students at Dartmouth and Harvard; they reported that the more equal-status contact the non-Jewish student had, the less prejudice they tended to address toward Jewish students. Starting with this noteworthy result, a great deal of research has added evidence in various contexts, including different areas of the world (e.g., Israeli and Palestinian adolescents in the Middle East, children in Malaysia, Hindu and Muslim adults in Bangladesh), different target groups (e.g., the disabled and the elderly), different settings (e.g., sports teams and experiences of traveling foreign countries, and different age groups (young children, adolescents, and adults) (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011).

Even though intergroup contact theory has been examined in a variety of contexts and studies have reported evidence that supports the theory, there has been criticism of intergroup contact theory. Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) categorize the informed critiques into five points: (1) the assertion that societal diversity diminishes solidarity; (2) the practical challenge to achieve intergroup contact especially in society where prejudice has been internalized; (3) the claim that intergroup contact does not affect attitudes toward social change and policies; (4) the argument that intergroup contact hampers social changes; and (5) the assertion that reducing intergroup prejudice at the micro level is not influential on intergroup conflict and violence at the macro level.

In summary, intergroup contact theory provides a theoretical groundwork for this study to examine integration issues in Korean TWI programs. Research has seen the potential of TWI programs as a way to diminish achievement gaps and reduce segregation among students of difference races (Morales & Aldana, 2010). However, research also has questioned if children as
well as parents are actually integrated and integration entails positive intergroup relations in the
program. Intergroup contact theory has been developed based on research of a variety of settings,
and a TWI program is one of the places that need to be tested based on the intergroup contact
theory. For this reason, the present study examines Korean TWI programs from the intergroup
contact theory perspective, especially focusing on parents’ views on integration among children,
integration among parents, and the relationship between integration among children and
integration among parents.

**Conclusion**

This study builds on theories regarding TWI programs, parental involvement, and intergroup
relations and contributes to the literature on parents of students in TWI programs. A great deal of
research in TWI programs, parental involvement, and intergroup relations has studied various
settings and subjects. However, none of the research studies has investigated parents of students
in Korean TWI programs based on a large-scale quantitative method. There have also been
limitations in previous studies.

First, previous research on TWI programs has almost exclusively concentrated on
Spanish TWI programs, and there are a merely handful of studies that have explored Korean
TWI programs. Additionally, of the research on Korean TWI programs, virtually no studies have
delved into parent attitudes by including multiple research sites in a quantitative method. Second,
research on parents of children in TWI programs has mainly focused on their reasons to choose
the program, attitudes toward bilingualism, overall satisfaction with the program and child’s
language development, and concerns over the program. However, parents’ own experiences in
the program have been ignored, even though their experiences comprise a great portion of
parental involvement in TWI programs. Third, in spite of the great emphasis on integration in
TWI instruction as a program goal and as a program criterion, little research has probed how parents of students in TWI programs evaluate integration among children, how they perceive integration among parents themselves, and how integration among children and integration among parents are associated. Finally, although some research has sought to explore TWI programs in a survey method, the vast majority of the research has analyzed data based on not inferential statistics, but on descriptive statistics. Therefore, relationships among multiple parent-related factors in the program are not sufficiently scrutinized.

By examining parents of students in multiple schools’ Korean TWI programs in a survey method, I add to literature on parents of students in TWI programs, and this study builds on theories related to TWI programs, parental involvement, and intergroup relations. Furthermore, this study attempts to connect the theory and practice in TWI programs by exploring parents of students in the program to better understand how parents actually perceive the way in which TWI programs operate.
CHAPTER 3–METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

In this chapter, I demonstrate methodological and analytical approaches used in this dissertation, including methodological design of this study, survey data instrument development as well as analytic strategies for data analysis. I then explore the characteristics of research sites to understand the contexts of communities and schools where Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs operate. Following the geographic definition of the U.S. Census Bureau, I examine the communities of the seven schools in this study. Next, I investigate overall features of the seven schools that offer Korean TWI education, including demographics, percentage of English Language Learners (ELLs), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Finally, I describe characteristics of seven schools’ Korean TWI programs.

Data Sources and Data Collection

Datasets

I collected data from parents of children in seven elementary schools in the Los Angeles area. This area has the greatest number of Koreans as well as Korean TWI programs in the United States. To identify the list of schools that offer Korean TWI instruction in the Los Angeles area, I first investigated information through the directory for California TWI programs in the California Department of Education (CDE) site. However, the CDE directory was not fully updated, so I also reviewed the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) websites. LAUSD provides a TWI program directory every academic year, so that parents can refer to the information before enrolling their child. GUSD also has a separate website for its Foreign Language Academies of Glendale (FLAG) program in which Korean is included.
According to the LAUSD and GUSD information, Korean TWI instruction was offered in 13 schools for the academic year 2013-2014 when the survey was administered. Of the 13 schools, there were nine elementary schools, three middle schools, and one high school. For this study, I purposefully selected elementary schools only in order to examine parents of students at similar academic levels. Not all nine elementary schools participated in this study, and actual survey data were collected from seven schools: (1) Broadway Elementary School, (2) Ocean View Elementary School, (3) Raymond Community School, (4) Valley Road Community School, (5) Catalina Elementary School, (6) Dryden Street Elementary School, and (7) Highland Elementary School. All school names are pseudonyms.

Additionally, to identify the characteristics of the schools in this study, I analyzed the 2013-2014 CDE data. To comprehend overall school situations in terms of racial composition, the share of non-English speaking students, the proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and academic performance, I focused on School Enrollment, English Learners, Free and Reduced Meals Program, and Academic Performance Index (API) datasets.

Finally, to understand specific characteristics of individual communities, I investigated the 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates data and focused on total population, racial group composition, and socioeconomic status for particular zip code areas where schools for this study were located. By communities, I followed the ZIP code tabulation areas (ZCTAs)\(^4\) definition that the U.S. Census Bureau created by employing the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Zip code service areas.

---

\(^4\) The American Community Survey (ACS) Data started to release Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) level estimates, starting for the 2007-2012 ACS five-year estimates. ZCTAs are statistical areas developed by employing the US Postal Service’s ZIP codes. Each ZCTA is created by combining Census blocks, and the most frequently occurring ZIP code becomes the ZCTA code for a particular statistical area. The U.S. Census Bureau offers more detailed information at [https://www.census.gov/geo/reference/zctas.html](https://www.census.gov/geo/reference/zctas.html)
Survey Data Collection Process

Contact Process

In order to contact parents of students in Korean-English TWI programs, I was required to obtain research approval from UCLA and from individual school districts. After I had received the approval of the UCLA Institutional Review Board (IRB) in 2012, I then submitted formal research proposals in 2013 to the LAUSD and GUSD. The review processes for the two districts differed from each other. The LAUSD research unit required more complex applications, and it took longer for the LAUSD to approve this research project, compared to the GUSD. Unlike the LAUSD that handled the review process only electronically, the GUSD requested an in-person meeting where I needed to explain the purpose and process of this research for a person in charge of reviewing research that occurs within the district.

After the research proposals were accepted by the two districts, I started to contact the school principals and coordinators of the nine elementary schools that offered Korean-English TWI instruction in the Los Angeles area. I sent them e-mail messages at first, explaining the purpose and benefits of this research and asking if they would allow me to distribute survey questionnaires to parents of students in Korean-English TWI programs. I also provided different survey options for them to participate either in paper surveys or in online surveys. Unfortunately, most schools were not responsive at first and did not show much interest in this study due to their school schedules and partially due to some questions of this study that asked parents to evaluate their programs, although I highlighted the purpose of study did not have to do with school evaluation.

For the schools in the GUSD, I had an opportunity to visit Broadway Elementary in 2012 and came to know the school’s Korean TWI program coordinator. Also, she was the coordinator...
of another school in the district that I examined. Persuading the principals of the two schools to participate in this study, she allowed me to distribute online surveys to their parents, so that teachers did not have to engage in additional work to distribute and collect surveys.

As for the LASUD schools, I sent e-mail messages several times to the principals and coordinators and then attended parents’ meetings and Korean TWI program teacher meetings to meet the principals and the teachers of the programs, if allowed. After meeting with teachers and principals in person, Catalina Elementary and Dryden Street Elementary became highly supportive and actively participated in the survey. I also presented preliminary findings of this study for the teachers and the principals of the schools, after I collected data from the two schools. Although I did not have the opportunity to meet the principal in person, Valley Road Community School was very supportive as well. She and the coordinator of the program allowed me to distribute paper surveys, and thanks to the teachers of the programs I was able to collect data at Valley Road Community School. As for Highland Elementary, after I met the principal in person, she became supportive and invited me to the school’s teacher-principal meeting as well. At that meeting, I explained this research and asked for the teachers’ help, but unfortunately, all teachers except one refused to participate in the study. I later heard that the teachers were reluctant to do additional work (e.g., distributing and collecting surveys) due to their hectic schedules. However, thanks to the one teacher, I was able to distribute survey questionnaires to parents in her class as well as some parents in other classes at the same school. Regarding Raymond Community School, I did not have any difficulty in having access to the school. I have developed relationships with the school personnel since 2012 when I had conducted a pilot study for this dissertation, and they helped me substantially with distributing and collecting the surveys.
for the parents of the school. Finally, despite several in-person and online contacts, two schools refused to participate in this research.

**Modes of Survey Administration**

With regard to the modes of data collection, I used mixed modes by using paper questionnaires and Web surveys. Mixed modes are usually employed for reducing costs and maximizing response rates (Groves et al., 2009). In this study, the reason for using mixed modes was to diminish teachers’ additional work to distribute and collect surveys. For the online survey tool, I used *Qualtrics*\(^5\), an online survey research platform.

Before making the decision to choose survey modes, I always discussed in advance with the lead teachers of TWI programs or the coordinators of each school to understand which mode they preferred to use for their parents. As mentioned earlier, the parents in the GUSD participated in Web surveys, whereas the other parents responded to paper surveys. As for response rates, paper surveys were more effective than were web surveys in this study. For instance, Valley Road Community School originally shared a link of the online survey for their parents, but due to low response rates, they distributed paper surveys later.

**Language Accommodation**

The survey questionnaire was developed in English, and I provided surveys in Korean and in Spanish for non-English speaking parents. As for surveys in English and Korean, I developed them myself and then had other people review the survey questions to see whether respondents understood the questions as intended. For the Spanish version of the survey, a Spanish-speaking doctoral student from Mexico translated the questionnaire, and I had a couple of other Spanish-speaking people review the questions again. While working with the Spanish-speaking

---

\(^5\) More detailed information for Qualtrics can be found at [http://www.qualtrics.com/](http://www.qualtrics.com/)
reviewers, I asked them to ensure readability of the questionnaire, so that people with a minimum education level could understand the questions without difficulty. Unfortunately, back-translation was not conducted in the translation process, and this is one of the limitations of this study. When distributing survey, the Web survey provided a simple drop-down option with which respondents were able to change languages by themselves. For the paper survey, I prepared copies for each language based on the number of parents in individual schools.

**Number of Participants in the Survey**

The seven schools in this study had approximately 1,100 students enrolled in Korean TWI programs, and a total of 454 parents of students in Korean TWI programs participated in the survey. Most (82%) of the respondents were mothers (372 females, 82 males), and the participants from three schools (Catalina, Dryden Street, and Valley Road) comprised over 70% of the total respondents in this survey (see Table 3.1). Some parents had more than one child in the program; thus, the actual number of parents of students was smaller than the reported number of students in the programs. In such cases, parents were asked to complete only one questionnaire for the eldest child. Considering this, I assume that there were approximately 900 parents who could participate in the survey. In fact, 44 respondents in this survey remarked that they had other children enrolled in TWI programs, so the number of participants in this study was satisfactory despite the different response rates per school.

Additionally, response rates differed from school to school, and the varied response rates can be attributed to several factors. First, the survey was not administered at the same period of time. Data collection occurred between December 2013 and April 2014, and I selected different time periods for accommodating each school’s schedule after discussing with the school staff. Second, different modes of survey may have influenced on the response rates. Specifically, the
two schools that participated in Web surveys showed relatively low response rates despite the reminder of the coordinator and the participation encouragement among parents themselves.

Table 3.1 Korean TWI Program Enrollment and Number of Surveys Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Student Enrollment in TWI programs</th>
<th>Number of Surveys returned</th>
<th>Survey Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014*

In terms of student’s grade levels, the number of respondents was fairly distributed across grade levels, although the number of respondents of third-grade and fourth-grade students was greater than was the number of parents of other grade-level children. Specifically, of 454 participants, 17% were parents of kindergarten children (76 participants); 16% were parents of first-grade students (72 participants); 22% were parents of second-grade children (101 participants); 20% were parents of third-grade students (91 participants); 11% were parents of fourth-grade students (48 participants); and 15% were parents of fifth-grade students (66 participants).

**Survey Instrument Development**

**Sources for Survey Instrument**

To develop the survey instrument for this study, I used three different sources. First, I referred to a survey developed to investigate parents of students in TWI programs. Targeting parents of children in Spanish TWI programs in New Mexico, *Dual Language Family Survey* was developed as part of the *Dual Language Database Project* in New Mexico in 2005 (Dual
Language Education of New Mexico, n.d.). The survey examined parents’ motivation for choosing TWI programs for their child. I referred to items of the survey regarding parents’ reasons for enrolling their child in the program, expectations for the TWI programs, and program evaluation. However, I modified answer choices of the original survey to quantify outcomes effectively. For instance, as for a question about parents’ reasons for choosing a TWI program, I changed the response method from ‘check all relevant’ items to items on a Likert scale. In doing so, I was able to quantify outcome values more effectively to perform regression analysis. In addition, when developing scales for given answers, I purposefully avoided a middle category (e.g., neither agree nor disagree) that may cause ambiguous interpretations.

Second, I added questions and answer choices based on the results of my pilot study, which was interview-based research that had been conducted in 2012. In this pilot study, I interviewed parents and school personnel at the UCLA Community School in Los Angeles, focusing on parents’ reasons for choosing the school’s Korean TWI program and parents’ overall satisfaction with the program. However, during the interviews with the parents and the school personnel, unexpected topics that the study did not intend to examine emerged, such as intergroup relations and teacher’s Korean proficiency. For example, the issue of intergroup relations among children was raised by teachers of the program; tensions among parents were reported by a Korean parent who often volunteered for the school. In addition, teachers’ Korean proficiency was mentioned by some parents, and commitment to the program was discussed by a couple of school staff during the interviews. Accordingly, I included these topics in this study for further examinations. A brief summary of this pilot study is presented in appendix F.

Finally, with respect to questions regarding demographics (e.g., race, language background, income level, and education level), I referred to a parent questionnaire used for
Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS: 2002) developed by National Center for Education Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). By employing the items and answer choices designed for the nationwide survey, I was able to employ a standardized format for questions regarding parents’ demographic information.

**Survey Measures**

This survey instrument was developed for descriptive uses as well as analytic uses (Groves et al., 2009). For descriptive uses, I collected information on parents’ demographics, information sources to search for programs, program evaluation, commitment to programs, and so forth. Regarding analytic uses, I sought to investigate relationships among variables of interest in this study. For both descriptive uses and analytic uses, the survey measures were developed to explore individual items as well as constructs. In fact, items and constructs are closely associated with each other. Constructs comprise a set of items that are relevant to the theme of each construct. The constructs — also called latent variables — take certain values for phenomena of interest that are not observable (DeVellis, 2011). Because some topics in this study were not directly observable, I developed multiple items that can be quantified under each construct. Note that I addressed six primary research questions for this study in Chapter 1 in regard to (1) parent characteristics, (2) reasons for choosing the program, (3) satisfaction with and concerns over language development, (4) integration among children and integration among parents, (5) parental involvement in the program, and (6) program evaluation; survey questionnaires were developed corresponding to the themes of the six research topics. I will explain individual measures below.
Parent Demographics

Questions regarding demographics included seven items: gender, race/ethnicity, language background (first language), countries of origin, English proficiency, education levels, and annual household income levels. The race/ethnicity item was created to identify what racial/ethnic groups of parents choose Korean TWI programs. As for race and ethnicity, I did not distinguish the two terminologies; instead, I used ‘race/ethnicity’ as one terminology in the survey. According to Omi and Winant (1994), *race* implies power and power relationships among different racial groups, whereas *ethnicity* indexes cultural differences, values, and practices. For example, the Asian racial category includes multiple ethnicities, such as Korean, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese. In this study’s survey, however, participants were allowed to interpret the question with either terminology that they felt comfortable with.

Additionally, participants were asked to indicate their language backgrounds and countries of origin. As for language background, I clarified the term *native language* in the survey question, explaining that native language refers to the first language a person learned to speak when he or she was a child. The survey also included a question about one’s country of origin based on the assumption that most respondents in the survey were immigrants or were from immigrant families. Participants were also asked to report their English proficiency in four language areas — reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Finally, participants were asked to identify their education levels, spouses’ education levels, and household income levels. All the questions in the survey were based on the self-reporting manner; thus, mendacious answers could be reported, which cannot be detected.
Reasons for Choosing Korean TWI Programs

A set of items for reasons to choose Korean TWI programs was derived from literature on parents in TWI programs that I presented in Chapter 2 and my pilot study. While conducting the pilot study, I noticed that parents had distinct reasons for choosing a school and for enrolling their child in a Korean TWI program. In fact, parents consider multiple factors concurrently when deciding a school for their child. However, in this study I separated school choice reasons and program choice reasons to better identify parents’ motivations. I created six items about parents’ school choice and developed seven items regarding Korean TWI program choice.

First, one set of items about school choice included the following reasons, such as offering of a Korean TWI program, school’s overall reputation, school’s academic performance (API scores), diverse demographics, school location (same neighborhood as home), and school safety. Next, the other set of items about Korean TWI program choice contained the following reasons, which are also reflected as parents’ expectation in the previous literature, such as development of bilingual abilities, better academic success, abilities to relate to other races and cultures, heritage maintenance, preparation for a global society, future economic benefits, and comparatively more English instruction than Spanish TWI programs. As for the item of comparatively more English instruction than Spanish, this item was created based on the pilot study interview result in which some English-Spanish bilingual parents addressed. The parents stated they chose a Korean program although a Spanish program was available because of more emphasis on English in the Korean program in comparison to the Spanish program. Even though this item was a school-specific item, I included this item for schools that had the Korean TWI program and the Spanish TWI program in the same school site. For all items, responses were offered on a scale of 1 (Not important) to 5 (Very important).
Additionally, I added an open-ended question for the heritage maintenance item for non-Korean parents who chose either *important* or *very important* in the question. Heritage maintenance is one of the reasons that partner-language speaking parents in TWI programs emphasize. However, given that TWI programs equally value all cultures and languages of children in the program, I examined how non-Korean parents in this survey perceived heritage maintenance in the Korean TWI program by allowing them to share their opinions in an open-ended question.

**Satisfaction with Language Development and Concerns over Language Instruction**

As discussed in Chapter 2, literature has addressed issues concerning different language proficiency levels between the English-dominant group and the partner-language group in the same program. In this study, I examined how parents perceived their child’s language development in English and Korean. Although language test scores can be a more objective index of student’s language proficiency, I attempted to explore this topic from parents’ perspectives by examining their satisfaction with their child’s language development given this study’s focus on parents. Considering that language ability comprises different skills, such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening, I developed individual items for these four skills in English and Korean, respectively. For these eight items, responses were provided on a scale of 1 (*Very dissatisfied*) to 4 (*Very satisfied*).

In regard to satisfaction with language development, I used these eight items to present descriptive statistics results and at the same time, I created the variable of *satisfaction with language* for inferential statistics analysis. To create the variable by using several items, I performed principal component analysis (PCA). PCA is used for identifying patterns, highlighting similarities and differences of the patterns in the data, and extracting relevant
information (factor) from confusing datasets (Smith, 2002). Because the primary purpose of PCA in this study was to identify and compute composite scores for the satisfaction with language factor, PCA was considered an appropriate analysis to identify the number of factors and ensure a common factor among multiple items. Using the eight language items, I performed PCA, and the result indicates that the satisfaction with language factor was underlying responses of all eight items ($\chi^2 (28) = 3707.55, p< 0.001$). Also, Cronbach’s alpha for the measure of parental satisfaction with their child’s language development was 0.89. After ensuring this analysis result, I averaged across the eight items assessing parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development. Appendix E has detailed Stata output for this result.

Additionally, participants were asked if their child was having any difficulty receiving instruction in English and in Korean, respectively. Concerns over language instruction was derived from previous literature presented in Chapter 2. By adding questions about parents’ concerns over language instruction, I sought to examine if parents of students in Korean TWI programs confronted the same issue. Responses were on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). These items were used for descriptive statistics only.

Integration among Children and Integration among Parents
As reviewed in Chapter 2, integration is one of the central goals of TWI programs. Literature on integration in TWI programs has admonished that the program may not foster integration without careful consideration of power relations and differential language status between English and a partner language (e.g., Genesee & Gándara, 1999; Valdés, 1997; de Jong & Howard, 2009). Also, from the intergroup contact theory’s perspective, TWI programs are an intriguing place for the theory to be tested. In regard to integration issue, I sought to examine Korean TWI programs by exploring how parents perceived integration among children and to further investigate how they
appreciated integration among themselves. As for integration among children, I created two items: child’s ability to get along with students of different races and cultures in school and outside of school, respectively in order to identify if there was any difference in integration in the school context and outside of the school context. Responses were on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied). Furthermore, I created a composite variable (get along well among children) by using the two items for inferential statistics analysis. To do this, I conducted principal component analysis, and the result ensured that the two items belonged to one factor ($\chi^2(1) = 498.47, p< 0.001$). Cronbach’s alpha for the measure of integration among children was 0.91. Regarding integration among parents, participants were asked to indicate their opinion on the following statement “parents get along well with parents of different races and cultures,” which was on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

**Parental Involvement**

As I clarified the definition of parental involvement in Chapter 2, most definitions regarding parent involvement literature underscore parents’ participation in school and their communication and interaction with others parents and school personnel, which are visible behaviors (e.g., Lopez, Scribner, & Mahitivanichcha, 2001; McWayne et al., 2004; Englund et al., 2004). Focusing on this definition, I added 10 items that asked how often parents participated in these 10 behaviors. These items were derived from the Dual Language Family Survey (Dual Language Education of New Mexico, n.d.) and included multiple involvement-related behaviors, such as sharing information with other parents, talking about school meetings/events with other parents, attending PTA meetings, organizing school events, speaking with a teacher, and so forth. These items were on a scale of 1 (Never) to 4 (Always).
In addition, I categorize the 10 items depending on the characteristics of the behaviors. Of the 10 items, four items are related to parents’ interactions with other parents, whereas the other six items are associated with parents’ engagement in school and school personnel. Based on this distinction, I performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to explore the 10 items focusing on two measures: parents’ experiences with other parents and parents’ participation in school. For the measure of parents’ experiences, four items — other parents give information, other parents do me a favor or receive a favor from me, other parents supervise my child, and I speak with other parents about school — were examined. Standardized factor loadings ranged from 0.52 to 0.89 for all items, and Cronbach’s alpha for the measure of parents’ experiences with other parents was 0.77. Additionally, the measure of parental participation in school was investigated based on CFA by using six items in the survey, including speak with the coordinator/principal, speak with the teacher, attend PTA meeting, volunteer for school/program, organize school event, and attend a conference meeting. The CFA result indicates that standardized factor loadings for all these items ranged from 0.61 to 0.74; Cronbach’s alpha for the measure of parents’ participation in school was 0.82. Stata outputs for these analyses are presented in appendix E.

I also added items that investigate parents’ perceptions of overall school environment. Research has shown that overall school environment is closely related to the degree of parental involvement, which can encourage or discourage parents’ engagement in child’s schooling (e.g., Comer & Haynes, 1991; Griffith, 1996, 1998). These items were derived from the Dual Language Family Survey (Dual Language Education of New Mexico, n.d.), which examined parents’ views of school environment, such as welcoming parents, embracing different languages and cultures, and feeling respected.
Finally, I added items to explore potential obstacles that hamper overall parents’ participation in school. These items came from the Dual Language Family Survey (Dual Language Education of New Mexico, n.d.) as well. In this set of items, participants were asked what would encourage parents to participate in school more often, such as flexible work schedule, childcare for younger children, language ability, school staff’s more efforts, and so forth.

Program Evaluation

The program evaluation measure indicates how parents evaluate their child’s TWI program in general, and the measure was on a letter-grade scale from F (1) to A+ (14). In addition to the evaluation measure, I added three items for descriptive purpose. Of the three, two items were about academic rigor of the TWI program; the two items referred to the Dual Language Family survey (Dual Language Education of New Mexico, n.d.). Also, the other item asked parents’ opinions on teachers’ language proficiency in a partner language, which emerged in previous research (Lee & Jeong, 2013) and in my pilot study while conversing with a Korean parent. These three items were on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

Outcome Variables and Explanatory Variables

Items and constructs were investigated for descriptive uses at first, and then they were used or recoded for analytic purposes. For analytic uses, an item itself was used as an outcome value or as an independent variable. A construct with several items was also employed as a dependent variable or a covariate. As discussed above, confirmatory factor analysis and principal component analysis were conducted to ensure that a set of items reflected a particular measure of interest.

With respect to dependent variables for inferential statistics, I paid particular attention to four topics based on this study’s primary research questions: (1) integration among parents, (2)
parents’ experiences with other parents, (3) their participation in school, and (4) program
evaluation by parents. Regarding explanatory variables, I included eleven parent-related
variables. Of the eleven variables, three variables — program evaluation, experiences with other
parents, and participation in school — were used as dependent variables as well. Other than these
three, the other covariates were parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development,
integration among children, integration among parents, years in the program, as well as parents’
demographic information, such as Korean ethnicity, English proficiency, income level, and
mother’s education level.

Regarding mother’s education, in particular, I focused this variable because it has been
employed in child development and educational research as a useful index of multiple social
status of family, such as socioeconomic status, household crowding, parental occupation, and
parental employment status (e.g., Burchinal, Lee, & Ramey, 1989; Caughy, DiPietro, &
Strobino, 1994; Christian, Morrison, & Bryant, 1998). Moreover, most participants in this survey
were mothers (82%). Some of them indicated that they did not have spouses or partners, and in
such case father’s education level remained missing in the data. Including missing observations
reduces the validity of the data analysis; hence, for the education level variable, I use maternal
education level rather than paternal education level. The following table has more detailed
information regarding what individual variables referred to and how they were recoded or
generated (see Table 3.2).
Table 3.2 Descriptions of Outcome Variables and Explanatory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation (prgm_eval)</td>
<td>Originally asked on a letter-grade scale (e.g., A’, A, A’, etc.) in the survey, the program evaluation variable was recoded with numeric values. This variable ranges from 0 to 12 in which a higher value refers to a better evaluation of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among parents (p_along, recoded from p_getalong)</td>
<td>This is a recoded binary variable by using the integration among parents variable. 0 refers to responses of ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree,’ and 1 contains responses of ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents (p_exp)</td>
<td>This variable was created by employing several aspects of parents’ interactions with other parents, including, give me information about school/teachers, do me a favor, receive a favor from me, supervise my child, and speak with other parents about school meetings and events. An average value for the aggregated sum of these variables comprise of the experience variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in school (participation)</td>
<td>The participation variable contained parents’ school-related activities, including attend school events, attend PTA meetings, volunteer for class/school, organize school events, chaperon for child's class, speak with a child's teacher, speak with a TWI coordinator, speak with a principal, speak in favor of a TWI program, and attend TWI-related meetings outside of school. An average value for the aggregated sum of these variables comprise of the participation variable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation (prgm_eval)</td>
<td>See description in outcome variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents (p_exp)</td>
<td>See description in outcome variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in school (participation)</td>
<td>See description in outcome variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with language development (satis_lang)</td>
<td>The satisfaction with language development variable includes language development of both English and Korean languages. This variable was generated by using the satisfaction with English (understand, speak, read, and write) and Korean (understand, speak, read, and write) variables. The overall satisfaction with language development variable is an average of the eight variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children (getalong_sch)</td>
<td>The integration among children variable was created by looking at the average value of two variables: parents' satisfaction with child's integration (1) in classroom and (2) outside of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among parents (p_getalong)</td>
<td>This variable refers to parents' agreement levels regarding the question that 'parents get along with parents of different races and cultures,' which ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability (p_eng)</td>
<td>Considering the importance of communicative skills for interacting with other parents and school personnel, self-reported speaking and listening abilities were employed for this variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level (income)</td>
<td>This variable was created by referring to the income level question in the American Community Survey. The variable ranges from 1 (none) to 13 ($200,001 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the program (howlong)</td>
<td>This variable indicates the number of years that a child were in the program. The variable ranges from 1 (1 year) to 6 (6 years).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This variable indicates a mother’s education level that was self-reported by a respondent. This variable was generated by using variables for gender, education level, and spouse or partner's education level, ranging from 1 (did not finish high school) to 7 (completed a Ph.D., MD, or equivalent).

This is a binary variable that indicates Korean ethnicity: 0 for non-Korean respondents and 1 for Korean respondents. Respondents who were biracial or multiracial of Korean descent were classified into the Korean group.

Note: Words in parentheses refer to actual variable names used for regression analysis in this study.

Pairwise Correlation Analysis and Path Analysis

Pairwise Correlation Analysis

In regard to relationships among variables, pairwise correlation analyses were conducted before I performed inferential analyses in order to see overall relations among variables and to detect multicollinearity issues, which are caused due to highly correlated covariate variables in regression analysis.

The results of pairwise correlation analysis indicated that there were several notable correlations between multiple pairs of variables in this study. First, as for strong correlations, the most significant and strong correlation was between child’s integration and integration among parents (r=0.51), and experiences with other parents and participation in school were strongly correlated with each other (r=0.49) as well. Program evaluation and parent’s satisfaction with their child’s language development had a strong correlation, which was r=0.45; parent’s English proficiency was strongly correlated with integration among parents (r=0.40).

Second, moderate correlations were found between several pairs of variables. The Korean ethnicity variable had negative and moderate correlations with parent’s English proficiency (r=-0.38) and integration among parents (r=-0.33), respectively. Satisfaction with language development was moderately correlated with child’s integration (r=0.36) and integration among parents (r=0.33), respectively. Mother’s education level was positively correlated with family income level, which was r=0.31.
Third, there were multiple weak but non-negligible correlations. Parent’s English proficiency was positively correlated with their satisfaction with child’s language development \((r=0.20)\). Integration among children had correlations with program evaluation \((r=0.24)\) and parent’s English proficiency \((r=0.26)\). Participation in school was correlated with parent’s English proficiency \((r=0.22)\), integration among parents \((r=0.26)\), and the Korean ethnicity \((r=-0.26)\), respectively. Program evaluation had a positive correlation with integration among parents \((r=0.22)\), whereas child’s integration had a negative correlation with the Korean ethnicity \((r=-0.27)\). Family income was positively correlated with experiences with other parents \((r=0.26)\) and the Korean ethnicity \((r=0.20)\).

Every correlation reported in this section was statistically significant at the \(p=0.05\) level, and all correlation results for each pair of variables are presented in Table 3.3.

**Path Analysis**

While pairwise correlation examines relationships between a pair of variables, path analysis explores *assumed* causal relationships with empirical evidence between a latent variable and a measure (DeVellis, 2011). A causal model can be depicted with a path diagram, which represents assumed cause-and-effect relationships among a set of variables (Agresti & Finlay, 2009).

Although further inferential analysis results will be covered in the following chapters, the path analysis results imply meaningful associations among some sets of variables. For example, significant and meaningful relationships were detected between the following sets of variables: (1) integration among children and integration among parents \((0.42)\), (2) satisfaction with language development and program evaluation \((0.41)\), (3) parental participation and experiences with other parents \((0.48)\), and (4) the oppositional relationships of the two aforementioned variables \((0.45)\).
The path diagram is also meaningful in that it demonstrates causal relationships as well as moderator effects among multiple variables. For instance, according to the path diagram, parents’ English proficiency affects their participation in school, which is also influential on parents’ experiences with other parents. Figure 3.1 has more detailed results for path analysis among sets of predictors and outcome variables of interest in this study.
Table 3.3 Pairwise Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program evaluation</th>
<th>English ability (parents)</th>
<th>Language development satisfaction</th>
<th>Integration (children)</th>
<th>Integration (parents)</th>
<th>Experiences (parents)</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Years in program</th>
<th>Mother education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sig †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language development</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (children)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration (parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences (parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.379</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in program</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. ‘NS’ refers to not significant.
Figure 3.1 Path Analysis

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Data Analysis Strategies

Analytic Approaches to the Data

Employing the survey data, data analysis for this study comprised three parts: (1) descriptive statistics to understand the topics of interest, (2) Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) rank sum tests to compare the Korean and non-Korean groups, and (3) inferential statistics to examine associations between dependent variables and independent variables as well as Korean ethnicity. The results and findings of these analyses will be demonstrated in the following chapters. On top of these analyses, I also performed pairwise correlation analysis and path analysis in order to understand relationships among variables of interest, which were presented earlier.

In regard to descriptive statistics, I examined individual items under certain topics of interest, such as demographics, parents’ reasons for school choice, integration issues in TWI programs, and so forth. I also presented descriptive statistics by groups (e.g., Koreans, non-Koreans, and all) to explore whether group analyses yielded different outcomes.

Following descriptive statistics, I conducted WMW rank sum tests to investigate if group differences were statistically significant. Traditionally, a chi-square test is used to examine if there is a relationship between two categorical variables, or a two independent samples t-test is performed to compare the means of the two groups. However, due to non-normally distributed variables of interest in this study, I purposefully conducted WMW rank sum tests, which assume that the dependent variable is not a normally distributed interval variable (UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group).

Finally, I further explored certain topics by performing regression analysis. Using multiple covariates, I conducted multivariate linear regression and multivariate logistic regression, depending on the characteristics of outcome variables. The outcome variables of
interest for the regression models were (1) program evaluation by parents, (2) parents’ integration with other parents, (3) parents’ experiences with other parents, and (4) parents’ participation in school. Along with the descriptive statistics for individual variables, inferential statistics provided meaningful information by allowing me to investigate relationships between outcome variables and independent variables by controlling for other explanatory variables in the regression model.

For regression analysis, I started with full models, which included all candidate covariates that I was interested in and then removed non-significant variables by using backward elimination method\(^6\) in order to seek efficient models. Although I present results for the full models as well as refined models for individual regression analyses, I will focus on refined models that contain only meaningful predictors for model interpretations.

Given the structure of the data, I also considered multilevel modeling where parents were nested within schools; to decide whether to perform a single-level analysis or a two-level analysis, I examined Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). Even though there is ongoing debate regarding whether ICC is a useful criterion for deciding either multilevel modeling or single-level modeling, ICC is an informative indicator when performing multilevel modeling (Hayes, 2006). For most models in this study, ICC for null models was sufficiently close to zero, meaning multilevel modeling would not yield meaningful results compared to single-level analysis. However, to investigate parents’ experiences with other parents, I conducted a multilevel multivariate regression analysis. Descriptions of regression output and ICC results for individual models in this study are presented in the appendices B and C.

---

\(^6\) Since unnecessary variables can cause noise to estimates in regression models and waste degrees of freedom (df) at the same time, it is desirable to eliminate redundant or non-significant covariates from models in order to measure the relationship between an outcome of interest and explanatory variables in a proper way. To remove predictors that are not statistically significant, backward elimination method drops a variable that has the highest p-value, and this process continues until a model keeps predictors that are significant.
**Issue of Multicollinearity**

Multicollinearity refers to a statistical phenomenon in which predictors in a model are highly correlated with each other. If there is a multicollinearity issue in a given model, it is difficult to measure statistically appropriate estimates of individual predictor variables; hence, it will yield improper conclusions and estimates between an outcome variable of interest and independent variables. Given this importance, it is necessary to detect if a model has a multicollinearity issue before conducting analysis. Multicollinearity can be detected by examining Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values, which indicate how much variance of an estimated regression coefficient is inflated due to the multicollinearity issue. In general, the rule of thumb used is that if VIF values exceed 5 or 10, it implies that the estimated regression has the issue of multicollinearity and that measured estimates are assessed inappropriately (Montgomery et. al., 2001). In this study, the issue of multicollinearity was checked for refined models for the four regression models, and all VIF values did not exceed 1.5, meaning that there was no issue of multicollinearity. Appendix D has more detailed Stata output for the tests.

**Analytic Software**

Every statistical analysis in this study was conducted in Stata (version 13.1), which is statistical data analysis software. Stata was considered the most effective tool for this study. First, Mitchell (2007) states in his comparative analysis of various statistics packages, “Stata is far more comprehensive in its support for analyzing survey data than SAS or SPSS [because] it handles a wider variety of estimation commands and a wider variety of survey design types and/or survey aspects than SAS or SPSS” (p. 20). Second, Stata is also effective software for logistic regression that I conducted to explore integration issue among parents. Again, Mitchell (2007) argues that Stata is unique in its offerings in regard to logit regression models and interpretations of the
results. Finally, Stata offers a tool for path analysis that I also explored, which allowed me to understand causal relationships among variables.

**Research Context**

In this section, I present a brief overview of the research context to understand the overall social environment where the schools that this study examines are situated. I illustrate general features of the communities of individual schools based on the ACS data analysis and then explore the two districts in this study by employing multiple CDE datasets. Next, I describe the characteristics of individual Korean TWI programs.

California has the highest number of Korean population in the nation\(^7\), and the city of Los Angeles has over one-quarter of the Korean population in the state\(^8\) (Hoeffel, Rastogi, Kim, & Shahid, 2012). Due to this high concentration of Koreans in the Los Angeles area, several Korean-English TWI programs have been developed since the early 1990s. Starting the first Korean-English TWI program in the U.S. launched in Koreatown in 1992 (Sohn & Merrill, 2008), as of 2014, there are 13 schools (nine elementary schools, three middle schools, and one high school) that offer Korean TWI instruction in the area. Some schools are located in Koreatown, Los Angeles or are adjacent to the area, which is a symbolic location for Korean Americans in Southern California. Koreatown, Los Angeles is also a home to a substantial number of immigrants from various countries, such as Korea, China, the Philippines, Japan, Vietnam, Mexico, and other South/Central American countries. The City of Los Angeles, on average, comprises nearly 40% of foreign-born population. In summary, considering this long

---

\(^7\) According to the 2010 American Community Survey, top five states in the U.S.A. that have large Korean population are California (30%), New York (9%), New Jersey (6%), Texas (5%), and Virginia (5%). The rest of the Korean population (46%) are distributed across the other states.

\(^8\) The City of Los Angeles alone has over one quarter of Korean population in California. One-in-thirteen Koreans in the U.S.A. live in the city as well.
history of Korean TWI programs and the diverse demographic feature of the area, I purposively selected the schools in the Los Angeles area for this study.

**Characteristics of Communities for Individual Schools**

*Racial Composition*

According to ZIP code tabulation areas (ZCTAs) that the ACS data employed, seven schools in this study belonged to six different ZCTAs. Total population varied from community to community, which ranged from 22,500 to 62,800. Two communities for Broadway and Ocean View were predominantly White and Asian, where nearly 85% of the residents were either White or Asian. Following these two communities, a community for Valley Road was a nearly White or Asian community as well, where 80% of the residents were either White or Asian. As opposed to these three, the rest of the communities in this study were majority-Latino communities where more than half or nearly half of the residents were of Hispanic descent; the second largest racial group for these communities was Asian. As for African Americans, a community for Dryden Street had the largest share of blacks (19%) among the communities (see Table 3.4).

*Nativity*

With respect to nativity, there were a substantial number of people who were foreign born in most communities. Over 50% of the respondents in three communities were born in foreign countries, and the other three communities had over one-in-three residents who were born outside the United States. This substantial number of foreign-born population for this study also demonstrated various languages spoken in the communities. According to the ACS data, a considerable portion of the residents reported that they spoke a language other than English at home, which ranged from 40% to 67% (see Table 3.4).
Income Level

In respect to median household income levels, there was a significant variation among the six communities in this study. According to the ACS five-year estimates data, the most affluent community was the one for Valley Road Elementary, which reported nearly 100,000 dollars for median household income. In contrast, the community for Raymond Community School recorded the lowest household income, which was slightly over 32,000 dollars. Regarding the share of population who were classified as being in poverty status, three communities had a higher portion of population in poverty status, compared to the statewide statistics, which was 15.3%. Of the four communities, over one-in-five people were in poverty status in three communities, and one community had over one-quarter of the population in poverty status. The other three communities in this study had less than 10% of the population in poverty (see Table 3.4).

Education Level

Educational attainment also varied from community to community. For instance, closely 95% of the residents in one community obtained high school or higher diplomas, whereas one-in-three residents in another community did not complete high school. The share of children enrolled in public schools was over 80%, on average, except one community that was the most affluent.
### Table 3.4 Community Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>91202</td>
<td>22,533</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>91214</td>
<td>31,479</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>90004</td>
<td>62,884</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>90005</td>
<td>39,592</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>90247</td>
<td>46,590</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>90004</td>
<td>62,884</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>91326</td>
<td>35,691</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Residents in Poverty Status</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>Speak a Language Other than English at Home</th>
<th>High School Graduate or Higher</th>
<th>Children Enrolled in Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>$70,176</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>$87,072</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>$87,072</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>$38,430</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>$32,086</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>$44,612</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>$38,430</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>$99,041</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

**Notes:** Poverty status here follows the 100 to 199% of the poverty level. According to the U.S. Census, ‘poverty areas’ are census tracts or block numbering areas (BNA's) where at least 20% of residents were below the poverty level.

---

9 People and families are classified as being in poverty if their income is less than their poverty threshold. Poverty thresholds are dollar amounts that the U.S. Census Bureau uses for telling a family or an individual’s poverty status. If a person or family income is less than the threshold itself, meaning income is less than twice of the threshold, they are in poverty (below 100% of poverty). If family income is less than three times the threshold, they are below 200% of poverty.
District and School Characteristics

In this section, I briefly describe features of the districts and schools in this study to comprehend the overall contexts where TWI programs operate. By schools, I refer to the entire school as one unit, not Korean TWI programs.

California schools, in general, encounter severe segregation by race, and this segregation is aggravated by associating with poverty and language issues (Orfield & Ee, 2014). At the same time, there is a significant difference in the level of segregation among different school districts across the state. This study explored two schools in the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) and five schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The two districts in this study also differed substantially in terms of racial composition, and this difference became more pronounced when comparing segregation statistics.

Table 3.5 Segregation Statistics in Glendale and Los Angeles Unified School Districts

<p>| Exposure Rates to Black/Latino/American Indian Students by Typical Student |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White/Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black/Latino/AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>26,187</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>655,494</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Exposure Rates to White/Asian Students by Typical Student |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White/Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black/Latino/AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>26,187</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>655,494</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Exposure to Low-Income Students by Typical Student |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White/Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black/Latino/AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>26,187</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>655,494</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education. School Enrollment Data, 2012-2013.
Note: AI refers to American Indian

Table 3.5 indicates that (1) the share of the combined group of black, Latino, and American Indian students, (2) the percentage of the combined white and Asian students, and (3) the proportion of low-income students by the typical student of each race. For instance, regarding
the exposure to black, Latino, and American Indian students, the typical black student in the LAUSD attended a school with 86% of black, Latino, and American Indian students, while the typical black student in the GUSD attended a school with 27% of black, Latino, and American Indian classmates. With respect to the exposure to whites and Asians, the typical white student in the GSUD attended a school with 76% of white and Asian classmates, while the typical Latino student in the LAUSD went to a school where less than 10% of white and Asian students were enrolled (see Table 3.5). The difference between the two districts in the double segregation by race and poverty was also conspicuous. In the LASUD, for instance, the typical Latino student attended a school where over 80% of their classmates were low-income, whereas the typical Asian student in the GUSD went to a school with 41% of low-income students.

Although all seven schools are located in Los Angeles County, they are in different cities, such as Los Angeles, Glendale, La Crescenta, Gardena, and Porter Ranch where small or large Korean communities have been developed (see Figures 3.2 and 3.3). All are public schools that serve students who reside in established school attendance boundaries, but the schools allow students who come outside of the boundaries to be enrolled in the schools, provided that the students must be enrolled only in TWI programs, not in regular programs.

Table 3.6 School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Magnet</th>
<th>Grades Offered</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>Porter Ranch</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education. School Enrollment Data, 2013-2014
Note: Total enrollment is the school total, not about Korean-English TWI program enrollment.
Even though all seven schools are public schools, Broadway is a magnet school. As for grades served, Raymond Community is a K-12 school; Valley Road serves students from kindergarten through eighth grade. The rest of the schools serve students at the elementary level.
only. Total enrollments of the schools range from 600 to over 1,000. With respect to school location, four schools are in Los Angeles: three in Koreatown and one in the Hancock Park neighborhood, which is the west region of Koreatown. As for schools in the GUSD, one is near the La Crescenta-Montrose neighborhood where CA-2 and I-210 freeways meet; the other is close to the junction of I-5 and CA-134 freeways. Valley Road is located in the northwest region of the San Fernando Valley region of the city of Los Angeles. Finally, Dryden Street School is located in Gardena, which is the South Bay region of Los Angeles County where the highest percentage of Japanese live in the U.S.A. except Hawaii (Zip Atlas, 2013).

Figure 3.3 Schools in Koreatown, Los Angeles

Source: Google Maps

Notes: School 4 (Catalina Elementary), School 5 (Raymond Community School), and School 6 (Highland Elementary)
Given different school neighborhoods and locations, seven schools in this study had diverse student bodies. The 2013-2014 California Department of Education Data (CDE) demonstrated that three of the seven schools were multiracial schools, which had more than 10% of students enrolled from three or more different groups (e.g., Broadway, Dryden Street, and Valley Road Community). However, three schools (Catalina, Raymond Community, and Dryden Street) were intensely segregated (90 to 100% minority students enrolled), and among the three schools, two schools (Catalina and Raymond Community) were “apartheid” schools, where less than 1% whites were enrolled (see Tables 3.7 and 3.8). Although there may be a dissenting opinion on whether grouping non-white students including Asians as the minority group is appropriate, the table for multiracial minority schools still provides noteworthy information that indicates the level school segregation of each school.

Table 3.7 Percentage of Racial Group in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Students of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education. School Enrollment Data, 2013-2014
Table 3.8 Multiracial and Minority Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Multiracial School</th>
<th>50-100% Minority School</th>
<th>90-100% Minority School</th>
<th>99-100% Minority School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education. School Enrollment Data, 2013-2014*

*Note: Minority school represents black, Latino, American Indian, and Asian students. Multiracial schools are those with any three races representing 10% or more of the total enrollment respectively.*

In addition, some schools in this study encountered intense segregation by race, poverty, and language. Catalina Elementary, for example, had over 85% students from low-income families, and more than half of the total enrollment was ELLs. Raymond Community also had over 80% socioeconomically disadvantaged students and nearly 50% ELLs. Considering schools in California on average had 60.8% students from low-income families, these schools had a higher number of poor students compared to other California schools in general. In contrast, only one-in-nine students were from a socioeconomically disadvantaged family at Valley Road Community, and the school had 10% ELLs, which was far lower than the state average, 22.6%.

With respect to academic outcomes of the seven schools, three-year average Academic Performance Index (API) scores indicated that all schools except Raymond Community performed well, exceeding the statewide API average scores — 815. API scores tend to get lower as grade levels increase, and given that Raymond Community is a K-12 school, the school’s API score may have been lower than the other schools that did not include students at the secondary level (see Table 3.9).
Table 3.9 Percentage of Low-Income and ELL Students and School API

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Low-Income</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>API</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: California Department of Education. English Learners, and Free, Reduced Meals Program, and Academic Performance Index Datasets, 2013-2014

Note: Valley Road Community does not have API scores for the past three years and offers an API score for the current year (2013-2014) instead.

Korean TWI Program Profiles

Located in different communities and districts, Korean TWI programs are housed in different school contexts as well. In this section, I present brief descriptions of seven schools’ Korean TWI programs, such as established year, number of classes offered, grades served, immersion model, and availability of English mainstream classes. Some descriptions are based on my personal observations, visits of individual schools, and conversations with school personnel and thus may contain subjective information.

Broadway Elementary

Established in 2007, the school’s Korean TWI program had a high reputation in the community as well as among teachers in other Korean-English TWI programs. Broadway’s Korean TWI program was implemented based on the district’s efforts as a response to declining enrollment of the district and for better academic benefits to students (Glendale Unified School District, 2013a). The program’s primary goals are to foster bilingualism and biliteracy, to develop academically successful students, and to promote students’ cultural competency for appreciating and respecting all cultures (Glendale Unified School District, 2013b).
The Korean TWI program is a special program in this school that also offers English mainstream classes. As a magnet school, this school provides the visual and performing arts option for parents in addition to the Korean-English TWI program. Located in a nice suburban neighborhood, the school had a very welcoming environment for its parents and visitors. The school office had bilingual staff who could offer support for non-English speaking parents. In the Korean TWI classrooms, the ratio of Korean and non-Korean speakers varied by grade levels, but it seemed that there were more Korean students. However, the teachers stated that there were Korean students whose primary language was English; thus, the simple ratio of Korean to non-Korean students may not correspond to the ratio of Korean speakers to English speakers.

As for its TWI model, the program is based on the 50/50 immersion model in which half of instruction takes place in English and the other half uses Korean. Students are taught by the same teachers who are bilingual in Korean and English, yet the school separates instructional time by language. The teaching staff developed their own materials for TWI instruction and also used Korean textbooks developed in and imported from South Korea. I observed the school’s science and math classes that occurred based on the Korean instruction. By and large, students were very active, and the teaching staff seemed professional. The school also had a TWI program coordinator who was bilingual in Korean and English. She was in charge of this school as well as Ocean View Elementary, which was about 15-20 minutes’ drive away from Broadway Elementary.

**Ocean View Elementary**

Like Broadway, Ocean View’s Korean TWI program was implemented in fall 2010 under the district’s plan to expand TWI programs across the district. Accordingly, the Korean TWI program at Ocean View shares program objectives with Broadway. Ocean View’s Korean TWI
program is housed in school along with English mainstream classes. Located in an affluent community, the school had a great number of Asian students, partially attracted by its Korean TWI program. When the survey was administered last year, the Korean instruction was offered for students from kindergarten through third grade; the school now serves fourth-grade students as well. Due to its limited classroom space issue, the district had several discussions to decide if the district needed to move its Korean TWI program to another school in the same district to secure classroom spaces. Yet, the district made the decision to leave the Korean program at Ocean View based on the multiple requests of the school’s parents.

As mentioned above, Ocean View’s Korean TWI program shares the same coordinator with Broadway, and accordingly the two schools are alike in terms of program operation, curriculum, and textbooks used for the program. The Korean program’s immersion model is on the 50/50 basis; instruction for Korean and English is separated by time but taught by the same teachers who are bilingual in Korean and English. The overall school environment seemed very safe and pleasant, and school office had bilingual staff as well. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to observe classroom instruction in person, but the coordinator stated that Korean TWI instruction at Ocean View was organized in the same way as Broadway.

**Catalina Elementary**

Located in Koreatown, this school has the longest history of its Korean-English TWI program in the United States. With respect to the school’s racial composition, the vast majority of this school’s student body was Latinos and Asians, which reflected the community’s demographic feature. Catalina’s Korean TWI program is one of the special programs at this school that also offers English mainstream instruction and Spanish transitional bilingual programs.
The teaching staff of this school were very passionate, and the lead teacher and the teachers of the Korean-English TWI program as well as the school principal showed great interest in this study. Also, they were confident about its TWI program. Even before I collected data, the lead teacher told me that she was sure about the positive feedback from their parents. In terms of school performance, the school maintained a great reputation compared to other schools in the same neighborhood. The teachers said the enrollment competition among Korean parents had been very intense in the past. She stated that the school had not been unable to accommodate all neighborhood students, so parents had lined up early in the morning three to four days in advance to enroll children in kindergarten before the neighborhood had two new schools near Catalina Elementary. I observed its kindergarten class where the Korean instruction occurred by groups based on the level of students’ Korean proficiency. There was a volunteer parent who helped the teacher with group work.

As for the school’s TWI model, the Korean program was on the 50/50 model basis, but some parents stated that the actual amount of time was spent more for English. The school also combined cultural aspects into its language program, such as doing calligraphy for arts activities. According to the lead teacher at Catalina, the school integrated languages and cultures of students and parents, and there was a school-wide culture of respect for diversity. To illustrate, she stated music and art instructional components were derived from students’ diverse cultures. All school materials were provided for parents in English, Spanish, and Korean. The school office also had Korean-speaking and Spanish-speaking staff for non-English speaking parents.

**Raymond Community**

Raymond Community is the only K-12 school in this study, although Korean TWI instruction is available only for students from kindergarten through fifth grade. Compared to the other schools
in the study, this school has a short history. The school’s Korean-English TWI program was launched in 2009 along with the Spanish-English TWI program. When the school opened in 2009, the Korean program served only kindergarten and first-grade students in the same classroom. By 2013, the Korean-English TWI instruction became available for students from kindergarten through fifth grade. Raymond Community has a strong commitment to its TWI programs where students are encouraged to develop biliterate, bilingual, and multicultural competency. Raymond Community does not offer English mainstream instruction for its elementary-level classes; therefore, parents need to enroll their child either in the Spanish program or in the Korean program.

Additionally, this school is distinct from other schools in that it operates multi-age classrooms where students in grades K-1, grades 2-3, and grades 4-5 are grouped together. As for the immersion model, the Korean program is based on the 50/50 model, whereas the Spanish-program is on the 90/10 basis. Yet, based on my observations of the Korean program and interviews with several parents, the language-use ratio was more like the 70/30 model with a 70% of emphasis on instruction in English. Like other Korean TWI programs in this study, the same teachers are in charge of instruction for both Korean and English classes, but for Korean instruction, a volunteer Korean-speaking parent helps teachers to accommodate students’ different levels of Korean proficiency. Korean instruction and English instruction are divided by time. Regrettably, this school’s TWI programs (both Korean and Spanish) have been officially removed from the LAUSD’s TWI directory as of 2013. In regard to this, the teaching staff explained they continued Korean TWI instruction, but by being removed from the district’s directory the school could enjoy autonomy as a pilot school in terms of developing its instruction without having to follow district regulations.
Raymond Community is located in the center of Koreatown where the neighborhood seems somewhat unsafe. In fact, the school coordinator remarked the school prioritized the safety issue as one of the most significant issues because the school’s immediate neighborhood was identified a sphere of gang’s influence. Also, the school is part of larger community schools, which share the school site together. In the same school site, there is an elementary school that offers a Korean TWI program as well, which did not participate in this study.

The vast majority of the student body at Raymond was Latinos, and school staff said there were many parents who did not speak English well. However, this school was well known for its bilingual staff, who were even trilingual, and the school coordinator and the principal stated that they received positive feedback due to its bi- or trilingual staff. Also, considering the school’s diverse parent body, all school materials are offered in English, Spanish, and Korean. Finally, having a partnership with a public university in the same city, the school had a very encouraging environment in terms of academic aspiration and offered several enrichment programs, including afterschool programs.

**Dryden Street Elementary**

Established in 1993, Dryden Street School’s Korean TWI program is the school’s special program, which the teaching staff are very proud of. Dryden Street also has students enrolled in English mainstream classes. The Korean TWI program at Dryden emphasizes the importance of increasing students’ interpersonal communication skills and of embracing a respect for themselves and others regardless of race, culture, or language. The school’s Korean TWI instruction is based on the 50/50 model. Like other Korean programs, teachers who are bilingual in Korean and English provide both English instruction and Korean instruction; however, instruction in each language is separated by time.
Given the school location, the school’s Korean program had some Chinese and Japanese students, which were not usually observed in the other Korean TWI programs. To attract students from its neighborhood, the school put a large banner that advertised its Korean program outside of the school wall. The program had a good reputation in general, and the Korean TWI teaching staff were active and passionate in terms of developing materials. However, a teacher who taught a combo class for students in fourth grade and fifth grade stated that it was very challenging for her to develop materials when she first taught the Korean TWI program. She also told me that the school had difficulty to maintain a balanced number of Korean and non-Korean students, especially for higher grade levels. Regarding the reason, she explained that parents tended to transfer their child to other schools after third grade or fourth grade to increase their options for enrolling their child in a middle school that had a good reputation among parents.

Despite some challenges, the teachers said there was a clear perception among students and parents that the Korean TWI program was superior to English mainstream classes. Sometimes, this caused tensions between teachers of the TWI program and teachers of the mainstream classes. For example, the Korean TWI teachers mentioned students’ comments, such as “I can do it, because I’m in the dual language program,” and “no, please don’t send me to the mainstream class. I would feel I got failed, if I went there.” Also, since students in the Korean TWI program performed better than did the students in regular classes, the Korean TWI program teachers said the teachers in the mainstream classes sometimes made complaints in regard to that issue.

Highland Elementary

Like most of other schools in this study, Highland offers a Korean TWI program as a special program along with regular English mainstream instruction. The school has a closely 15-
year history of its Korean-English TWI program, which started in 2000. The school’s TWI model is based on the 50/50 like other schools. The same Korean-English bilingual teachers are in charge of both Korean and English instruction by dividing instructional time. Highland offers only one Korean TWI classroom for each grade, and the principal said the school did not have any plan to increase the number of classes.

Located in the Hancock Park area, adjacent to Koreatown, the school attracted chiefly Asian and white students. Although I did not have the opportunity to observe its classrooms, I attended a meeting for their non-English speaking parents as well as a meeting between the principal and the teaching staff of Korean TWI program. Given the location and the student body, this school was very popular among Korean parents, and especially the school’s successful academic performance was another appealing factor that attracted parents. Specifically, Highland was in the top 2% of all elementary schools in Los Angeles based on its API scores. The principal was highly proud of the school’s Korean TWI program and the overall performance of the school. Being bilingual herself in Korean and English, she often interacted with parents in both Korean and English at school.

**Valley Road Community School**

Valley Road Community School is a brand-new school that opened in 2012 to serve students from kindergarten through eighth grade. As the school opened, it brought a pre-existing Korean TWI program from Topeka Elementary, which became an affiliated charter school. After the school had become a charter by 2012, LAUSD made the decision to move Topeka’s Korean program to Valley Road Community School. Accordingly, some students from Topeka transferred to Valley Road in order to stay in the Korean TWI program. Valley Road Community School’s Korean TWI instruction is a special program of this school, which also offers English
mainstream classes. Also, as of the academic year 2014-2015, Korean TWI programs have been expanded to seventh grade, but the school provides only mathematics and elective classes for middle-school level Korean instruction. In this study, I only focused on the school’s Korean TWI programs at the elementary level. The school’s TWI program is based on the 50/50 model for classes from kindergarten through fifth grade. One class is offered for each grade level except for third grade, which has two Korean TWI classes. Like all other Korean TWI programs, both Korean and English instruction classes are taught by the same bilingual teachers by dividing instructional time.

Located in an affluent white and Asian community, this school attracted mainly Asian and white students in the neighborhood. The school had a great reputation among parents in the area, and the school also encouraged non-heritage families to enroll the program. The school operates a Facebook page as well as the school website for their parents and students. They posted school event photos on a regular basis to attract more various groups of parents. The TWI teaching staff were also proud of their program as well. The lead teacher of the Korean program remarked that the program received much support from the school community. Although its history was not long enough, she said she saw great potential in the program given the increasing number of Korean population in the neighborhood.

The following table has a brief summary of individual schools’ Korean TWI program information, such as grades served and number of classes by grades (see Table 3.10).
Table 3.10 Korean TWI Program Information by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Established year</th>
<th>Grades served in Korean TWI programs</th>
<th>Number of Korean TWI classes by grades</th>
<th>Immersion model</th>
<th>Other program options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Total of 11: K(2), G1(2), G2(2), G3(2), G4(2), G5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>Total of 9: K(2), G1(2), G2(2), G3(2), G4(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Total of 10: K(2), G1(2), G2(2), G3(2), G4(1), G5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream/ Spanish transitional bilingual program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community*</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Total of 3: K-1(1), G2-3(1), G4-5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>Spanish TWI program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Total of 5: K(1), G1(1), G2(1), G3(1), G4-5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Total of 6: K(1), G1(1), G2(1), G3(1), G4(1), G5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>K-5*</td>
<td>Total of 7: K(1), G1(1), G2(1), G3(2), G4(1), G5(1)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>English mainstream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reflects the current academic year (2014-2015) information. As of the academic year 2014-2015, Valley Road Community school has expanded its Korean TWI program for sixth- and seven-grade students in mathematics and elective classes; however, this table focuses on Korean TWI programs at the elementary level. Raymond Community School has been excluded from the list of LAUSD TWI programs since last year.

Summary

In this chapter, I explored data sources for this study, including ACS data, CDE data, and the Korean TWI parent survey data. ACS data and CDE data offered informative contexts for individual schools and communities, and the parent survey data allowed me to examine parents in the programs profoundly. To analyze the survey data appropriately, I also investigated the results of pairwise correlations and path analysis among the variables of interest. Additionally, I described Korean TWI program profiles based on my personal observations and visits of individual schools in this study.

Seven schools were located in six different communities on the ZCTA basis. With respect to racial composition, all six communities had a considerable number of Asian population. However, of the six communities, three were majority Latino communities, which had on average 50% Latino population, whereas the other three were mainly white and Asian
communities, which were affluent as well. The seven schools reflected the features of the communities. All schools had a large number of Asian students, ranging from 20 to 60%. However, other than the Asian group, the majority of students in three schools were Latino, while the other four schools had a great number of white students. Three schools were multiracial schools, and all schools except one were 50-100% minority schools. Three schools were highly segregated schools (less than 10% white enrolled); of the three highly segregated schools, two were apartheid schools (less than 1% white). As for income levels, there was a considerable variation from community to community. The median income levels of the six communities ranged from 32,000 dollars to 99,000 dollars. The seven schools of these six communities also reflected each community’s socioeconomic status. The share of low-income students of the seven schools ranged from 11 to 87%.

Finally, regarding Korean TWI programs, all seven programs operate on the 50/50 immersion model basis, but actual instruction may vary depending on grade levels and student populations in each classroom. Of the seven programs, two were established in the early 1990s, and two programs were implemented after 2010. All seven Korean TWI programs serve students at the elementary level, but one school recently has expanded its Korean TWI instruction to the middle-school level. Six schools offer mainstream English classes as well as Korean TWI programs.
CHAPTER 4–PARENTS IN KOREAN TWI PROGRAMS

In this chapter, I address the first research question for this study: *Who are parents in Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs?* This question per se is significant in that it elucidates the demographic features of the parents who enroll their child in the programs. Moreover, the comparative analysis of the demographic characteristics between Korean and non-Korean families is especially crucial in terms of examination of equal status and power relations in the Korean TWI programs. Additionally, by analyzing the characteristics of parents of students in Korean-English TWI programs, this section offers rich information that helps us better understand the findings that the following chapters present.

**Understanding Parent Demographics in Korean TWI Programs**

In the data analysis, I focused on respondents’ demographics, including their races, languages, and countries of origin. I then analyzed English proficiency of the respondents, maternal/paternal education levels, and annual household income levels.

**Race/Ethnicity**

Survey data analysis demonstrated that Korean-English TWI programs attracted various racial groups of parents, although the primary group was Korean parents. Of 454 survey participants, 332 respondents were Korean parents or parents of Korean descent (76%). The second largest group in the survey was Latino parents (10%), followed by 8% non-Korean Asian group (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Vietnamese, and Indian). White parents and African-American parents were 6% and 1% in the survey, respectively. The analysis result indicated that percentage of spouses or partners by race also looked similar to the racial composition of the survey respondents (see Table 4.1).
Table 4.1 Number of Survey Participants by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Spouse/partner</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean/Korean and Other</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asians</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014

Native Languages and Countries of Origin

As for native languages of the respondents, there were 15 different languages reported, which implied a diverse body of parents in the programs. Unsurprisingly, the majority of the respondents (72%) reported their native language was Korean. 12% and over 8% of the respondents stated their native languages were English and Spanish, respectively. There were also 2% participants who spoke Filipino as their first language. Languages spoken by 3% of the respondents encompassed a great variety, such as Chinese, Japanese, Mongolian, Mien, Vietnamese, Indonesian, Indian, Bengali, Armenian, and an African language. In addition, 2% of the participants reported they had two native languages, such as English/Korean, English/Spanish, Spanish/Korean, and English/Filipino (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Native Languages and Countries of Origin Reported by Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native language</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Non-Korea Asian county</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>South/Central American country</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Languages</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>449</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014

As various languages spoken by respondents indicated, countries that parents in the survey were born were diverse. Nearly 70% of the parents in this survey came from South Korea,
and 18% of the participants were born in the United States. 3% were from Mexico, and the rest of the parents in this survey (10%) were born in non-Korea Asian countries and South/Central American countries, including the Philippines, China, Japan, Vietnam, Laos, Mongol, Indonesia, Guatemala, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, and an African country.

However, the analysis of survey participants’ race and ethnicity along with countries of origin raises a critical question regarding whether the survey result is indicative of racial composition in Korean TWI programs. Based on the ethnic distinction (Koreans vs. non-Koreans), nearly 75% of the survey respondents were of Korean descent, including half-Korean-and-half-other-race participants; in terms of the language criterion, 72% of the participants indicated that their native language was Korean. In either case, Korean parents comprise over 70% of the survey participants. In reality, this result can be true or untrue. For example, according to the lead teacher at Catalina Elementary, the school’s Korean TWI program — survey participants at Catalina also comprised over one-third of the total respondents in this study — enrolled closely 230 students. Of the total enrollment of the Korean TWI program, 170 were Korean-dominant students (75%); 36 were English-dominant students (16%); and 22 were Spanish-dominant students (10%). In addition, even though response rates were relatively low at Ocean View and Broadway, 75% of the survey participants of the two schools were of Korean descent. In regard to this, the coordinator who in charge of the Korean program at the two schools remarked that the schools enrolled 65-70% of Korean-dominant students and 30-35% English-dominant students.

In contrast, survey participants in Dryden Street’s Korean TWI program were fairly balanced groups: 42% non-Korean respondents and 58% Korean respondents. This result also reflected Dryden Street’s Korean program enrollment. The teacher of the school’s fourth-grade
and fifth-grade Korean TWI combo class stated that although the school experienced shrinkage of non-Korean students in the combo class, the overall Korean TWI program at Dryden Street maintained a closely balanced number of Korean students and non-Korean students. Moreover, survey respondents at Raymond Community School were closely 30, and of these participants, 22 were non-Koreans (76%), which is counterintuitive. Based on my personal examination, Raymond’s Community School’s Korean TWI program had nearly 65% of non-Korean students and 35% of Korean students. Considering empirical observations and school personnel’s statements, I cautiously assert that the survey results roughly reflect the racial composition of the Korean TWI programs. Yet, there needs to be a further examination of individual programs and classrooms by grade levels.

**English Proficiency**

In this study, the majority of the respondents (nearly 88%) reported their native language was not English. For those who spoke non-English languages as their native language, participants were asked to self-report their English proficiency in four language areas: speaking, reading, writing and understanding of spoken English. In regard to speaking and writing abilities, two-thirds of the respondents stated they spoke English *well* or *very well*, and nearly 70% of the participants in the survey answered they wrote English *well* or *very well*. In contrast to speaking and writing, parents in the survey felt more competent in reading proficiency; over 80% reported they read English *well* or *very well*. As for understanding of spoken English, over three-quarters of the respondents stated they understood spoken English *well* or *very well*.

**Education Level**

Analysis results demonstrated that respondents, on average, were highly educated. 46% of the respondents graduated from four-year college or university, and nearly one-in-five respondents
obtained a Master’s or higher degree. One-in-seven survey participants completed two-year college, and one-eighth of the respondents were high school graduates who ever attended two- or four-year college but did not earn the degree. 6% of the parents in the survey graduated from high school, and 3% of the respondents did not finish high school. In addition, spouses or partners’ education levels was correlated with respondents’ education levels in general. Over one-quarter of the spouses or partners held a Master’s or higher degree. 42% obtained a Bachelor’s degree, and 8% finished two-year college. 11% had high school diplomas, and another 11% was high school graduates who ever attended but did not finish college. The rest of the respondents’ spouses or partners (4%) did not complete high school.

Table 4.3 Education Levels of Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Mothers Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Fathers Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school and attended a 2- or 4-year college</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from a 2-year college</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a M.A. or equivalent</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a Ph.D., MD, or equivalent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school and attended a 2- or 4-year college</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from a 2-year college</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a M.A. or equivalent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a Ph.D., MD, or equivalent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school and attended a 2- or 4-year college</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from a 2-year college</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a M.A. or equivalent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a Ph.D., MD, or equivalent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
In addition, I examined education levels for mothers and fathers by Korean ethnicity. As Table 4.3 illustrates, Korean respondents in the survey, on average, were highly educated. Closely 70% Korean female participants and 74% Korean male participants obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher, and this outcome confirms an analysis result regarding recent Korean immigrants. According to Pew Research Center (2013a), over 70% of Korean immigrants who migrated to the U.S. in the last 10 years have a bachelor’s degree or higher, and the result is markedly higher compared to earlier Korean immigrants (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Even though Korean parents in this survey are not a representative group of Korean immigrants in the U.S., the result implies that the survey participants reflect the feature of recent Korean immigrants.

Moreover, non-Korean respondents in this study were a highly educated group as well. Nearly half of non-Korean respondents in the survey received a bachelor’s degree or higher. Especially, the number of non-Korean female respondents who earned a professional degree (e.g. Ph.D. or M.D.) was more than twice as many as the number of Korean female participants who held the same level of degree (see Table 4.3).

**Income Level**

Annual household income values that parents in the survey reported, on average, exceeded the median household income values of the Los Angeles County and California, which were 56,241 dollars and 61,400 dollars, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). However, results showed that income levels varied substantially from school to school, which reflected socioeconomic status of communities where the seven schools were located.

According to the survey results, nearly one-quarter of the respondents reported that their annual household income was over 100,000 dollars. In particular, over half of the respondents at
Valley Road Community and Ocean View said their annual income exceeded 100,000 dollars. Over one-in-three respondents at Broadway also reported that their annual income was over 100,000 dollars. In comparison to the respondents at Valley Road, Ocean View, and Broadway, economic situations of the participants at Catalina and Raymond Community considerably differed. Half of the respondents at Catalina Elementary and nearly 60% of the respondents at Raymond Community said their annual household income was less than 25,000 dollars. Also, over one-in-three participants at Dryden Street reported their annual income level did not exceed 25,000 dollars, which reflected the socioeconomic status of the school neighborhood as well.

Table 4.4 illustrates the median range values of respondents’ annual household income levels for individual schools; this result revealed the substantial differences in socioeconomic status across the schools. Some schools contained extreme outliers as well, which were mainly far lower or higher than the given distribution. Nevertheless, the wide gulf between the lowest median value and the highest median value reflected differential economic situations of the overall participants among the seven schools.

Table 4.4 Median Range of Annual Household Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Median household income range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elementary</td>
<td>$75,001-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>$100,001-200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Elementary</td>
<td>$35,001-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Community</td>
<td>$15,001-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Street Elementary</td>
<td>$35,001-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Elementary</td>
<td>$100,001-200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road Community</td>
<td>$100,001-200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014

Note: Participants were asked to indicate not a specific value of annual household income, but a range of annual household income; accordingly, the median value for each school is presented by range values.
Latino Population in the Survey

Following Korean parents, Latino parents were the second largest group in the survey. In fact, public schools in California have over 3.3 million Latino students, which comprise 53% of the total enrollment in the state. Although a further examination is required for exploring the Latino population in the Korean TWI program in a thorough way, I examined demographic features of the Hispanic parents in the survey given this population’s great impact on California’s education in general.

There were 43 respondents in the survey who claimed themselves Hispanic or Latino/Latina. First, with respect to countries of origin and native languages, of the 43 participants, 14 were born in the U.S.A. (33%), 14 were born in Mexico (33%), and 15 were from various South/Central American countries (35%) — 4 were from El Salvador, 3 were from Guatemala, 3 were from Ecuador, and the rest of the Hispanic respondents were from Peru, Honduras, and other countries. As for native languages, Spanish was the native language for 34 respondents (80%); 4 participants stated English was their native language (9%). Also, there were 5 respondents (12%) who said both Spanish and English were their native languages.

Next, regarding English proficiency for Spanish-speaking respondents, — 34 respondents who chose Spanish as their native language — 25 indicated very well for all four language areas (understanding of spoken English, speaking, reading, and writing), and closely five respondents chose not well for understanding and reading English.

Regarding education levels, 43 Latina participants offered information. Of the 43 Latina respondents, 12 did not finish high school (28%), five graduated from high school (12%), and 19 had some experiences in college but did not earn the degree (34%). There were only three Latina
respondents who graduated from college (7%). Three obtained a Master’s degree; one earned a Ph.D. degree. As for paternal education levels, information about 40 individual was reported. Of the 40 Latino males, nine did not finish high school (23%), 13 graduated from high school (33%), and 12 were exposed to college experiences but did not earn a Bachelor’s degree (30%). Two Latino males graduated from college (5%); three received a Master’s degree (8%); and one held a Ph.D. degree (3%). Due to its small population, this result should be interpreted cautiously, but the analysis of Latino respondents’ education levels indicated a stark difference in comparison to Korean parents in the survey.

Finally, as for annual household income levels, seven Latino respondents in the survey reported their annual income levels were under 15,000 dollars (16%); 10 Hispanic respondents out of 43 indicated that their income level ranged from 15,000 to 20,000 dollars (23%). Five reported 20,001-25,000 dollars (12%); eight chose 25,001-35,000 dollars (19%); and six selected 35,001-50,000 dollars (14%). There were seven participants whose family income exceeded over 50,000 dollars per year (16%).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined characteristics of the respondents who participated in the survey. I focused on general features of the survey participants, including race/ethnicity, native languages/countries, and self-reported English proficiency. I also investigated participants’ education levels and income levels.

Findings demonstrated that the vast majority of parents in the survey were Koreans. As for the Korean group, nearly all Korean respondents were from South Korea (305). However, 23 Korean respondents and were born in the U.S.A.; 4 were from South/Central American countries. In the survey, one-quarter of the respondents were non-Korean parents who also added
diversity in terms of languages and cultures. Of the non-Korean group, Latino respondents were the largest group, which comprised 10% of the total survey participants. The next largest group was non-Korean Asian respondents (8%), followed by white participants (6%). Compared to the other racial groups, there were few African American parents (1%) in the survey.

With respect to languages spoken by the participants, nearly 90% of the respondents stated that their first language was not English. The language diversity among parents in the survey reflects the diversity of the student body in the Korean TWI programs as well as the inflow of immigrants from various countries in the Los Angeles area. Overall, there were 15 different languages reported in the survey, including Spanish and non-Korean Asian languages, such as Tagalog, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese.

As for parents’ education levels, the survey analysis indicated that a considerable number of respondents in the survey were highly educated. Nearly half of the respondents obtained a Bachelor’s degree, and only 3% of the parents in the survey reported they did not finish high school. Despite participants’ high education levels, on average, income levels varied substantially, especially from community to community. By and large, survey respondents living in Koreatown reported considerably lower annual household income compared to survey participants in other communities, such as Porter Ranch and Glendale.

Finally, I want to point out a possibility that survey participants may have provided mendacious information, especially regarding education levels and income levels, which may be sensitive information. In fact, some respondents skipped demographics-related questions, and there was one respondent who wrote “I decline to answer to this question” for the income level question in the survey. Due to the sensitive nature of demographic questions, I arranged them in
the end of the survey questionnaire; however, during the self-reporting process the possibility that participants may have reported false information cannot be excluded.

Furthermore, the survey study did not capture respondents who were illiterate. Due to the absence of verbal assistance when survey was administered, if parents were not literate enough to read a survey questionnaire, they would not be able to respond to this survey. In addition, illiterate population usually receives no or little education; thus, their low-education levels and income levels may have not been added on the collected data, which can cause biased information regarding participants’ overall education levels, socioeconomic status, and the survey data in general.
CHAPTER 5–REASONS FOR PROGRAM CHOICE

In this chapter, I address the second research question in this study: Why parents choose a Korean two-way immersion (TWI) program? Using the survey data collected from the seven Korean TWI programs in the Los Angeles area, I explored parents’ reasons for their school choice and program choice. By examining parents’ reasons, I elucidated what factors affected parents’ decisions in choosing a school and in enrolling their child in a Korean-English TWI program, in particular. Additionally, I examined what information sources parents rely on when they search for Korean TWI programs.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, previous studies have dealt with parents’ reasons to choose TWI programs as an important topic to understand their rationale for the decision to enroll their child in a TWI program. As for the Spanish language programs, considering the number of speakers and the popularity of the language in the United States as well as in the world, the increasing interest in Spanish-English TWI programs in the U.S. is understandable. However, interest in Korean-English TWI programs, especially from non-Korean parents, needs more examination.

In this section, by analyzing the survey data, I explored parents’ reasons for choosing Korean TWI programs. As for the question regarding heritage maintenance, in particular, I further examined non-Korean parents’ opinions by using an open-ended question. I then analyzed what types of information sources parents used in searching for a Korean TWI program. For individual analyses, I also compared Korean parents to non-Korean parents to investigate if there was a difference between the two groups.

---

1 In the world, there are over 400 million Spanish speakers who speak the language as their first language. Also, there are 15 million speakers who speak Spanish as their second language. With respect to Korean, there are 77 million of Korean speakers in South Korea and North Korea, but the exact number of speakers who speak the language as their second language was not reported (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2014). In the United States, there are 1.1 million people who speak Korean at home (Ryan, 2013).
Reasons for School Choice

With respect to parental school choice, I asked a set of questions to assess the degree to which parents considered given categories importantly when they chose a school for their child. I began the survey data analysis by investigating descriptive statistics. Next, I examined the mean difference by performing a Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) test in order to identify distinctions between Korean and non-Korean respondents in terms of school choice.

Analysis results demonstrated that offering of a TWI program was the most significant factor that attracted parents to a school, but not surprisingly, the reason was more influential on Korean respondents (mean=3.46) than on non-Korean respondents (mean=3.02). This group difference was statistically significant. School reputation (mean=3.23) and being located in a safe area (mean=3.22) were also important factors for both Korean and non-Korean groups. Interestingly, non-Korean parents in the survey tended to consider school’s diverse demographics more importantly (mean=3.34) than did their Korean counterparts (mean=2.93), which was also statistically significant. Being located in the same neighborhood as home was less significant to Korean respondents (mean=2.51) than to non-Korean participants (mean=3.01). This result may have to do with Korean parents’ intentional school choice in order to enroll their child in a Korean TWI program, even though the school with the Korean TWI program is outside their zoned-school area.

For this set of school choice questions, non-Korean parents in the survey, on average, tended to place more importance on given categories except the TWI program category than did Korean respondents, and the WMW rank sum tests demonstrated that the differences between Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey were statistically significant across most categories except the school’s academic performance (see Tables 5.1 and 5.2).
Table 5.1 Parents’ Reasons for Choosing Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>All (N=446)</th>
<th>Korean (N=337)</th>
<th>Non-Korean (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean-English TWI program</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School reputation</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic performance</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse demographics</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same neighborhood as home</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (not important) to 4 (very important).

Table 5.2 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for School Choice between Korean and Non-Korean Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean-English TWI program</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-4.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School reputation</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic performance</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1.69†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse demographics</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>4.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same neighborhood as home</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>4.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10. †p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Reasons for Program Choice

In addition to the reasons for school choice, I asked a different set of questions for parents’ TWI program choice. The program choice was closely associated with what parents wanted their child to accomplish and improve in the program in the long term. The results demonstrated that for both Korean and non-Korean respondents, developing bilingual abilities (mean=3.66) and preparing for a global society (mean=3.57) were highly significant factors that affected parents’ program choice. Compared to Korean participants, however, non-Korean parents in the survey tended to place higher emphasis on improving their child’s abilities to relate to other races and cultures (mean=3.62) and on better academic outcomes (mean=3.78). Future economic benefits (mean=3.27) seemed fairly important to the two groups as well (see Tables 5.3 and 5.4).
Table 5.3 Parents’ Reasons for Choosing a Korean TWI Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of bilingual abilities</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better academic success</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students’ abilities to integrate</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage maintenance</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for a global society</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future economic benefits</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatively more English instruction</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (not important) to 4 (very important).

Table 5.4 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Reasons for Choosing a TWI Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of bilingual abilities</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better academic success</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>5.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students’ abilities to integrate</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage maintenance</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for a global society</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future economic benefits</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatively more English instruction</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01. 

The noticeable difference between Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey had to do with their perspectives on heritage maintenance through Korean TWI instruction. For Korean respondents, a Korean TWI program was considered as a space where their child could maintain their Korean heritage by learning the Korean language and culture (mean=3.58); however, non-Korean parents did not fully acknowledge the fact that their child could develop their cultural and racial identity as well in the program (mean=2.77). Nevertheless, there were a substantial number of non-Korean parents who responded important and very important to the heritage maintenance question. More specifically, 39.2% of non-Korean parents in the survey chose the not applicable (N/A) choice for this question, but a similar number of non-Korean parents (38.3%) responded important or very important to the question, meaning that their child’s heritage could be maintained in the Korean TWI program.
Non-Koreans’ Perspectives on Heritage Maintenance in the Korean TWI Program

As explained in Chapter 3, given the significance of this topic, there was an open-ended question\(^1\) for non-Korean respondents, especially for those who chose either *important* or *very important* in the heritage maintenance question. In the open-ended question, I asked them to elaborate their reasons on why the program could be important in maintaining their child’s heritage. The reasons they shared varied from parent to parent depending on their racial identity and personal experiences.

First, several parents addressed a more diverse student body in Korean TWI programs, compared to Spanish TWI programs, in particular, and claimed that classroom diversity would help their child maintain his or her heritage.

“I’m biracial, and identity was an important issue when I was young. And, I think this would be the same issue for him. I noticed students in the Korean program were more diverse than students in the Spanish program. So, being in the KDLP program, I think, makes him more comfortable about thinking his identity by looking at other children from diverse cultures. And this will be good for maintaining his heritage, too.”

“I believe languages are easier to learn when you are younger. Any languages. Being multiracial myself it is important to understand other cultures, and it’s important for her and her identity, too. Allowing my daughter to be more comfortable by letting her be immersed in the language and culture (heritage) would help her have a stronger identity regarding ethnicity.”

---

\(^1\) Unfortunately, this open-ended question was developed and added later after survey data had been collected from some schools. Thus, I followed up parents – who chose ‘important’ or ‘very important’ for this question – via email.
“The majority of children at my son’s school are Hispanic, which is okay. However, I thought it would be overwhelming for him if he were in a regular program where over half of his peers are Latino. I think the Korean program has a more diverse student body than the regular program or the Spanish program, so I chose the program. I believe my son may feel more comfortable about maintaining his heritage in the program.”

Second, parents pointed out Korean TWI program’s classroom environment in which different cultures and languages are valued. Immigrant parents, in particular, appreciated this feature and stated that this environment would allow their child to maintain his/her own heritage.

“The school usually throws events that embrace different cultures of students and parents. I love this! We are not Korean, but I believe she would be comfortable with maintaining her heritage in this school environment. I believe if a school valued diverse cultures that students and parents brought to the school, students at the school would be encouraged to keep his/her heritage and culture.”

“I appreciate my kid’s teacher’s effort to create an environment where children from different cultural backgrounds feel respected in the classroom. Although we are not Korean, I believe this environment encourages my child’s to maintain her heritage by developing a strong identity.”

“My son’s teacher, Ms.Kim, is really good at using different cultural aspects for several classroom activities. My son has also shared holidays and foods of the Philippines in the classroom, and I was very happy with this. Also, he can sing the Happy Birthday song in
three different languages: English, Korean, and Spanish, which I am so proud of. I think in the dual language program, he can maintain his heritage and identity more strongly than in other programs.”

“'I think learning a different language other than English is a good way to become open-minded in this diverse society. Raised by immigrant parents myself, I experienced some sort of prejudice towards my family when I was young. I wanted my daughter to be open to people from other cultures and countries, and the KDLP looked a right place for her to be exposed to children from various backgrounds. In the KDLP program, I want my daughter to build a healthy identity and maintain her heritage.’”

Third, some Asian parents asserted a Korean TWI program would be helpful for their child to maintain their heritage because the program focused on one of the Asian languages, which was Korean. As mentioned in the previous chapter, of the total survey participants, 8% were from various Asian countries, such as China, Japan, Mongolia, Vietnam, and the Philippines. Although Korean culture and language are not directly linked with their culture and language, some Asian parents made the decision to enroll their child in Korean TWI programs, hoping that their child would feel comfortable with developing their identity in the programs.

“'My son is not Korean, but Asian. I want him to stay, play, and study with Asians, and I think a KDPL program would be a comfortable place for him to maintain his heritage, compared to other dual language programs.’”
Information Sources

In regard to information sources for program choice, I focused on two types of networks that parents mainly obtain information from: (1) formal network and (2) interpersonal network (Goldring & Phillips, 2007). Information from a formal network includes public sources, such as brochures, pamphlets, public meetings, and school district websites, whereas information from an interpersonal network covers knowledge from friends, family, and co-workers (Goldring & Phillips, 2007; Smrekar & Goldring, 1999). In the survey questionnaires, a formal network included websites of school districts or schools and public sources from the Internet, newspapers, and radio, while an interpersonal network covered one’s personal network with friends and acquaintances in the neighborhood, at work, and at church or temple. Parents were also allowed to specify other sources that given choices did not encompass.

The analysis of the survey data indicated that both Korean and non-Korean respondents tended to rely on information from their interpersonal networks rather than from formal networks while searching for a Korean TWI program. However, non-Korean parents in the survey used formal networks more actively (mean=0.49) compared to their Korean counterparts (mean=0.18), and the difference was statistically significant. Korean respondents remarkably depended on interpersonal networks (mean=1.01), and this can be associated with the Korean community’s feature that a large majority of Korean immigrants in the U.S.A. tend to develop their networks through churches to navigate a new society (see Tables 5.5 and 5.6). Besides formal and interpersonal networks, other answers included that a respondent himself or herself was a teacher in a Korean TWI program and that a parent came to haphazardly know about a TWI program by passing by the school neighborhood.
Table 5.5 Information Sources regarding a TWI Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (N=454)</th>
<th>Korean (N=339)</th>
<th>Non-Korean (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Network</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Network</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was based on an aggregated sum of the answers to multiple-choice questions.

Table 5.6 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Information Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Network</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>6.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Network</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-6.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sources</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Conclusion

This chapter addressed parents’ reasons for choosing a school and a Korean TWI program and what types of information sources they employed in the information-collecting process. Findings demonstrated that respondents considered offering of a TWI program as a primary reason to select a school. Parents in the survey also regarded school reputation and safety of the school neighborhood as significant factors that affected their school choice. Non-Korean participants also considered a diverse student body as an important reason compared to their Korean counterparts.

As for parental choice of a Korean TWI program, developing bilingual abilities was a salient reason that both Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey pointed out. Non-Korean respondents, in particular, emphasized their expectation for better academic success that their child could achieve in Korean TWI programs, and they were more interested in enhancing child’s ability to relate to students of other races and cultures in Korean TWI programs. In regard to heritage maintenance, Korean parents in the survey expressed keen interests in this issue in comparison to the non-Korean group. In an open-ended question, however, non-Korean
respondents addressed invaluable points regarding why the Korean TWI programs could be beneficial for their child to maintain their own heritage as well, such as the program’s diverse student body and the TWI program’s feature that values languages and cultures that students bring to the classroom.

Finally, the result indicated that when searching for a Korean TWI program, both Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey used interpersonal networks more often compared to formal networks. However, non-Korean respondents were slightly more dependent on formal networks than were Korean parents. This result implies that individual schools and districts need to make more efforts to reach out non-Korean parents, in particular, by taking advantage of their websites or public events for parents in neighborhood. In doing so, Korean TWI programs will keep the balanced number of students from a target language group and an English-speaking group, which is a critical element to maintain a successful TWI program.
CHAPTER 6–PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter, I explored parents’ perspectives on their child’s language development in Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs by focusing on three topics: (1) parents’ satisfaction level of their child’s language development in Korean and English, respectively, (2) parents’ additional support for improving their child’s Korean proficiency, and (3) parents’ concerns over receiving instruction in Korean and in English, respectively. For individual topics, I analyzed the survey data to examine descriptive statistics for the topics of interest. Next, I conducted Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) tests to identify differences between Korean and non-Korean participants in the survey.

Satisfaction with Language Development

Parents’ satisfaction with language development was investigated by asking their level of satisfaction with English development and Korean development, respectively. Four language areas — understanding of spoken language, speaking, reading, and writing — were asked separately, and the overall satisfaction level was created by averaging the values for the four language areas after confirming principal complement analysis results.

English Development

With respect to English development, non-Korean parents in the survey tended to be more satisfied with their child’s language proficiency (mean=3.69) than did their Korean counterparts (mean=3.41), and the difference of the satisfaction level between the two groups of parents was statistically significant across the four language areas. The two groups were the most content with their child’s listening proficiency and were the least satisfied with writing proficiency. Given the fact that it takes longer to develop cognitive academic language proficiency than to
increase basic interpersonal communication skills (Cummins, 1986), respondents’ relatively lower satisfaction level concerning their child’s writing proficiency was understandable.

**Korean Development**

In regard to the level of satisfaction with Korean language development, there was no noticeable difference between Korean and non-Korean participants. Although Korean parents in the survey, on average, tended to be slightly more satisfied with their child’s Korean development (mean=3.32) than did non-Korean parents (mean=3.26), the difference was not statistically significant at all. The analysis indicated that parents’ satisfaction level in Korean development (mean=3.31) was somewhat lower in comparison to the satisfaction with English development (mean=3.48) (see Tables 6.1 and 6.2).

Table 6.1 Satisfaction with Language Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014

Notes: The overall variable is an average value of the understand, speak, read, and write variables. The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied).
Table 6.2 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Language Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>5.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>5.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>5.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

**Offering of Additional Support for Korean Language Development**

Following the questions regarding parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development, I also explored if parents provided any additional support for developing their child’s Korean proficiency, in particular. Of various types of support for improving Korean language proficiency, I especially focused on (1) sending their child to a Korean program, such as afterschool or a weekend Korean school and on (2) offering of supplementary materials, including books, Korean TV programs, and online materials (e.g., YouTube clips).

The result demonstrated that Korean respondents, on average, offered more resources for their child’s Korean language development (mean=2.06) than did their non-Korean counterparts (mean=1.68), and the difference between the two groups of respondents was statistically significant. However, considering the fact Korean parents had more access to Korean materials due to their Korean language abilities compared to the non-Korean group, non-Korean parents in the survey seemed as supportive as Korean respondents in making efforts to offer various support for developing their child’s Korean proficiency (see Tables 6.3 and 6.4).
Table 6.3 Offering of Additional Support for Korean Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>All (N=454)</th>
<th>Korean (N=339)</th>
<th>Non-Korean (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend school/Afterschool program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering of supplementary materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: The outcome measures are aggregated values for individual items (e.g., weekend school + afterschool program). Supplementary materials include books, TV programs, and online materials (e.g., YouTube clips). All sources are a sum of the two outcome values above.

Table 6.4 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Offering Additional Support for Korean Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekend school/Afterschool program</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering of supplementary materials</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-1.80†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sources</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-2.57*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Concerns over a Child’s Receiving Instruction in English and in Korean

Besides parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development, I investigated parents’ opinions regarding whether a child may have encountered any difficulty in receiving instruction in English and in Korean, respectively. Non-Korean respondents, on average, articulated less apprehensions over receiving instruction in English (mean=3.38) and in Korean (mean=2.98) compared to Korean participants’ responses to the same items — English (mean=2.37) and Korean (mean=2.39). Overall, Korean parents in the survey addressed similar levels of concerns over their child’s receiving instruction in both English and Korean, and their concern levels were higher than were the non-Korean group’s results. The group differences were also statistically significant for both English instruction and Korean instruction (see Tables 6.5 and 6.6).
Table 6.5 Concerns over Receiving Instruction

| No difficulty in receiving instruction in | All | | | Korean | | | Non-Korean | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD |
| English | 443 | 2.61 | 1.08 | 336 | 2.37 | 1.03 | 105 | 3.38 | 0.85 |
| Korean | 434 | 2.53 | 0.96 | 332 | 2.39 | 0.95 | 100 | 2.98 | 0.88 |

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The higher score means parents tend to have less concerns over their child’s receiving instruction in English or Korean.

Table 6.6 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Concerns over Receiving Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No difficulty in receiving instruction in</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>8.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>5.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I addressed one of the research questions concerning parents’ satisfaction with child’s language development. Following this question, I then examined to what extent parents in the survey offered additional support for improving their child’s Korean proficiency. Next, I explored parents’ concerns over their child’s receiving instruction in English and in Korean, respectively, in Korean TWI programs.

Findings demonstrated that parents were more content with their child’s English development compared to Korean development. As for child’s English proficiency, non-Korean parents in the survey addressed higher levels of satisfaction than did their Korean counterparts. Of the four language areas for English proficiency, both Korean and non-Korean respondents were the least satisfied with their child’s writing ability and were the most content with listening proficiency. In regard to Korean language development, there was no noticeable difference between Korean and non-Korean respondents in the level of satisfaction. As for the four
language areas for Korean proficiency, Non-Korean participants expressed similar levels of satisfaction across the four areas, whereas Korean parents in the survey again were the least satisfied with writing proficiency.

Although further discussions will be presented in Chapter 9, parents’ satisfaction with their child’s language development was closely linked with their program evaluation. Thus, this association implied that by understanding parent satisfaction with child’s language development, we can estimate how successfully Korean TWI programs work and serve students. This finding also informed schools of the importance of strengthening their language instruction.

With respect to offering of additional support for developing child’s Korean development, Korean parents in the survey tended to provide more opportunities for their child to develop Korean proficiency compared to their non-Korean counterparts. However, given that Korean parents took advantage of more access to Korean materials than did non-Korean parents, the non-Korean group in the survey also made a fair amount of efforts to support their child’s Korean development.

Finally, in regard to parents’ apprehensions over their child’s receiving instruction in Korean and in English, respectively, findings demonstrated that Korean parents in the survey addressed higher levels of concern over instruction both in English and in Korean. Although non-Korean respondents did not have similar levels of concern as did Korean parents, they showed relatively higher levels of concern over instruction in Korean compared to the English instruction.
CHAPTER 7–INTEGRATION IN KOREAN TWI PROGRAMS

In this chapter, I address a question regarding the issue of integration among children and parents, respectively, in Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs. One of the objectives to develop TWI programs is to address the issue of equity (de Jong & Howard, 2009), and an integrated environment is one of the key factors to successful TWI programs as well (e.g., Howard & Christian, 2002; Valdés, 1997; Christian, 1996). Furthermore, considering the exacerbating segregation across California schools despite the growing cultural and linguistic diversity in the state (Orfield & Ee, 2014), it is significant to explore how TWI programs can facilitate integration.

Even though Korean TWI programs have been under-researched in terms of the integration issue, previous research reports tensions between Korean and non-Korean parents as one of the challenges in Korean TWI programs (Lee & Jeong, 2013). The tensions among the two groups of parents may affect integration among children in the Korean TWI program as well. Indeed, in the correlation analysis presented in Chapter 3, the result demonstrated that integration among parents was positively and strongly associated with integration among children. Although a further analysis result will be discussed in this chapter, this correlation result suggested that parents’ integrative interactions with other parents had a significant association with their child’s experiences as well. In regard to this, a teacher in one of the research sites in this study stated as follows:

“It’s true. Korean parents and Latino parents tend to get together with their own groups. After school, they also send children to the same after school programs or arrange play dates. Since students spend time together even after school, they want to paly with them
at school, too. If this keeps going, they get along with their own group of friends, and so do the parents.” Ms. Kim, teacher at Catalina Elementary

To explore overall integration issues in Korean TWI programs, I started with the examination of parents’ perspectives about the degree to which they were satisfied with their child’s relating to students of other races and cultures in two different contexts: in classroom and outside of school. I then investigated parents’ own experiences concerning integration with their fellow parents in Korean TWI programs. In order to examine these topics, I analyzed the survey data and present results of descriptive statistics. Also, to investigate group differences between Koreans and non-Koreans in the survey, I performed Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) rank sum tests. Given the apparent significance of the integration issue in TWI programs, I then scrutinized the issue of integration among parents by conducting logistic regression analysis. Finally, I explored potential obstacles that may impede parents’ experiences with their fellow parents.

Integration among Children and Parents

Parents’ Perspectives toward Child’s Integration

An integrated environment is one of the key factors to successful TWI programs; hence, I asked whether parents were satisfied with their child’s experiences to relate to students of other races and cultures. For this question, respondents were asked to indicate how they perceived integration among students in the different contexts: in classroom and outside of school. Yet, descriptive statistics results showed that there was no meaningful difference between the classroom setting and the outside-of-school setting (see Table 7.1).
Findings demonstrated that survey respondents, on average, were content with their child’s experiences to relate to other races and cultures in classroom as well as outside of school; however, non-Korean participants were more positive (mean=3.68) than were Korean participants (mean=3.21) regarding their child’s experiences. The group difference between Koreans and non-Koreans was also statistically significant (see Tables 7.1 and 7.2).

**Parents’ Perspectives toward Integration among Parents**

While the advantages of student integration in TWI programs have been generally taken for granted, little research has explored integration among parents and its relationship with integration among children. To examine the relationship between parents’ perceived experiences of integration among parents themselves and among children, I asked a question regarding how parents evaluated integration among parents at their child’s school in general. The survey results indicated that non-Korean respondents tended to acknowledge that parents at their school related well to parents of other races and cultures (mean=3.45), whereas Korean participants were not as
complacent with experiences of integration (mean=2.87) as were non-Korean respondents. The group difference was statistically highly significant as well (see Tables 7.3 and 7.4).

Table 7.3 Integration among Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get along with other parents</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along with other parents</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014*

*Note: The outcome measure for ‘get along with other parents’ was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)*

Table 7.4 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Integration among Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get along with other parents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get along with other parents</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>7.08***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014*

*Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.*

I then further examined the relationship between the variable of integration among parents and parent-related predictors by performing a multivariate logistic regression analysis. For this analysis, the outcome measure was recoded as a binary variable: 0 for *very dissatisfied* or *dissatisfied* with parents’ integration and 1 for *somewhat satisfied* or *very satisfied*. Of course, integration is not a phenomenon that can be simplified as a dichotomous variable, so we should be cautious about interpreting and generalizing the following results.
Table 7.5 Parents Get along with Other Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>2.584</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-0.734</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with language development</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the program</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refined Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>3.382</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data , 2013-2014

Notes: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. ‘NS’ refers to not significant. The outcome measure was recoded as a binary variable of 0 (parents do not get along well) and 1 (parents get along well).

I started with a full model that contained all predictors of interest in the survey data, including parents’ English proficiency, integration, participation, years of attending the program, mother’s education, family income level, and so forth. I then developed the model based on backward elimination method that removes non-significant predictors in order to identify statistically significant variables for the model. Interestingly, mother’s education level and family income level — two major factors that usually affect educational outcomes and experiences in research — were not significant at all in this model.

The analysis results indicated that all things being equal, survey participants’ integration was associated with their English proficiency and child’s integration; there was a significant difference between Korean and non-Korean respondents in their perception of the integration among parents as well. In term of the interpretation of odds ratio, the result demonstrated that one unit increase in respondent’s English proficiency was significantly associated with a 134% increase in the odds of experiencing integration among parents. In other words, parents’ English
proficiency could improve integrative experiences among parents, and at the same time this can be interpreted that parents’ limited English proficiency could be an obstacle to interactive relationships among parents.

Second, the result showed that the odds of experiencing integration among parents increased by 238% for each extra point of child’s integration that parents reported. This result implied a significant point that child’s integration was essential to integration among parents. Although further research is required, the result also suggested that integrative experiences among parents could foster integration among students.

Finally, although it was marginally significant, the result indicated that the odds of being satisfied with integration among parents for Korean participants were considerably lower by 55% compared to their non-Korean counterparts. This also confirmed aforementioned descriptive statistics results regarding survey respondents’ experiences, which revealed that the Korean group tended to perceive that parents at their child’s school did not relate to other parents in comparison to the non-Korean group (see Table 7.5).

**Obstacles to Parents’ Integrative Relationships**

As the results above demonstrated, Korean participants and non-Korean participants reported different levels of perception regarding integration among parents at school. If respondents felt that they did not get along with each other, I wondered what factors would cause this issue among parents. Of various reasons, both Korean and non-Korean respondents pointed out language issues (mean=2.81) — lack of English ability, in particular — and the lack of interactions among parents because of work schedule and not having enough time (mean=2.80) as primary reasons that may hinder parents’ integration at school. These results also confirmed the intergroup contact theory’s fundamental premise. From the intergroup contact theory’s
perspective, cooperation between groups is an essential factor for achieving positive intergroup relations, but limited contacts among parents and English proficiency tended to hamper interactions among groups. Also, these reasons seemed more salient to the Korean group compared to the non-Korean respondents in the survey. However, survey participants did not agree that they were disrespectful to each other (mean=1.77) and that they had less interest in their child’s education (mean=1.68). The two groups of participants shared the same perspectives in that regard (see Tables 7.6 and 7.7).

Table 7.6 Obstacles to Positive Relationships with other Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (N=440)</th>
<th>Korean (N=333)</th>
<th>Non-Korean (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interactions</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in child's education</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely).

Table 7.7 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Obstacles to Positive Relationships with other Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-2.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interactions</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in child's education</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I investigated integration issues for children and parents in Korean TWI programs. Findings demonstrated that survey participants were fairly satisfied with their child’s integration experiences in TWI programs, although non-Korean participants addressed more positive views on integration. In addition to integration among children, the logistic regression
analysis of parents’ experiences yielded meaningful results that respondents’ integrative experiences had positive and significant associations with their English proficiency as well as satisfaction level regarding their child’s relating to other races and cultures. Also, there was a substantial difference in participants’ integrative experiences between Korean and non-Korean respondents. All things being equal, the non-Korean group addressed more positive opinion on integration among parents compared to their Korean counterparts.

With respect to obstacles that hinder parents’ integrative relationships, both Korean and non-Korean participants reported a language barrier and lack of interactions as major reasons. This result also confirmed the logistic regression outcomes that survey participants’ integration was closely linked with their English proficiency, meaning that the more fluent in English parents were, the more likely parents were to interact with each other. Even though we need to be careful about generalizing this finding due to this study’s limited focus on Korean TWI programs, the result suggested that integration among parents seemed to be related to their child’s integration in a meaningful way in TWI programs.

Additionally, the results presented in this chapter remain critical questions in regard to integration in Korean TWI programs. According to intergroup contact theory, the optimal conditions for fostering positive intergroup relations are being in equal status between groups, sharing the common goals, cooperating between the groups, and offering of institutional support. First, regarding maintaining equal status between groups in TWI programs, it is challenging to analyze power relations in a traditional dichotomous way to look at parents as a language-majority group and a language-minority group. In fact, relations among parents of students in Korean TWI programs are complicated due to their different sociopolitical status. Specifically, Korean parents — language-minority group in the Korean TWI program — are sometimes
grouped with whites as an academically successful group with higher socioeconomic status. Yet, they are racially minority in society, and most of Koreans are immigrants or are from immigrant families. Also, some of them have limited English proficiency. Non-Korean parents in Korean TWI program are not a language-majority group, either. Of course, some non-Korean parents are English-dominant, but the Korean TWI program also enrolls students from diverse language-minority groups who speak another language other than English. The presence of multiple language-minority groups in Korean TWI programs can be effective in terms power distribution in the program, but at the same time the predominant number of Koreans in the program itself raises a question regarding how the program maintains equal status among multiple groups.

Second, with respect to cooperating between groups and institutional support, more purposeful and determined efforts by schools are required. As the results in this chapter illustrated, parents in Korean TWI program encountered practical challenges (e.g., language barriers and lack of contacts), which also could curb cooperation among themselves and reduce motivation to interact with other parents. In the TWI program setting where parents share common goals in terms of their child’s education — developing two languages, embracing other cultures, and academically performing better — systematic institutional support can yield improvement in fostering intergroup relations among parents and ultimately integration among children. Therefore, immediate and tangible actions to support parents in Korean TWI programs and TWI programs in general need to be taken.
CHAPTER 8–PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TWI PROGRAMS

In this chapter, I analyzed parental involvement in Korean two-way immersion (TWI) programs. Following the definition that specifies parental involvement as visible behaviors at school (e.g., López, 2001; McWayne et al., 2004; Englund et al., 2004), I explored to what extent parents interact with other parents and to what degree they participate in school activities and events. I then conducted regression analysis to examine how parental involvement in Korean TWI programs was associated with other parent-related factors, such as parents’ English proficiency, education level, socioeconomic status, years in the program, satisfaction with child’s language development, integration, and overall evaluation of the Korean TWI program.

To examine parental involvement, I started with exploring school environment, which is one of the influential factors on parents’ engagement in school (e.g., Comer & Haynes, 1991; Griffith, 1996, 1998). Employing the Korean TWI parent survey data, I presented descriptive statistics for individual topics and then compare Korean respondents to non-Korean respondents by performing Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) rank sum tests. I then demonstrated regression analysis results regarding parental involvement.

Parental Involvement

School Environment

School environment is a critical factor that encourages or discourages parents’ participation in their child’s school and that affects parental involvement in child’s education as well (e.g., Comer & Haynes, 1991; Griffith, 1996, 1998). For the school environment question, I focused on aspects regarding whether a school had a welcoming environment for parents and whether parents, in general, felt respected regardless of one’s backgrounds, such as native language and
socioeconomic status. In addition, I asked if language support was adequate for non-English speaking parents — Spanish-speaking parents and Korean-speaking parents, in particular.

The results indicated that non-Korean respondents tended to perceive the overall school environment more positively (mean=3.57) than did Korean participants (mean=3.32). The majority of non-Korean respondents also agreed that their child’s school had a welcoming environment and embraced various languages and cultures of parents and students (mean=3.46); this result was slightly higher than was Korean participants’ response (mean=3.40). Moreover, the non-Korean group in the survey tended to feel more respected regardless of their language (mean=3.50) and socioeconomic backgrounds (mean=3.55) in comparison to the Korean group (mean=3.23 and mean=3.24, respectively). The differences between the two groups in the levels of satisfaction for these questions were statistically significant. In regard to language support for non-English speaking parents, the survey participants, on average, were satisfied with school’s language support for Korean-speaking parents (mean=3.34) and Spanish speaking parents (mean=3.32) (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2).

Table 8.1 School Environment and Language Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School environment</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome parents</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace languages and cultures</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel respected regardless of language</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel respected regardless of SES</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean-language support</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-language support</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied).
Parents’ Experiences in Korean TWI Programs

Experiences with Other Parents

Parents’ experiences with other parents at school may vary depending on their current situations, such as work schedule and the level of participation in school. For this topic, I was especially interested in to what degree parents interacted with each other for their child’s education, such as sharing information about school, talking about school events, asking or receiving a favor, and so forth.

The survey results indicated that the two groups of parents in the survey managed similar levels of experiences with other parents, but there was a modest difference across given items. Specifically, the results demonstrated that Korean respondents tended to share information more often (mean=2.60) than did non-Korean participants (mean=2.15), while non-Korean parents in the survey talked about school meetings and events more actively with other parents (mean=2.86) compared to their Korean counterparts (mean=2.59). The Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests for the measure of experiences with other parents also demonstrated that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant across the given items (see Table 8.3 and 8.4).
Table 8.3 Experiences with Other Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did or receive a favor</td>
<td>454 2.08 1.01</td>
<td>339 2.12 0.98</td>
<td>107 2.12 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>440 2.49 1.03</td>
<td>333 2.60 1.01</td>
<td>107 2.15 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about meetings/events</td>
<td>440 2.66 0.88</td>
<td>333 2.59 0.85</td>
<td>107 2.86 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parents supervise my child</td>
<td>440 1.95 0.93</td>
<td>333 1.97 0.93</td>
<td>107 1.91 0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (never) to 4 (always).

Table 8.4 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Experiences with Other Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did or receive a favor</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-4.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about meetings/events</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parents supervise my child</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. ‡p<.01. ***p<.001.

**Inferential Statistics Result for Experiences with Other Parents**

In order to further investigate the relationship between parents’ experiences and other parent-related predictors, I performed a multilevel multivariate regression analysis. As mentioned in Chapter 3, I generated the outcome variable of interest (the experience variable), — how often parents interacted with other parents, — by employing four items that had to do with parents’ experiences based on the confirmatory factor analysis result (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77). In addition, given the considerable variations of the experience variable at the school level, ranging from 1.65 to 2.79 (see Table 8.5), I investigated intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) to examine whether to perform a multilevel analysis or single-level analysis. The 0.23 ICC results12 indicated that a multilevel model fit more appropriately than did a single-level model. Accordingly, I developed a two-level regression model of parents’ experiences on parent-related predictors with a random intercept.

---

12 Appendix B has more information about the calculation results for ICC.
First, I started with a full model with all predictors of interest. All things being equal, the results indicated that parental participation was positively associated with respondents’ experiences with other parents ($\beta=0.49$), meaning that the more parents participated in school, the more often they tended to interact with other parents. Second, the outcome variable had a positive and significant association with years of attending in the program ($\beta=0.04$). This result seems reasonable because the longer a child attended in the same program, the more opportunities respondents would have in terms of interacting with other parents. Third, although marginally significant, the outcome variable was positively related to the program evaluation and family income variables. Interestingly, the variable of integration among parents was not significant in this model. I suppose that because parents tend to get along with the same group of parents, their overall experiences with other parents may not be affected by the integration variable (see Table 8.6).
I then developed a refined model by eliminating non-significant variables from the full model. Interestingly, participation and income variables remained significant in the refined model, but the other variables turned out to be non-significant. For the participation and income variables, the magnitude and the significance level did not change, either. The noticeable difference was coefficients for the random effects. Because this model allowed a random intercept for the upper level (i.e., schools), random-effects parameters indicated the difference among schools. For example, in the refined model, the estimate of the standard deviation of the random intercepts was 0.26, meaning that we could expect approximately 95% of the random intercepts to fall within 0.51 (=0.255×2) units on either direction of the estimated overall mean, 2.31, which is between 1.8 and 2.82\textsuperscript{13} (see Table 8.6). In addition, the estimated within-subject standard deviation was 0.59. This suggested that we could expect 95% of the respondents of

\textsuperscript{13} Appendix C has more detailed Stata output.
individual schools to fall within 1.18 (=0.59×2) units from the subject-specific mean. For instance, the mean value for the variable of parents’ experiences at Catalina Elementary was 2.18, and we could expect that the variable of parents’ experiences at the parent-level within Catalina could range between 1.0 and 3.36 (see Table 8.6).

**Parental Participation in School**

In addition to parents’ experiences, I investigated parental participation in school in order to understand to what degree parents engaged in school events and meetings and how actively they participated in their child’s education in TWI programs. Besides the level of participation, I also examined potential factors that made parents’ participation challenging.

**Parents’ Participation**

As explained in Chapter 3, parents’ participation in school was measured by concentrating on six observable behaviors pertaining to parents’ interactions with school personnel and engagement in school events and activities. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to ensure if the six items shared one common factor (participation in school), and Cronbach’s alpha was 0.82, meaning the six items belong to one factor.

Findings of the survey data demonstrated that non-Korean respondents, on average, participated in school more eagerly across all categories than did their Korean counterparts. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests for the items of parents’ participation indicated that the difference between the two groups in the level of participation was statistically significant for most categories. Non-Korean participants, in particular, participated in attending school events and PTA meetings (mean=3.23) and in speaking with their child’s teacher (mean=3.53), and they were more active in speaking in favor of TWI programs or attending activities outside of school (mean=3.01) in comparison to Korean participants (mean=2.71). In contrast, Korean parents in
the survey were relatively less active and less engaged in their child’s school (see Tables 8.7 and 8.8).

Table 8.7 Parents’ Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in school</th>
<th>All N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Korean N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Non-Korean N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend events/PTA meetings</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/chaperon</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize events</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with a teacher</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with a principal or a coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak in favor of a TWI program/ Attend other TWI conferences</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely).

Table 8.8 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Parents’ Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in school</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend events/PTA meetings</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>7.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/chaperon</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>4.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize events</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with a teacher</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>7.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with a principal or a coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak in favor of a TWI program/ Attend other TWI conferences outside of school</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>3.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: ‘p<.10. ‘p<.05. ’’p<.01. ’’’p<.001.

**Inferential Statistics Result for Participation in School**

I further analyzed parental participation by conducting a multivariate regression analysis to examine a relationship between the participation variable and other parent-related independent variables. As discussed in Chapter 3, the outcome variable for measuring parents’ participation was created by averaging six items that shared one common factor (participation), including attending school events and PTA meetings, speaking with school personnel, volunteering for
class, and so forth. The analysis results indicated that variables that had a significant association with the outcome of interest were parents’ experiences, their English proficiency, child’s integration, and overall evaluation of program. There was a statistically significant difference between Korean and non-Korean respondents as well (see Table 8.9).

First, the variable of parent’s participation was positively and significantly associated with the variable of experiences with other parents ($\beta=0.40$), meaning that the more often parents interacted with other parents, the more actively parents tended to participate in their child’s school after controlling for other variables in the model. Second, there was a statistically significant group difference between Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey. Compared to non-Korean respondents, Korean participants were less likely to participate in school ($\beta=-0.31$) after adjusting for other predictors in the regression model. This also confirmed the aforementioned descriptive statistics in this chapter. Third, the participation variable had a positive relationship with parent’s English proficiency ($\beta=0.09$). Although the magnitude was not substantial, the parent’s English proficiency variable was highly significant ($p=0.006$). This result implied that if parents — especially for non-English speaking parents — felt more comfortable with English, their participation in school would be incremented in a meaningful way. Fourth, it was noteworthy that the parent participation variable had a positive and significant association with the child’s integration variable ($\beta=0.08$). Although a further examination is needed to explore a causal relationship between the two variables, the result may imply that if children related well to other students of races and cultures, parental participation in school could be encouraged. Finally, program evaluation was associated with the participation variable in a positive way ($\beta=0.03$), which was statistically significant as well. This implied that
respondents who gave a higher grade to their child’s program tended to more actively engage in school in comparison to respondents who under-evaluated their child’s TWI program.

Table 8.9 Parents’ Participation in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among parents</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the program</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with language develop</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refined Model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. ‘NS’ refers to not significant.

Obstacles to Parental Participation in School

Even though parents hope to participate in school actively, there are practical challenges in reality, which parents may encounter depending on their personal situations, such as work schedule, childcare support for a younger child, language issues, and so on. In regard to these challenges that discourage parental participation in school, survey participants were asked to indicate what could possibly increase their participation in school and what difficulty parents experienced in terms of engaging in child’s school.

For both Korean and non-Korean respondents, work schedule (mean=3.41) and childcare for a younger child (mean=3.02) were practical obstacles that hampered parental participation, and participants agreed that participation would be boosted if the issues were coped with.
Koreans in the survey, English ability was another obstacle (mean=3.00) that impeded their participation in school, and this language issue for Korean respondents was discussed in Chapter 7 as a reason that made it challenging for them to relate to parents of other races and cultures.

Moreover, the English proficiency issue for Korean respondents corresponded to their response to another participation question that ‘participation would be encouraged, if activities were offered in my native language’ (mean=2.93). Besides the work schedule and childcare issues, the non-Korean group responded their participation would be encouraged if school staff made more efforts to invite parents to school (mean=2.94) (see Table 8.10).

Table 8.10 Obstacles to Parents’ Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation would be increased if…</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work schedule allowed</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had transportation</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had childcare for a younger child</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt more comfortable at school</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities were offered in my native language</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew more English</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew more Korean</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school staff made more efforts</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely).

Table 8.11 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Parents’ Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation would be increased if…</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work schedule allowed</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had transportation</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had childcare for a younger child</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt more comfortable at school</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities were offered in my native language</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-1.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew more English</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew more Korean</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school staff made more efforts</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01. ****p<.001.
Conclusion

In this chapter, I explored parental involvement in Korean TWI programs by focusing on their experiences with other parents and participation in school. Findings demonstrated that although most respondents expressed positive perspectives toward school environment, non-Korean participants tended to feel more supported and comfortable at school. In addition, results indicated that both Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey interacted with other parents at different levels. Specifically, non-Korean respondents tended to talk about school events more often with fellow parents than did Korean participants, while Korean parents in the survey more frequently shared information with other parents than did the non-Korean group. According to the inferential statistics result, all things being equal, the variable of parents’ experiences with other parents had positive and significant associations with their participation in school and income levels. In addition, the analysis of the full model for the parents’ experiences variable demonstrated that years in the program and program evaluation had positive associations with parents’ experiences. However, these two variables were non-significant in the refined model; hence, we need further research on this topic.

With respect to parents’ participation in school, the results indicated that parents in the survey participated in school activities and TWI programs at different levels. Non-Korean participants, on average, tended to participate in school more actively than did Korean participants. Parent-teacher communication, in particular, occurred more often for the non-Korean group. In addition, the regression analysis result showed that the outcome variable of parents’ participation in school was positively related to parents’ interactions with other parents, their English proficiency, parents’ satisfaction level of integration among children, and program evaluation. Interestingly, unlike parents’ experiences with fellow parents, participation in school
was not associated with parents’ income and education levels. The regression analysis result suggested that if parents interacted more often with fellow parents, they would participate in school more actively. Also, if parents felt more comfortable with speaking English, their participation would increase as well. If parents felt more satisfied with their child’s experiences to relate to students of other races and cultures, parents’ participation would be encouraged, too. Finally, parents in the survey who highly evaluated their child’s TWI program tended to participate in school more actively.
Program evaluation is a sensitive topic for schools and teachers, but it is a critical indicator that shows parents’ overall satisfaction with their child’s programs and their experiences as a parent at school. Given the significance of this topic, I explored how parents assess their child’s Korean-English two-way immersion (TWI) programs by focusing on parents’ satisfaction with teacher’s target language proficiency, parents’ satisfaction with program’s academic rigor, and overall grades that parents would like to give to the programs. Next, I examined how long parents will be committed to the Korean TWI programs. Exploring these topics, I also compared Korean respondents to non-Korean participants by conducting Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) rank sum tests. I then scrutinized how program evaluation is associated with parent-related variables in the programs.

Additionally, I want to point out the limitations of the program evaluation question due to practical challenges during the school contact process. Because of the question’s sensitive nature, especially to school personnel, it was difficult for me to include multiple questions regarding program evaluation in the survey questionnaire. I needed to share the survey questionnaire with school principals, teachers, and coordinators to obtain approval from schools before distributing surveys; thus, I tried to minimize questions in regard to program evaluation, so that I could be allowed to perform this study.

Parents’ Evaluation of Korean TWI programs

In the survey, I focused on issues that previous research has pointed out: program’s academic rigor and teachers’ target language proficiency. On top of these two items, respondents were asked to indicate how they assessed their child’s Korean TWI program on the whole.
First, as for teachers’ target language proficiency, the survey result showed that both Korean and non-Korean respondents tended to be highly content with Korean proficiency of teachers in their child’s programs, and this result was somewhat contradictory to previous literature regarding Korean TWI programs (Lee & Jeong, 2013) and my pilot study result in which Korean parents addressed some complaints regarding teachers’ Korean proficiency. However, both Lee and Jeong’s study and my pilot study were conducted by examining one single school based on the interview method, which may have limitations in terms of exploring a large number of parents’ views. Nevertheless, the result has remained a question, and parents’ satisfaction with teachers’ target language proficiency requires a more comprehensible examination by including various parental voices to ensure program quality. Additionally, although this study did not explore teachers’ English proficiency, future research on teachers’ English ability is needed as well.

Second, in regard to the academic rigor question, I specified this issue into two questions: one was about academic rigor for each grade level in general, and the other was academic rigor for a respondent’s child, in particular. However, these two answers yielded very similar results, which did not make a meaningful difference. Parents in the survey, on average, were satisfied with the academic rigor that a Korean TWI program provided, although non-Korean respondents expressed more satisfaction (mean=3.35) than did Korean participants (mean=3.21), which was statistically significant based on the rank sum test result.

Finally, the result for parents’ evaluation of Korean TWI programs indicated that respondents, on average, were positive about their child’s Korean TWI programs. The outcome measure was on a letter-grade scale from F to A+, in which parents were asked to give a grade to a child’s Korean TWI program. The average value of program evaluation was slightly over
10.15, which was B+ on a letter-grade scale. Although Korean parents in the survey tended to give higher grades to their child’s program (mean=10.17) compared to non-Korean respondents (mean=10.07), the difference was non-significant (see Table 9.1).

Table 9.1 Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Korean proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic rigor for each grade level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic rigor for my child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: The outcome measures for ‘teacher’s Korean proficiency’ and ‘academic rigor’ were on a Likert-Scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The higher value means more satisfaction with the outcome measures. The overall evaluation variable was on a 13 scale of 0 (F) to 12 (A+).

Table 9.2 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Korean proficiency</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for each grade level</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for my child</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: *p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Inferential Statistics Result for Program Evaluation

To examine the relationship between parents’ program evaluation and other parent-related variables, I performed a multivariate regression analysis. The regression analysis of the survey data yielded that program evaluation was associated with parents’ English ability, their satisfaction with child’s language development, integrative experiences for both children and parents, and respondents’ experiences with other parents.

First, program evaluation had a negative association with parents’ English ability. After controlling for other variables in the regression model, respondents with more fluent English proficiency tended to give lower grades to their child’s programs, and the variable was highly
significant. Second, parents’ satisfaction with child’s language development was positively related to program evaluation, and its magnitude was substantial as well ($\beta=1.34$). In other words, survey participants who were more satisfied with their child’s language development tended to assess the program in a more favorable way, after adjusting for other independent variables in the regression model. Third, integration issues for both children and parents were significant factors that were positively connected with program evaluation. The regression analysis indicates that parents in the survey gave higher grades when they were satisfied with child’s experiences to relate to other students ($\beta=0.32$) and with parents’ integrative experiences with other fellow parents ($\beta=0.31$), after controlling for other variables in the regression model. These variables were statistically significant as well. Finally, program evaluation was positively related to the parent’s experience variable. After adjusting for the other predictors in the regression model, one unit increase in parents’ experiences with other parents was associated with a 0.24 unit increase in parents’ program evaluation. Income and mother’s education levels were not significant at all in the program evaluation analysis (see Table 9.3).
Table 9.3 Program Evaluation by Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Model</th>
<th></th>
<th>Refined Model</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's English ability</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with language development</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among children</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among parents</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with other parents</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the program</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. ‘NS’ refers to not significant.

Parental Commitment to TWI Programs

Commitment to Korean TWI Programs

Parents’ commitment to Korean TWI programs is a central issue in maintaining TWI programs in a stable way and in establishing long-term plans and policies for the programs. Program commitment is also critical because parents’ loyal commitment can be an indicator of their satisfaction with Korean TWI programs as well as of their emphasis on language education for their child.

Table 9.4 Plans to be Committed to Korean TWI Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Non-Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this school-year only</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until 3rd or 4th grade</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until 5th or 6th grade</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until 8th grade</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until 12th grade</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Notes: Parents who chose ‘for this school-year only’ did not include parents whose child was in grade 5.
With respect to the question about how long a respondent would be committed to the program, the survey result revealed that over 40% of the participants responded that they would be committed to the program through fifth grade or sixth grade, which is until elementary education. As for the commitment until third grade or fourth grade, over one-in-five Korean parents in the survey made this choice, while there were only 5.6% of non-Korean respondents who selected this response. In fact, this result reflected the Korean TWI program’s situations for fourth-grade and fifth-grade classrooms. Due to the shrinkage of students for upper grades, some TWI programs in this study offer a combo class where fourth graders and fifth graders are grouped together or reduce the number of classes for fifth-grade students. A few teachers and coordinators of the Korean TWI programs also shared some anecdotes, stating that Korean parents tended to leave the Korean TWI program in third grade or fourth grade in order to enroll their child in a better school district before the child reached middle school.

Second, nearly half of non-Korean parents in the survey responded they would like to be committed to a Korean TWI program until eighth grade or twelfth grade, if a program were available, whereas nearly one-third of Korean participants who chose the same answer. In brief, the survey results revealed that the majority of Korean respondents — over two-thirds of Korean participants in the survey — perceived Korean-English TWI instruction would be sufficient for elementary education, while nearly half of non-Korean respondents wanted to be committed to the program until eighth grade or twelfth grade (see Table 9.4).

**Reasons for Leaving Korean TWI Programs**

Regarding the program commitment matter, I further explored what factors could affect parents in making the decision to leave Korean TWI programs. First, except moving out to a different place, the most noticeable reason for both Korean and non-Korean respondents was an
integration issue. The two groups of parents in the survey responded that they would leave the program if their child did not get along with students of other races and cultures. Even though the difference between Korean and non-Korean participants was not statistically significant, this issue was more salient to non-Korean parents (mean=2.65) compared to Korean parents (mean=2.55). Second, for non-Korean respondents, in particular, their child's difficulty with Korean instruction could be another reason for leaving the program. The non-Korean group responded that they would leave the Korean TWI program, if their child found it challenging to receive instruction in Korean (mean=2.26). Third, school safety issue was relatively significant as well for both Korean and non-Korean parents in the survey, and it was more salient to Korean participants (see Table 9.5).

Table 9.5 Possible Reasons for Leaving a Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>All (N=440)</th>
<th>Korean (N=333)</th>
<th>Non-Korean (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If my child left a TWI program, because…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my child didn’t keep up instruction in Korean</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my child didn't want to learn Korean</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my child didn't get along with other races/cultures</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send to better program/school</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a school was not a welcoming environment</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my family moved out</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send a school in the same neighborhood as home</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send a school in a safe area</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014
Note: The outcome measure was on a Likert-Scale of 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely).
Table 9.6 Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Tests for Possible Reasons for Leaving a Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my child didn’t keep up instruction in Korean</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my child didn't want to learn Korean</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my child didn't get along with other races/cultures</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send to better program/school</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this school was not a welcoming environment</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my family moved out</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send a school in the same neighborhood as home</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-2.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send a school in a safe area</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean-English TWI Program Parent Survey Data, 2013-2014

Note: †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explored how parents in the survey assessed their child’s Korean TWI programs and how long they would be committed to the program in terms of grade level. I also examined what factors could make parents leave the program earlier.

Findings indicated that parents in the survey, on average, addressed fairly positive attitudes toward their child’s program. Specifically, respondents were satisfied with teachers’ native language proficiency and academic rigor for each grade level as well as for their child. Furthermore, according to the regression analysis result, program evaluation was positively and significantly associated with (1) parent satisfaction with their child’s language development, (2) child’s experiences to relate to students of other races and cultures, (3) integrative experiences among parents, and (4) their interactions with other parents. However, program evaluation was negatively linked with parents’ English proficiency, which was statistically significant. The regression analysis result demonstrated that income and education levels were not related to parents’ evaluation of the programs at all.

Finally, the analysis of program commitment demonstrated that respondents on average, would be committed to the programs until fifth grade or sixth grade. Interestingly, 20% of Korean participants stated they would be committed to the program until third grade or fourth
grade, and over 40% of non-Korean parents in the survey responded they would send their child to Korean TWI programs until twelfth grade if a program were available. In regard to potential reasons for leaving the program earlier, both Korean and non-Korean groups in the survey pointed out integration issues among children as a main reason except moving out. Yet, the result has remained further inquiry regarding the considerable difference between the Korean and non-Korean respondents in terms of parents’ commitment to Korean TWI programs.
CHAPTER 10–EMPOWERING PARENTS’ EXPERIENCES TO IMPROVE KOREAN TWI PROGRAMS

In this dissertation study, I presented research on 454 parents of students in Korean-English two-way immersion (TWI) programs of seven elementary schools in the Los Angeles area. I sought to probe parents of students in the programs in a comprehensive manner by employing a survey method. Throughout this dissertation study, I delved into parents in the survey data focusing on the research questions demonstrated in Chapter 1. In this chapter, I summarize the study’s findings presented in Chapters 4 through 9 to review the findings of the present study. I then describe this study’s contributions to literature on parents of students in TWI programs and discuss the limitations and challenges in this study. Next, I suggest future directions for research and present this study’s implications.

Summary of Findings

Parents of Students in Korean TWI programs

Survey data analysis demonstrated that the vast majority of participants in the survey were Korean parents. Specifically, about three-quarters of the respondents were of Korean descent. The next largest racial group in the survey was Latinos (10%), followed by non-Korean Asians (8%) and whites (6%). The respondents’ spouses/partners reflected a similar proportion as well (see Table 4.1).

This seemingly simple racial composition of the parents in the survey actually contained a wide range of diversity in terms of native languages and countries of origin. Over four-in-five survey respondents were immigrant parents, and of the immigrant parents, five-sixth participants came from South Korea. Except the Korean group, parents in the survey migrated mainly from
Latin American and Asian countries, including Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, the Philippines, China, Japan, Vietnam, Laos, Mongol, and Indonesia. Regarding respondents’ native languages, 72% were native Korean speakers, 12% were native English speakers, and 8% were native Spanish speakers (see Table 4.2). Given the high percentage of foreign-born parents, I also explored parents’ self-reported English proficiency. As for speaking proficiency, in particular, the result indicated that one-third of parents in the survey responded that they did not speak English *not well or not at all*.

With respect to education and income levels, the analysis result indicated that by and large survey respondents were highly educated — nearly half of the respondents graduated from a four-year college. It was also noteworthy that one-fifth non-Korean mothers obtained a Master’s or higher degree, implying that highly educated non-Korean mothers purposefully chose a Korean-English TWI program, although their heritage language was not Korean (see Table 4.3). The analysis of income levels revealed substantial economic disparity across the seven schools in this study, and the overall income level was linked with socioeconomic status of individual communities where the schools were located (see Table 4.4).

**Reasons for Choosing a Korean TWI Program**

The reasons for choosing a Korean-English TWI program addressed by respondents in this study confirmed the findings of the previous studies, which were summarized in Chapter 2. With respect to school choice, offering of a TWI program was the most attractive reason for parents in the survey. Respondents also paid special attention to school reputations and the Korean TWI program’s diverse student body. Regarding program choice, parents’ reasons included (1) developing bilingual abilities, (2) preparing for a global society, (3) increasing future employment opportunities, and (4) becoming comfortable with relating to other races/cultures.
Yet, the notable finding in this study was that non-Korean parents in the survey placed the highest emphasis on better academic performance as their paramount reason for enrolling their child in the Korean TWI program. Although it requires a further examination, this result reminded of my conversations with one Ethiopian mother at Catalina Elementary and one Chinese mother at Dryden Street Elementary.

“I want my daughter to succeed in this country. ... I started sending my daughter to the Korean program since kindergarten. Not only to this school, I’m also sending her to the Korean afterschool in town. I’m sure she gets challenged by her Korean friends. I mean, positively. You know, it’s not pressure.” – Ethiopian mother of a second-grade daughter

“To be honest, I’m not that interested in Korean. But, Chinese culture is very similar to Korean culture in that it really cares about academic success. I know my son is smart. ... I want him to get along with more Asian children. ... Compared to other schools, this program has more Asians in this neighborhood because of this KDLP (Korean dual language program) program.” – Chinese mother of a third-grade son

These two parents chose the Korean TWI program, anticipating that the program would be beneficial for their child’s academic success. Literature has demonstrated that parents in TWI programs, in general, expect better academic outcomes by enrolling their child in the TWI program (e.g., Whiting and Feinauer, 2011; López, 2013; Gerena, 2010). The survey result and the comments stated above by the two parents confirm the previous research on parents’ reasons for choosing a TWI program. Furthermore, non-Korean parents’ attention to Korean TWI programs can be attributed to the overall reputation of the program’s academic performance and
of the program’s racial composition with more Asian students, especially in comparison to Spanish TWI programs.

Additionally, heritage maintenance was one of the primary reasons for Korean respondents to choose the program. This reason can be intuitively justified, and literature has illustrated that maintaining home language and culture is a pivotal reason for Spanish parents to enroll their child in the Spanish TWI program (e.g., Shannon and Milian, 2002; Giacchino-Baker & Piller, 2006; Gerena, 2010; López, 2013). Yet, some non-Korean participants in the survey remarked that heritage maintenance was also a crucial motivation for them to enroll their child in the Korean TWI program. In regard to heritage maintenance, survey participants were allowed to elaborate in an open-ended question, and their comments included several noteworthy reasons, including (1) Korean program’s diverse student body compared to Spanish programs, (2) the program’s classroom environment that defers diverse languages and cultures as well as immigration history, and (3) the program’s overall atmosphere where non-Korean Asian students may feel comfortable.

With respect to information sources that parents used when searching for Korean-English TWI programs, most parents in the survey tended to rely on interpersonal networks (e.g., from friends, family, coworkers, etc.) rather than formal networks (e.g., district/school brochures, pamphlet, online information, etc.). As for the group difference, the result also showed that non-Korean respondents were more dependent on formal networks than were their Korean counterparts.

**Perspectives on Language Development**

Parental satisfaction with their child’s language development was one of the critical variables pertaining to program evaluation presented in Chapter 9. In regard to child’s language
development, the result showed that parents in the survey were more content with child’s English development in comparison to Korean development. Also, non-Korean respondents addressed greater satisfaction with their child’s English development compared to the Korean group. Yet, there was no difference between the two groups in satisfaction with child’s Korean development.

I further explored the extent to which parents offered support for developing child’s Korean proficiency. Even though Korean respondents tended to provide more support than did non-Korean participants, the result indicated that non-Korean parents in the survey, too, put significant efforts in offering support for their child to improve Korean proficiency.

Finally, I discussed findings about parental concerns over their child’s difficulty with receiving instruction in Korean and in English. Non-Korean respondents, on average, raised less concerns than did the Korean group. However, Korean participants reported higher levels of concerns in comparison to their non-Korean counterparts over both English and Korean instruction.

Integration among Children and Parents in Korean TWI Programs
Integration is one of the fundamental criteria that underpin TWI programs, and at the same time it is a central focus of intergroup contact theory. From this perspective, I examined integration among children and parents, respectively, and how integration was linked with other parent-related factors in the Korean TWI programs. The findings demonstrated that respondents, on average, were content with their child’s integration experiences in the Korean TWI programs, but non-Korean participants expressed greater satisfaction compared to the Korean group. Notwithstanding the difference in the perception of integration in TWI programs between Korean and non-Korean respondents, the survey participants’ positive views on integration in general confirmed the theoretical perspective of this study. Moreover, the regression analysis and
correlation analysis in this study indicated that parental satisfaction with their child’s integration experiences had a positive and strong association with parents’ own experiences with other races and cultures in the programs.

Additionally, the result showed that there was a considerable difference between Korean and non-Korean respondents in terms of their experiences with parents of other races and cultures. All things being equal, non-Korean parents in the survey, on average, addressed more positive experiences in comparison to the Korean group. I also explored the potential obstacles that could interfere interactive relationships among parents, and the two groups pointed out English fluency and lack of contacts as the outstanding reasons that hampered parents’ interactions.

**Parental Involvement in Korean TWI programs**

Regarding parental involvement in Korean-English TWI programs, I explored this topic from the parental involvement as social capital perspective. I started with the examination of parental perceptions of the overall school environment, which could encourage or discourage their participation. The findings showed that respondents, on average, held positive views toward their child’s school environment, but non-Korean parents in the survey felt more supported compared to the Korean group. Moreover, the analysis indicated that non-Korean participants, on average, participated more in their child’s schools than did their Korean counterparts. Specifically, the non-Korean group was more committed to attending PTA meetings and to speaking with a teacher.

Additionally, the multilevel regression analysis yielded the result that the variable of interactions with other parents was positively and significantly linked with parental participation. The regression analysis for examining parental participation also demonstrated that the variable
of parental participation was positively associated with (1) their interactions with other parents, (2) English proficiency, (3) integration among children, and (4) program evaluation. These findings, in particular, confirmed the theoretical basis of parental involvement as social capital. Respondents who possessed additional social capital (e.g., English proficiency and networks with fellow parents) were more likely to participate in school. I also explored potential barriers that curbed parental participation. Parents commented on work schedule and childcare for a younger child as their practical obstacles that impeded their participation in school.

**Parents’ Evaluation of Korean TWI programs**

Finally, I probed program performance based on parents’ evaluation of their child’s Korean-English TWI programs. For examining this topic, respondents were asked to evaluate their program on a letter-grade scale. The result demonstrated that parents in the survey, on average, rated the program fairly high, which was a B+. According to the regression analysis result, respondents’ evaluation of their child’s Korean TWI programs had significant and positive associations with (1) parent satisfaction with their child’s language development, (2) integration among children (3) integration among parents, and (4) parents’ interactions with other parents.

I also examined until which grade parents would be committed to the Korean TWI program. As Table 9.4 illustrated, about two-fifth of parents in the survey responded they would be committed to Korean-English TWI programs until fifth grade or sixth grade. Surprisingly, more non-Korean respondents (42.1%) expressed their desire to be committed to the program for a longer period – until twelfth grade – than did their Korean counterparts (22.5%). Moreover, Korean respondents addressed relatively short-term commitment (20.4%) to the program – until third grade or fourth grade – compared to the non-Korean group (5.6%).
In regard to potential reasons for leaving the program earlier, child’s relating to other races and cultures was the most significant reason for both Korean and non-Korean respondents except moving out. Also, although some teachers shared anecdotes that Korean parents left the program early to enroll their child a better middle school, this reason was not salient for Korean parents in the analysis of potential reasons for leaving the program early. In fact, maintaining stable student enrollment in the program is a critical issue for TWI programs. A quality learning environment where language learning takes place effectively can be created by ensuring a balanced number of native English speakers and language-minority students. Furthermore, maintenance of the two groups in similar numbers is central to cultivating integration in the program as well. Therefore, a further investigation is required in regard to the decreasing enrollment trend for higher grade-level classes in Korean TWI programs.

Contributions to the Literature

This research study adds literature to research on parents of students in TWI programs. Even though interests in TWI programs have been substantially increasing as TWI programs have grown in popularity, parents of students in non-Spanish TWI programs have been relatively under-researched. Moreover, the immense majority of research on parents of students in TWI programs has been conducted based on a qualitative method that focuses on a limited number of research subjects.

By including 454 parents’ voices, this survey-based study adds to the knowledge and information related to parents’ perspectives toward and experiences in Korean TWI programs. Also, the study’s findings call upon researchers and educators to attend to Korean TWI programs and TWI programs in general to ensure quality TWI instruction for all students and foster integration in the program.
Limitations and Challenges

Although this study yielded meaningful results in terms of identifying parents of students in Korean TWI programs, elucidating parents’ perspectives toward child’s language development and integration, and comprehending parents’ own experiences in the program, limitations have remained in the study.

First, survey response rates from individual schools varied substantially from 20 to 76%. The varied response rates can be attributed to different survey administration time, survey modes (Web and paper), respondents’ levels of motivation to participate in survey, and school staff’s encouragement. Especially for studies that contain multiple research sites like this dissertation study, low response rates from a particular site implies that results from the site cannot be representative of the group; hence, analyzing group differences in such case can produce sample error and sample bias (Nulty, 2008). For this study, the estimated number of parents of students in seven schools’ Korean TWI programs was nearly 1,100, and a total of 454 parents participated in this study (see Table 3.1). The response rates on the whole were adequate for analysis; however, it is apparent that a large number of parents at some schools were discounted in the data. For this reason, I was unable to analyze differences by schools except the multilevel analysis of parents’ experiences in Chapter 8, and the result for parents’ experiences also needs to be carefully interpreted. Additionally, as mentioned in Chapter 4, verbal accommodation for illiterate parents was not provided when survey was administered; accordingly, the survey was unable to capture the voices of illiterate population in Korean TWI programs. For non-English speaking parents, the survey questionnaire was offered in Korean and Spanish, yet it might have been challenging for respondents with little or no education to respond the survey. Therefore,
voices of less educated population, — perhaps in low socioeconomic status as well — may not have been sufficiently represented in the survey, which caused unintended selection bias.

In addition, some limitations have to do with the survey questionnaire. First, back-translation was not performed when survey was developed. Especially, it was critical for the Spanish-version survey due to my lack of knowledge in Spanish. Although I tried to ensure that overall survey questions could be understood easily when the survey was reviewed, the absence of back-translation process has remained a limitation in this study. Second, I missed information about respondent’s length of residence in the United States. This is a meaningful indicator that shows a foreign-born immigrant parent’s immigration trajectory. Third, respondents were asked to indicate their satisfaction with teacher’s target language proficiency, but teacher’s English proficiency was ignored. While visiting the seven schools in this study, I was not told any complaints about teacher’s English proficiency from parents. However, it would be informative if the question about teacher’s language proficiency included both English and Korean.

Moreover, some responses in the survey should be interpreted cautiously due to different operational systems of individual programs. For example, although all seven Korean TWI programs in the present study are organized on the 50/50 basis, instructional contexts may differ by schools and grade levels; thus, survey participants’ responses may have referred to different perspectives, although the same question was asked. Furthermore, there may be external factors (e.g., school reputation and overall academic success) that could have affected parents’ responses as well. To illustrate, parents may have considered overall school factors instead of focusing on the TWI program only when they were asked to evaluate their child’s Korean TWI program. Interpretation of survey questions in a subjective manner by respondents is one of limitations of a survey study, including this study as well. Similarly, parents’ satisfaction with their child’s
language development should be analyzed with supplementary data, such as language test scores, which provide more objective information. Understanding parents’ satisfaction is significant, yet it does not inform us of students’ actual language development in an objective way. Literature on TWI programs has questioned if native English speakers can reach similar levels of proficiency in two languages (e.g., Garcia, 2005; de Jong & Bearse, 2011), and this is a valid question for Korean TWI programs as well. However, in the analysis results, non-Korean respondents were more content with their child’s language development, in general, and this requires a further analysis by using child’s language test outcomes.

Finally, even though it is not a limitation, I need to clarify the term for the Korean group used throughout this dissertation study. In the survey data, there were 10 respondents who claimed themselves as biracial or multiracial Korean. Racial identity is complex, especially for people of two or more races and cannot be simplified into a single category. Being aware of this issue clearly, I intentionally combined respondents of biracial or multiracial Korean respondents into the Korean group that includes Korean-dominant parents, Korean-English bilingual parents, and English-dominant parents who are of Korean descent. Due to the modest number of English-dominant Korean respondents in the data, additional analysis based on the distinction between English-dominant and Korean-dominant parents will not yield different results. However, a future inquiry needs to be followed to examine the difference between Koreans and biracial or multiracial Koreans in Korean TWI programs using a qualitative approach.

**Future Directions for Research**

Subgroup analysis should be followed. For this study, the analysis of Latino respondents was conducted for understanding in-group characteristics, especially by focusing on demographics and education levels as well as income levels given that Hispanic respondents were the largest
group in the survey except Koreans and that they are the predominant majority group in California. Similar analysis is required for non-Korean Asian population as well.

Phenomena can be appreciated in a distinct manner from different subjects’ perspectives. In this dissertation study, I focused on parents’ perspectives in regard to their child’s language development, integration issues, and parental involvement. However, these topics should be scrutinized from different angles, such as from the perspectives of school personnel and students in the Korean TWI program. Also, comparative analysis is necessary to examine to what degree results can be aligned with this study’s findings.

Furthermore, survey questionnaire with more concrete constructs on integration and parental involvement should be developed to reflect the unique context of Korean TWI programs. Some survey questionnaire of this study referred to an existing survey designed to investigate Spanish-English TWI programs; however, further inquiry is required based on a more culture-specific survey questionnaire that is developed for Korean TWI programs.

Studying Korean TWI programs at the middle-school and high-school level is needed. Although there are not many Korean TWI programs available for middle-school and high-school students, a small number of Korean TWI programs are offered in Los Angles and Glendale. However, virtually no studies explore Korean TWI programs at the secondary education level and how instruction is organized. Further inquiry is needed to understand challenges and concerns as well as advantages regarding secondary-level Korean TWI programs.

Future research on why Korean parents are less likely to seek integration and participation is required. This study’s findings demonstrate that Korean respondents tended to perceive integration among children and among parents in a less positive way compared to non-Korean respondents. The Korean group was also less likely to participate in their child’s school
than were non-Korean respondents. A further examination needs to be performed to explore what causes this difference between Korean parents and non-Korean parents in terms of integration and participation. At the same time, there needs to be speculations on what can improve Korean parents’ integrative experiences and their participation in school as well.

With respect to Korean parents’ relatively short commitment to the Korean TWI program, a further discussion is required. If the majority of parents of students in Korean TWI programs plan to be committed to the program for four to five years only from kindergarten to third or fourth grade, a different instructional model can be discussed to meet these parents’ needs. For instance, immersion education can be on the 90/10 basis at higher grader levels (e.g., fifth grade or higher) with more emphasis on English instead of the current 50/50 basis, so that Korean instruction can continue as a bilingual program.

Finally, a school that provides mainstream English instruction, Korean TWI instruction, and Spanish TWI instruction needs to be examined by encompassing parents from three different instructional programs to shed light on what affects parent’s program choice in the same school site. With respect to parents’ reasons for choosing a school demonstrated in Chapter 4, parents consider school factors and program factors concurrently when choosing a school for their child. In order to clarify school-related reasons and program-specific reasons, investigating one single school site that offers different instructional programs is required, and in doing so the study will delineate parents’ reasons for choosing a specific program more explicitly.

**Study Implications**

Based on this study’s findings, I present study implications in terms of policy, practice, and theory, and it is desirable to speculate on the implications discussed below from all three
perspectives. First, with respect to policy, policymakers need to attend to the potential of TWI programs in order to address desegregation efforts in society, and they must provide systematic policy support for immigrant parents in TWI programs to increase the effects of the program and parental participation in the program.

Second, regarding practice, all members in TWI programs, including teachers, school personnel, students, and parents, need to be aware of the importance of integration in the program to improve overall experiences of parents and students. Moreover, additional efforts to maintain a balanced number of Korean-speaking students and English-speaking students must be made to amplify the effects of the program. Finally, parents must be cognizant of the significance of the full commitment to the program in terms of boosting their child’s language attainment and maintaining the program in a stable and effective way.

Third, from the theory perspective, researchers need to pay special attention to language development in Korean TWI programs and TWI programs in general. Although this study did not explore the levels of language proficiency in Korean and English in the Korean TWI programs, parents in this study addressed different levels of satisfaction with their child’s language development. Given that the TWI program was developed based on research-driven evidence to offer the most effective learning environment for attaining two languages, it is critical to focus on language development and proficiency levels of English as well as a partner language.

Two-Way Immersion Program as a Space to Alleviate Segregation

This study shows a promise that TWI programs can diminish school segregation, although continuing efforts need to be made consciously in the program. As student demographics
changed dramatically in the past 20 years in California, school segregation became more evident. For example, Latino students comprise slightly over 50% of the total enrollment in California, but the typical Latino student attends a school where three-quarters of their classmates are black, Latino, and Native Indian students (Orfield & Ee, 2014). Confronting this exacerbating school segregation, TWI programs can cultivate school desegregation at some levels (Morales & Aldana, 2010). To exemplify, some schools in this study were located in a predominantly Latino neighborhood highly segregated by poverty as well; however, Korean TWI programs included a substantial number of Asian (mostly Koreans) students in the classroom. Accordingly, Latino students in the programs had more exposure to Asian students and were less segregated in a given school context especially compared to regular programs at the same school.

Support for Immigrant Parents

This study demonstrated that the vast majority of respondents in the survey were immigrants, and this reflects a special feature of Korean-English TWI program’s parent body. Over 80% of parents in the survey were born in foreign countries, and nearly one-third of the total respondents in the survey spoke English not at all or not well. Even though respondents were highly educated parents, they encountered difficulty in terms of interacting with other parents and of participating in school due to their limited English proficiency. Recall that parent’s English ability was positively and significantly associated with parental views on integration among parents. In other words, parents in the survey who spoke English more fluently were more likely to perceive the overall parents’ interactions positively. Furthermore, their English proficiency had a positive and strong relationship with parental participation in school. Given these results and parents’ demographics, more active institutional support for immigrant parents, including language
support, needs to be provided in various ways to promote overall parents’ experiences in Korean TWI programs.

In addition to the language support, specific cultural guidelines for immigrant parents from various racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds need to be provided in order to increase interactions among parents. Some parents’ low motivation to interact with other parents can be attributed to a lack of cultural understanding of other cultures. For example, parents perhaps are not knowledgeable about initiating a conversation or arranging playdates with parents of other cultures in an appropriate way. Therefore, it would helpful to offer specific examples that include culturally appropriate protocols for parents of different cultures, so that they feel more motivated to interact with other parents of students in TWI programs by practicing the examples.

**Integration Matters**

An integrated environment does matter in TWI programs, and this study confirmed the importance of integration. Furthermore, the finding illuminated a strong and positive relationship between integration among children and integration among parents. In other words, parents’ integrative interactions with parents of other races and cultures are closely associated with child’s relating to other races and cultures. Furthermore, for non-Korean participants in the survey, enhancing child’s abilities to integrate was one of the foremost motivations for choosing the Korean TWI program. As described above, TWI programs can foster desegregation, but without ongoing and intentional efforts to cultivate integration, it is impossible to expect positive outcomes. Notice that integration in TWI programs emerged several times as a significant variable in different regression models in this study. To recall the results, the variable of children’s integration was highly linked with the variable of integration among parents and with
parental participation in school. The variables of integration among children and among parents, respectively, also had a strong impact on parents’ evaluation of their child’s TWI programs.

Given these relationships between the integration factor and other parent-related variables, educators in TWI programs must place the greatest emphasis on the integration issue not only among children in classroom but also among parents in the school community. Moreover, there needs to be active community-level efforts to raise awareness of integration, especially in the Korean community. As briefly discussed in Chapter 1, Koreans in the U.S. stand out for their least positive intergroup relations, and they also tend to relate to the same group compared to other non-Korean Asians (Pew Research Center, 2013a). Considering this feature of Koreans in the U.S., conscious emphasis on social and cultural benefits of integrative experiences should be placed not only among Korean parents in the Korean TWI programs but also in the Korean community in the U.S.A. in general.

**Maintaining Balanced Number of Students**

Analysis of survey data and empirical observations of Korean TWI programs demonstrate that Korean TWI programs encounter difficulty with maintaining a balanced number of students from a target language group (Korean speakers) and a language-majority group (English speakers). Moreover, non-Korean students in the program comprise mixed populations, including English speakers and non-Korean language minority students, which add complex layers in terms of language use and instruction in the program. To ensure quality learning environment for TWI instruction and integration, educators, program developers, and administrators need to address palpable efforts to enroll more non-Korean students. Moreover, in order to attract non-Korean parents, it is equally significant to emphasize various advantages of TWI instruction besides
learning two languages and how both Korean and non-Korean groups can benefit from the TWI instruction.

**Encouragement of Full Commitment to the Program**

Full commitment to Korean TWI programs needs to be emphasized, especially among Korean parents. Literature underscores that TWI instruction should preferably continue from kindergarten to twelfth grade to maximize the program effect; being committed to a TWI program for the full period of instruction is significant not only for developing full bilingualism and biliteracy but also for maintaining the program in a stable way. It is also critical for helping students raise appropriate levels of understanding of other races and cultures. However, a substantial number of Korean respondents in this study addressed a limited plan to be committed to Korean TWI programs — until third or fourth grade. In such a case, Korean TWI programs do not sufficiently function as TWI programs; rather, they are more likely to be transitional bilingual programs where students acquire some levels of English proficiency and transfer to English mainstream classes. Furthermore, some Korean parents’ short commitment to the program raises a serious question regarding what Korean TWI programs mean to the Korean community and challenges the future of Korean TWI programs as well. It is also contradictory to the Korean community’s avid desire to maintain their heritage language for future generations of Koreans in the U.S. Therefore, a strong emphasis on full commitment to the program must be placed continuously by school personnel as well as among parents themselves and Korean parents, in particular.

**Parents Do Care about Language Development**

Regarding parental evaluation of their child’s TWI programs, the most significant variable was their satisfaction with their child’s language development of English and Korean. Of course,
there were other factors that parents considered in terms of evaluating the programs, yet the analysis showed that language development was the foremost indicator of parental evaluation.

Developing bilingual and biliterate abilities is one of the fundamental goals of TWI programs. At the same time, it is one of the primary reasons that parents in the survey pointed out for choosing a Korean TWI program. In that regard, child’s progress in developing two languages is the most visible and tangible factor that parents can use in measuring the program efficacy. Hence, educators and researchers need to pay continuous attention to Korean TWI programs in maintaining an effective language learning environment for students.

**Concluding Statement**

To conclude this dissertation study, I want to call attention to the issue of growing diversity in terms of race, language, and culture in U.S. society, which was discussed in the very beginning of the present study. This multiracial study with a primary emphasis on parents of students in Korean TWI programs provokes a speculation on the future of society in terms of California’s next generations, in particular. This study contains various kinds of relations and intuitions that emerged through the examination of parents of students in Asian mainstream classrooms. Simultaneously, the study also illuminates challenges and concerns that this diverse society is facing in terms of intergroup attitudes and dynamics.

Korean TWI programs have significant potential in offering inclusive environment where students as well as their families interact with diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic groups. Yet, this study also evokes the significance of conscious and purposeful efforts for integration, which should be attended to continuously. Furthermore, ensuring quality education and cultivating constructive intergroup relations need to be equally emphasized in Korean TWI programs, so
that the program can raise citizens of tomorrow who are competent in the 21st global society and responsible for promoting civil rights in multiracial society.
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APPENDIX A: PARENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Q2 Counting this year how long has your child been in a Korean-English dual language program? (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- 1 year (New student)
- 2 yrs
- 3 yrs
- 4 yrs
- 5 yrs
- 6 yrs

Q3 Do you have other children who are enrolled in another dual language program? (e.g. Spanish, Chinese, French, etc.)
- Yes
- No (Skip next question; go to Q5)

Q4 If yes, how many? (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Q5 Do you have other children who are enrolled in an English-only instructional program? (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- Yes
- No (Skip next question; go to Q7)

Q6 If yes, how many? (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Q7 The school gave you the option to choose dual language or English-only instruction for your child. (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- Yes
- No

Q8 What is your native language (the first language you learned to speak when you were a child)? (Please pick one of the answers below or add your own.)
- English
- Korean
- Spanish
- A Filipino language
- Hindi, Tamil or other Indian subcontinent language
- Other (Please specify) ____________________

Q9 What language do you speak most often with your child? (Please pick one of the answers below or add your own.)
- English
- Korean
- Spanish
- A Filipino language
- Hindi, Tamil or other Indian subcontinent language
- Other (Please specify) ____________________
Q10 How often do you use your native language with... (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your spouse/partner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your friends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff? (teachers, coordinator, principal, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 How well do you do the following? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand spoken English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 How well do you do the following? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand spoken Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 How important was each of the following in selecting a Korean-English dual language program versus other dual language programs (e.g., Spanish, Chinese, and French)? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want my child to be comfortable relating to his/her heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my child to be able to speak, read, and write in two or more languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my child to be comfortable relating to people of different races/cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my child to be academically successful in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program offers at least 50% of the instruction in English compared to the 90/10 model, which offers less English instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my child to be successful in a global society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child’s learning Korean will bring economic benefits to him/her in the future (e.g. getting a better job, having more opportunities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13-1. For non-Korean parents: if you choose <important> or <very important> for the response “I want my child to be comfortable relating to his/her heritage,” would you please elaborate why you think so? (e.g., because a dual-language program values every culture and language that students bring in to the classroom, etc.)

Q14 How important was each of the following in choosing the school for your child? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has a Korean-English dual language program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has high Academic Performance Index (API) scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a diverse student body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is your neighborhood school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is located in a safe neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other child attends (or attended) the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a good reputation in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 How did you know about the program? (Please check all that apply)
- Through information from the school district
- From a church or a temple
- From Internet, radio, newspaper, etc.
- From preschool teachers
- From other parents, friends, or neighbors
- Other (Please specify) ____________________

Q16 How satisfied are you with your child’s English language development? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>No opportunity to observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of spoken English</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in English</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in English</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in English</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 How satisfied are you with your child’s Korean language development? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>No opportunity to observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of spoken Korean</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Korean</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Korean</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in Korean</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 Do you do the following things to further improve your child’s Korean proficiency? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I send my child to a Saturday (or Sunday) Korean school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I send my child to a Korean after-school program</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer supplementary Korean academic materials for my child at home (e.g., Korean and Kumon books)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer supplementary Korean materials for my child on the Internet (e.g., Youtube clips, Korean websites)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my child to watch Korean movies, TV programs, etc.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 Please rate your opinion on the following statements. (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No opportunity to observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program provides adequate academic rigor for each grade level</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program provides adequate academic rigor for my child</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is having NO difficulty receiving instruction in <strong>Korean</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is having NO difficulty receiving instruction in <strong>English</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20 How much education do you want your child to complete? (Please pick one of the answers below.)

- ○ Less than high school graduation
- ○ Graduate from high school or GED equivalent
- ○ Graduate from a 2-year college or vocational school
- ○ Graduate from a 4-year college
- ○ Obtain a Master’s degree or equivalent
- ○ Obtain a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree

Q21 In the context of your child’s dual language program, how satisfied are you with the following? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>No opportunity to observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along with students of different races/cultures <strong>in school</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along with students of different races/cultures <strong>outside of school</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22 Since the beginning of this year, how many times did the following occur? The parents of one of my child’s friends... (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Three or four times</th>
<th>More than five times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gave me information about the school, teachers, etc.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did me a favor</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a favor from me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised my child on an educational outing or field trip</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23 Please rate your opinion on the following statements. (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No opportunity to observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school environment welcomes, embraces, and nourishes language learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school environment appreciates the heritage and cultures of all students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the home-school communication</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the native and academic language ability of target (Korean) language teachers at my child’s school</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the bilingual skills of the support staff (secretary, nurse, counselor, lunch lady, janitor, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school provides adequate support for Korean-speaking parents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school provides adequate support for Spanish-speaking parents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents get along with parents of different races/cultures</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that every parent is equally respected at my child’s school no matter what language s/he speaks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that every parent is equally respected at my child’s school no matter what his/her income level is</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24 How often during this current school year have you (or your spouse/partner) ________? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended special school events (e.g. Open House, science night, drama, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke to the principal or program coordinator about the dual language program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaperoned a field trip for your child’s class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a PTA meeting or parent-teacher conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to organize special program events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given opportunities to attend a dual language conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke in favor of the program at your child’s school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered in your child’s classroom/ school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with other parents about school meetings and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with your child’s teacher about your child’s progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q25 What would encourage you to have more participation with the activities above? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If my work schedule allowed it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had child care for my younger child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I felt more comfortable at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If more activities were offered in my native language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I knew more English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I knew more Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If school staff made more effort to invite me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26 If you think parents at your child’s school don’t get along with other parents of different races/cultures, what would be the reasons? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because they don’t speak English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because they don’t understand each other’s cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because they don’t respect each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because they don’t have enough time to interact with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because they are not interested in their child’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27 How long are you going to be committed to a Korean-English program? (Please pick one of the answers below.)

- For this school-year only
- Until grade 3 or 4
- Until grade 5 or 6
- Until grade 8
- Until grade 12

Keep going! You’re doing great! 😊
Q28 If your child left a Korean-English dual language program, what would be the reason? (Please mark the corresponding circle - only one per line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child couldn’t keep up with instruction in Korean</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child didn’t want to learn Korean anymore</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to enroll my child in a better program or school for future academic success</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child found it hard to get along with students of other races /cultures</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family needed to move out to other district, state, or country</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send my child to a school with his/her sibling(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send my child to a neighborhood school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to send my child to a school in a safe area</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school was not a welcoming environment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29 How would you rate your child’s dual language program in general?

☐ A+
☐ A
☐ A-
☐ B+
☐ B
☐ B-
☐ C+
☐ C
☐ C-
☐ D+
☐ D
☐ D-
☐ F

Q30 What is your gender? (Please pick one of the answers below.)

☐ Male
☐ Female

Q31 In what country were you born? (Please pick one of the answers below.)

☐ United States
☐ South Korea
☐ Mexico
☐ Another country (Please specify) ____________________
Q32 Which of the following best describe race/ethnicity of you?  (Please pick one of the answers below for you.)
- Korean
- 2+ races (Korean+other race)
- Hispanic or Latino/Latina
- African American/Black
- White
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Chinese
- Japanese
- Filipino
- Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian/Kampuchean, Thai, Burmese)
- South Asian (Asian Indian, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankan)
- Native Indian or Alaska Native

Q33 Which of the following best describe race/ethnicity of your spouse/partner?  (Please pick one of the answers below for your partner/spouse.)
- Korean
- 2+ races (Korean+other race)
- Hispanic or Latino/Latina
- African American/Black
- White
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Chinese
- Japanese
- Filipino
- Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian/Kampuchean, Thai, Burmese)
- South Asian (Asian Indian, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankan)
- Native Indian or Alaska Native
- Does not apply. I do not have a spouse or partner

Q34 Which is the highest level of education you have reached?  (Please pick one of the answers below for you.)
- Did not finish high school
- Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)
- Graduated from high school and attended a two-year school (such as a vocational or technical school, a junior college, or a community college), but did not complete a degree
- Graduated from a two-year school (such as vocational or technical school, junior college, or a community college)
- Graduated from high school and went to college, but did not complete a four-year degree
- Graduated from college
- Completed a Master’s degree or equivalent
- Completed a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced professional degree

Q35 Which is the highest level of education your spouse/partner has reached?  (Please pick one of the answers below for your spouse/partner.)
- Did not finish high school
- Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)
- Graduated from high school and attended a two-year school (such as a vocational or technical school, a junior college, or a community college), but did not complete a degree
- Graduated from a two-year school (such as vocational or technical school, junior college, or a community college)
- Graduated from high school and went to college, but did not complete a four-year degree
- Graduated from college
- Completed a Master’s degree or equivalent
- Completed a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced professional degree
- Does not apply. I do not have a spouse or partner
Q36 What was your total family income from all sources last year? (If you are not sure about the amount, please estimate.) (Please pick one of the answers below.)
- None
- $1,000 or less
- $1,001-5,000
- $5,001-10,000
- $10,001-15,000
- $15,001-20,000
- $20,001-25,000
- $25,001-35,000
- $35,001-50,000
- $50,001-75,000
- $75,001-100,000
- $100,001-200,000
- $200,001 or more

(Optional) Thank you so much for participating in the survey! If you allow me to contact you for further inquiry, please write your email address below:

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you so much for your participation. 😊
Please return this survey to your child’s teacher
APPENDIX B: INTRACLASS CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (ICC) TEST RESULTS

Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) is defined as:

\[
 ICC = \frac{\tau_{00}}{\tau_{00} + \sigma^2}
\]

where \(\sigma^2\) is the estimated residual variance. ICC can be employed to examine if a multilevel analysis is useful for exploring a certain outcome variable. If ICC is sufficiently close to zero, simple single-level modeling can be used instead of multilevel modeling.

1. For the model that examined parents’ experiences, the ICC value was 0.23, meaning that multilevel modeling can yield better outcomes than single-level analysis.

\[
 ICC = \frac{.128}{.128 + .440}
\]

mixed p_exp || school:
Performing EM optimization:
Performing gradient-based optimization:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -453.41761
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -453.41761
Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression                     Number of obs      =       440
Group variable: school                          Number of groups   =         7
Obs per group: min =        26
                       avg =      62.9
                       max =       161
Wald chi2(0)       =         .

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
p_exp |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
    _cons |   2.344418    .140867    16.64   0.000     2.068324    2.620512
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Random-effects Parameters  |   Estimate   Std. Err.     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----------------------------+------------------------------------------------
school: Identity             |
var(_cons) |   .1284746   .0748436      .0410152    .4024294
var(Residual) |   .4401254  .029916       .385229    .5028448
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
LR test vs. linear regression: chibar2(01) =    70.52 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0000

2. For the model that investigated parental participation, the ICC value was 0.04, meaning that multilevel modeling was no use.

\[
 ICC = \frac{.023}{.023 + .550}
\]
mixed participation || school:

Performing EM optimization:
Performing gradient-based optimization:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -512.57216
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -512.57216

Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression                     Number of obs      =       454
Group variable: school                          Number of groups   =         7
Obs per group: min =        26
avg =      64.9
max =       161

Log likelihood = -512.57216                     Wald chi2(0)       =         .
Probit > chi2 =  .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
participation |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
--------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
   _cons |   2.442124    .069738    35.02   0.000      2.30544    2.578808
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Random-effects Parameters  |   Estimate   Std. Err.     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----------------------------+------------------------------------------------
school: Identity             |
   var(_cons) |   .0228501   .0176079      .0050463    .1034685
-----------------------------+------------------------------------------------
   var(Residual) |   .5497164   .0367519      .4822039    .6266813
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LR test vs. linear regression: chibar2(01) = 8.81 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0015

3. For the model that explored program evaluation, the ICC value was 0.04, meaning that multilevel modeling was not informative.

\[
\text{ICC} = \frac{.162}{.162 + 3.482}
\]

mixed prgm_eval || school:

Performing EM optimization:
Performing gradient-based optimization:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -903.17902
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -903.17902

Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression                     Number of obs      =       440
Group variable: school                          Number of groups   =         7
Obs per group: min =        26
avg =      62.9
max =       161

Log likelihood = -903.17902                     Wald chi2(0)       =         .
Probit > chi2 =  .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
4. For the model that looked at the integration among parents, the ICC value was 0.09, meaning that multilevel modeling was not different from single-level modeling.

\[
\text{ICC} = \frac{.058}{.058 + .567}
\]

**mixed p_getalong || school:**

Performing EM optimization:

Performing gradient-based optimization:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -469.35119
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -469.35119

Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression

Group variable: school

Number of obs  = 408
Number of groups = 7

Obs per group: min = 23
avg = 58.3
max = 150

Log likelihood = -469.35119
Wald chi2(0) = .
Prob > chi2 = .

---

**p_getalong | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]**

| cons | 3.01094 | 0.1016796 | 29.61 0.000 | 2.811651 3.210228 |

---

Random-effects Parameters  | Estimate Std. Err. [95% Conf. Interval]

school: Identity

| var(_cons) | .1618154 | 0.14288 | .0286698 .913303 |

| var(Residual) | 3.482516 | 0.2371713 | 3.047357 3.979815 |

LR test vs. linear regression: chibar2(01) = 14.28 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0001

---
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APPENDIX C: STATA OUTPUT FOR INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

Program Evaluation by Parents

[Full Model]

```
regress prgm_eval p_eng satis_lang getalong_sch p_getalong p_exp kor participation income howlong momedlv
```

```
Source |       SS       df       MS              Number of obs =     395
-------------+------------------------------           F( 10,   384) =   15.63
Model |  395.657949    10  39.5657949           Prob > F      =  0.0000
Residual |  971.850912   384  2.53086175           R-squared     =  0.2893
-------------+------------------------------           Adj R-squared =  0.2708
Total |  1367.50886   394  3.47083467           Root MSE      =  1.5909

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
prgm_eval |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
--------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
p_eng |  -.4956283   .1177796    -4.21   0.000     -.727202   -.2640546
satis_lang |   1.340175   .1577691     8.49   0.000     1.029976    1.650375
getalong_sch |   .3092276   .1309969     2.36   0.019     .0516667    .5667886
p_getalong |   .2980246   .1285179     2.32   0.021     .0453377    .5507116
p_exp |    .214066   .1314597     1.63   0.104     -.044405     .472537
kor |   .3025349   .2278314     1.33   0.185    -.1454183     .750488
participation |   .2094167   .1593638     1.31   0.190    -.1039183    .5227517
income |  -.0427332   .0341572    -1.25   0.212    -.1098918    .0244254
howlong |  -.0647156   .0528551    -1.22   0.222    -.1686372     .039206
momedlv |  -.0260498    .062929     -0.41   0.679    -.1497784    .0976787
_cons |   4.703004   .7423511     6.34   0.000     3.243422    6.162586
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

[Refined Model]

```
regress prgm_eval p_eng satis_lang getalong_sch p_getalong p_exp
```

```
Source |       SS       df       MS              Number of obs =     397
-------------+------------------------------           F(  5,   391) =   29.83
Model |  378.924888     5  75.7849776           Prob > F      =  0.0000
Residual |  993.377379   391  2.54060711           R-squared     =  0.2761
-------------+------------------------------           Adj R-squared =  0.2669
Total |  1372.30227   396  3.46540977           Root MSE      =  1.5939

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
prgm_eval |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
--------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
p_eng |  -.5517438   .1062384    -5.19   0.000    -.7606139   -.3428737
satis_lang |   1.345304   .1572891     8.55   0.000     1.036066    1.654542
getalong_sch |   .3185805   .1289141     2.47   0.014     .0651291    .572032
p_getalong |   .3088891   .1271776     2.43   0.016     .0588516    .5589266
p_exp |    .241826   .1120379     2.16   0.032     .0215538    .4620981
_cons |   4.792698   .7423511     6.49   0.000     3.243422    6.162586
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Parents Get along with Other Parents

[Full Model]

```
logit p_along p_eng getalong_sch prgm_eval kor p_exp income satis_lang participation momedlv howlong
```

```
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -214.39429
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -168.10216
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -163.20219
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -163.07072
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -163.07069
Iteration 5:   log likelihood = -163.07069
Logistic regression                               Number of obs   =        395
LR chi2(10) = 102.65
```
Parents’ Experiences with Other Parents

[Full Model]
mixed p_exp participation howlong prgm_eval income momedlv getalong_sch kor p_getalong p_eng satis_lang || school:,mle
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Performing EM optimization:

Performing gradient-based optimization:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood =  -358.16625
Iteration 1:  log likelihood =  -358.16625

Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression Number of obs =       395
Group variable: school Number of groups =         7
Obs per group: min =        19
group =      56.4
max =       146

Log likelihood =  -358.16625
Wald chi2(10) =     115.48
Prob > chi2 =    0.0000

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
     p_exp |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
--------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
  participation |   .4898015    .054258     9.03   0.000     .3834579    .5961452
 howlong |   .0408985   .0200401     2.04   0.041     .0016206    .0801764
 prgm_eval |   .0334458   .0190634     1.75   0.079    -.0039178    .0708094
 income |   .0229041   .0133113     1.72   0.085    -.0031857    .0489939
 momadlv |   .0340318   .0235692     1.44   0.149    -.0121631    .0802266
 getalong_sch |  -.0638915   .0493822    -1.29   0.196    -.1606789    .0328958
kor |   .0631248   .0880464     0.72   0.473     -.109443    .2356926
 p_getalong |   .0296388   .0489998     0.60   0.545    -.066399    .1256666
 p_eng |   .0157325    .045435     0.35   0.729    -.0733184    .1047834
 satis_lang |  -.0015466   .0641931    -0.02   0.981    -.1273628    .1242696
 _cons |   .3140377   .3225552     0.97   0.330     -.318159    .9462343
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Random-effects Parameters  |   Estimate   Std. Err.     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----------------------------+------------------------------------------------
school: Identity |   var(_cons) |   .0334928   .0266195   .0070539    .1590274
                       var(Residual) |   .3484712   .0250998   .3025912    .4013077
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
LR test vs. linear regression: chibar2(01) =   9.99 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0008

[Refined Model]
mixed p_exp participation income || school:, mle
Performing EM optimization:
Performing gradient-based optimization:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood =  -401.07358
Iteration 1:  log likelihood =  -401.07358

Computing standard errors:

Mixed-effects ML regression Number of obs =       439
Group variable: school Number of groups =         7
Obs per group: min =        26
group =      62.7
max =       161

Log likelihood =  -401.07358
Wald chi2(2) =     116.04
Prob > chi2 =    0.0000
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## [Parents' Participation in School]

### [Full Model]

Bivariate regression of participat~n on p_exp, kor, p_eng, income, getalong_sch, prgm_eval, p_getalong, howlong, momedlv, satis_lang.

**Source | SS df MS**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Model | 54.5027473 10 5.45027473 | Prob > F = 0.0000
Residual | 99.2065343 384 .25835035 | R-squared = 0.3546
Total | 153.709282 394 .39012508 | Root MSE = .50828

**participat~n | Coef. Std. Err. t P>|t| [95% Conf. Interval]**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
p_exp | .4919482 .0466272 10.55 0.000 .4005605 .5833359
kor | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
p_eng | .8803 .1931562 4.56 0.000 .5017207 1.258879
income | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
getalong_sch | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
prgm_eval | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
p_getalong | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
howlong | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
momedlv | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
satis_lang | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
cons | .0201954 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341

### [Refined Model]

Bivariate regression of participat~n on p_exp, kor, p_eng, getalong_sch, prgm_eval.

**Source | SS df MS**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Model | 60.0126718 5 12.0025344 | Prob > F = 0.0000
Residual | 110.849208 427 .259600019 | R-squared = 0.3512
Total | 170.86188 432 .395513611 | Root MSE = .50951

**participat~n | Coef. Std. Err. t P>|t| [95% Conf. Interval]**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
p_exp | .3687687 .0377114 9.78 0.000 .294622 .4429155
kor | -3.321894 .0710347 -4.59 0.000 -.4658551 -.1865237
p_eng | .0835778 .0382514 2.18 0.029 .0083694 .1587862
income | .0193431 .0108908 1.78 0.077 -.0020699 .0407562
getalong_sch | .0716963 .041997 1.71 0.089 -.0108765 .154269
prgm_eval | .0213773 .0120098 1.68 0.093 -.0033433 .0437341
p_getalong | .0243857 .0413292 0.59 0.556 -.0568742 .1056455
howlong | -.0096192 .016913 -0.57 0.570 -.0428729 .0236344
momedlv | .0054753 .0549387 0.10 0.921 -.102543 .1134936
satis_lang | 1.024369 .243725 4.20 0.000 .5451663 1.503572

**LR test vs. linear regression:** chibar2(01) = 31.01 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0000
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APPENDIX D: EXAMINATION OF MULTICOLLINEARITY

Multicollinearity refers to a statistical phenomenon in which predictors in a model are highly correlated with each other. If there is a multicollinearity issues in a given model, it is difficult to measure statistically appropriate estimates of individual predictor variables; hence, it will yield improper conclusions and estimates between an outcome variable of interest and independent variables. Given this importance, it is necessary to detect if a model has a multicollinearity issue before conducting analyses. Multicollinearity can be detected by looking at VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) values, which indicate how much variance of an estimated regression coefficient is inflated due to the multicollinearity issue. In general, the rule of thumb used is that if VIP values exceed 5 or 10, it implies that the estimated regression has the issue of multicollinearity and measured estimates are assessed inappropriately (Montgomery et al., 2001). In this study, detection of multicollinearity was performed for refined models for the four regression models, and all VIF values did not exceed 1.5, meaning that there was no issue of multicollinearity.

Collinearity Diagnostics for the ‘Program Evaluation by Parents’ Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p_eng</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.8225</td>
<td>0.1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satis_lang</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.8371</td>
<td>0.1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getalong_sch</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.6890</td>
<td>0.3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_getalong</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.6518</td>
<td>0.3482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_exp</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.9622</td>
<td>0.0378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean VIF 1.29

Collinearity Diagnostics for the ‘Parents Get along with Other Parents Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p_eng</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.8278</td>
<td>0.1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getalong_sch</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.8970</td>
<td>0.1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.8233</td>
<td>0.1767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean VIF 1.18

Collinearity Diagnostics for the ‘Parents’ Experiences with Other Parents’ Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.8883</td>
<td>0.1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.8550</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.8634</td>
<td>0.1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momedlv</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.8899</td>
<td>0.1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean VIF 1.18
Mean VIF 1.14

Collinearity Diagnostics for the ‘Parents’ Participation in School’ Model

collin p_exp kor p_eng getalong_sch prgm_eval
(obs=433)

Collinearity Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>SQRT</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p_exp</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.9586</td>
<td>0.0414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kor</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.8144</td>
<td>0.1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_eng</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.7872</td>
<td>0.2128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getalong_sch</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.8255</td>
<td>0.1745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prgm_eval</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.9025</td>
<td>0.0975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean VIF 1.17
APPENDIX E: STATA OUTPUT FOR FACTOR ANALYSIS

Principal complement analysis result for the satisfaction with language development variable:

```
factor satis_eng_understand satis_eng_speak satis_eng_read satis_eng_write satis_kor_understand satis_kor_speak satis_kor_read satis_kor_write, pcf
(obs=430)
```

```
Factor analysis/correlation                        Number of obs    =      430
Method: principal-component factors            Retained factors =        2
Rotation: (unrotated)                          Number of params =       15

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Factor     Eigenvalue   Difference        Proportion   Cumulative
-------------+------------------------------------------------------------
Factor1        4.48932      2.16815            0.5612       0.5612
Factor2        2.32117      1.87394            0.2901       0.8513
Factor3        0.44723      0.12686            0.0559       0.9072
Factor4        0.32037      0.12686            0.0400       0.9473
Factor5        0.13816      0.02711            0.0173       0.9645
Factor6        0.11105      0.01313            0.0139       0.9784
Factor7        0.09792      0.00934            0.0122       0.9907
Factor8        0.07479            .            0.0093       1.0000
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(28) = 3707.55 Prob>chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
Factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances
-------------------------------------------------
Variable   Factor1   Factor2    Uniqueness
-------------+--------------------+--------------
satis_eng~nd    0.7669   -0.5278       0.1333
satis_eng~k    0.7332   -0.5652       0.1430
satis_eng~ad    0.7635   -0.5211       0.1455
satis_eng~e    0.7623   -0.5072       0.1617
satis_kor~nd    0.7246    0.5740       0.1454
satis_kor~k    0.6858    0.6113       0.1560
satis_kor~ad    0.7732    0.5122       0.1398
satis_kor~e    0.7788    0.4783       0.1648
-------------------------------------------------
alpha satis_eng_understand satis_eng_speak satis_eng_read satis_eng_write satis_kor_understand
satis_kor_speak satis_kor_read satis_kor_write
Test scale = mean(unstandardized items)
Average interitem covariance:     .2692204
Number of items in the scale:            8
Scale reliability coefficient:      0.8877
```

Principal complement analysis result for the get along well among children variable:

```
factor getalong_insch getalong_outsch, pcf
(obs=429)
```

```
Factor analysis/correlation                        Number of obs    =      429
Method: principal-component factors            Retained factors =        1
Rotation: (unrotated)                          Number of params =        1

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Factor  |   Eigenvalue   Difference        Proportion   Cumulative
-------------+------------------------------------------------------------
Factor1  |      1.82969      1.65939            0.9148       0.9148
Factor2  |      0.17031            .            0.0852       1.0000
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
LR test: independent vs. saturated:  chi2(1)  =  498.47 Prob>chi2 = 0.0000
```
Factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>getalong_i~h</td>
<td>0.9565</td>
<td>0.0852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getalong_o~h</td>
<td>0.9565</td>
<td>0.0852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average interitem covariance: .5116768
Number of items in the scale: 2
Scale reliability coefficient: 0.9062

Factor analysis result for parents’ experiences with other parents construct:

```plaintext
sem (Interaction -> otherp_giveinfo otherp_spvschild spokewotherp p_favor), stand
(14 observations with missing values excluded)

Endogenous variables
Measurement: otherp_giveinfo otherp_spvschild spokewotherp p_favor
Exogenous variables
Latent: Interaction

Fitting target model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2142.7559
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -2142.6866
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2142.6866

Structural equation model Number of obs = 440
Estimation method = ml
Log likelihood = -2142.6866

( 1) [otherp_giveinfo]Interaction = 1

| OIM |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Standardized | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------|-------|-----------|---|-------|-------------------------------|
| Measurement |       |           |   |       |                              |
| otherp_giveinfo <- |       |           |   |       |                              |
| Interaction | .7382711 | .0295939 | 24.95 | 0.000 | .680268 .7962741 |
| _cons | 2.4279 | .047167 | 25.63 | 0.000 | 2.242259 2.613542 |
| otherp_spvschild <- |       |           |   |       |                              |
| Interaction | .5798539 | .0366132 | 15.84 | 0.000 | .5080934 .6516144 |
| _cons | 2.111904 | .08568 | 24.65 | 0.000 | 1.943975 2.279834 |
| spokewotherp <- |       |           |   |       |                              |
| Interaction | .5253584 | .0397632 | 13.20 | 0.000 | .447359 .6033578 |
| _cons | 3.021128 | .1124481 | 26.87 | 0.000 | 2.800734 3.241523 |
| p_favor <- |       |           |   |       |                              |
| Interaction | .8921636 | .0260369 | 34.27 | 0.000 | .8411322 .943195 |
| _cons | 2.430349 | .0893872 | 25.09 | 0.000 | 2.067853 2.8148245 |
| var(e.otherp_giveinfo) | .4549559 | .0436967 | 10.3768901 | .549195 |
| var(e.otherp_spvschild) | .6637695 | .0424606 | 15.585539 | .7524327 |
| var(e.spokewotherp) | .7239985 | .0418147 | 17.6465117 | .8107725 |
| var(e.p_favor) | .2040442 | .0464584 | 4.3105918 | .3188103 |
| var(Interaction) | 1 | . | . | . |

LR test of model vs. saturated: chi2(2) = 2.91, Prob > chi2 = 0.2338

alpha otherp_giveinfo otherp_spvschild spokewotherp p_favor

Test scale = mean(unstandardized items)
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Average interitem covariance: 0.4206073
Number of items in the scale: 4
Scale reliability coefficient: 0.7675

Factor analysis result for parents’ participation in school construct:

sem (Participation -> spokewprin_cordi orgnzedevent spokewtchr schevent_pta vol_chaper infavor_dualconf), stand
(14 observations with missing values excluded)

Endogenous variables
Measurement: spokewprin_cordi orgnzedevent spokewtchr schevent_pta vol_chaper infavor_dualconf

Exogenous variables
Latent: Participation

Fitting target model:

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -2926.605
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -2924.0013
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -2923.9442
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -2923.9442

Structural equation model
Number of obs = 440
Estimation method = ml
Log likelihood = -2923.9442
( 1)  [spokewprin_cordi]Participation = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spokewprin_cordi &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgnzedevent &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spokewtchr &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schevent_pta &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol_chaper &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infavor_dualconf &lt;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.spokewprin_cordi)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5884918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.orgnzedevent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6252192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.spokewtchr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5625355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.schevent_pta)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5230113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.vol_chaper)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.570166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(e.infavor_dualconf)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4433947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(Participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LR test of model vs. saturated: chi2(9) = 202.56, Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

alpha  spokewprin_cordi orgnzedevent spokewtchr schevent_pta vol_chaper infavor_dualconf
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Test scale = mean(unstandardized items)

Average interitem covariance:  .3626624
Number of items in the scale:  6
Scale reliability coefficient:  0.8237
APPENDIX F: PILOT STUDY RESULTS

This dissertation study stemmed from a pilot study that I conducted at UCLA Community between October, 2011 and May, 2012 for a year-long course project. In this study, I investigated parents of children in a Korean-English dual language program through classroom and school observations as well as semi-structured interviews to understand parents’ reasons for choosing the program, their expectations of the program, and challenges and concerns that parents recognized in the program. For interviews, six Korean-dominant parents and six English-dominant parents participated. I summarize the key findings of the study below.

With respect to reasons for choosing the school, parents pointed out the following reasons: (1) dual language instruction of the school, (2) communication with school personnel in their native language, (3) school location (neighborhood school), and (4) school’s partnership with UCLA. As for expectation, both Korean-dominant and English-dominant parents expected their child in the Korean dual language program to develop two or more language proficiencies, to improve multicultural competences, to reinforce ethnic identity, and to develop diverse network with various racial groups. Additionally, parents also expected their child’s better academic outcomes and more job opportunities in the future. Korean parents, in particular, highlighted the importance of developing identity in the program. Non-Korean parents stressed the exposure to Academic culture.

As for concerns over the program, both Korean-dominant parents and English-dominant parents raised questions regarding (1) program efficacy for language development, (2) the amount of Korean-language instruction, (3) the quality of program and curriculum, and (4) multi-age classroom structure. First, in spite of parents’ positive expectations for learning two languages, parents also addressed their concerns over how efficient the program could be for
developing two or more languages. Second, some parents commented on the insufficient amount of Korean-based instruction. According to the school, the program was run on a 50/50-model basis in which Korean and English were equally balanced. However, parents stated the program looked like a 30/70 model: 30% for Korean and 70% for English. Third, some parents pointed out a multi-age setting of the classroom, which was a unique feature of this school.

Besides, Korean parents addressed concerns over (1) racial composition in the program, (2) teachers’ Korean proficiency, and (3) tensions between Korean and non-Korean parents. Even though the Korean program had a more diverse student body in comparison to the Spanish program of the same school, Korean parents cautiously commented on the lack of White students and their child’s exposure to a considerable number of students of color. Additionally, teacher’s limited Korean proficiency was mentioned by some parents. Finally, some Korean parents commented on subtle tensions between Korean and non-Korean parents. Several reasons that may cause this conflict can be considered, such as lack of interactions between the two groups and limited English proficiency to communicate with each other. In contrast to Korean parents, English-dominant parents noted their own concerns which differed from Korean parents’ opinions. Their primary concern was the lack of knowledge about the Korean language. For example, non-Korean parents were not capable of checking their child’s progress in Korean and had difficulty with offering supplementary materials for their child.