

Introduction

English language learners (ELLs) with disabilities, especially Hmong, Latinos, and Somalis, exhibit the lowest academic performance and participation rates on statewide tests of academic achievement required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (Albus, Barrera, Thurlow, Guven, & Shyyan, 2004; Liu, Barrera, Thurlow, Guven & Shyyan, 2005). These challenges are even more acute for learners with disabilities among these groups (cf. Albus et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2004) and likely reflect the combined effect of limited proficiency in English and the specific disability-related characteristics with which these students may be identified (cf. Barrera, 2003; Garcia & Malkin, 1993; Ortiz, 1997).

Unfortunately, ways to address the needs of English-challenged learners with disabilities have received limited attention in educational research despite recent growth in interest in this topic (cf. Coutinho & Oswald, 2004; Gersten & Woodward, 1994). A particular limitation in this area is the dearth of work examining the involvement of immigrant and language minority parents in the education of their children with disabilities (cf. Vang & Barrera, 2004).

The increased emphasis on promoting improved standards-based academic achievement among historically under-performing students, as indicated by state accountability systems, raises the stakes for schools and learners. Educators must seek ever more effective alliances with parents to reinforce and enhance school-based learning if learners with disabilities, especially those challenged to learn in English as a new or second language, are to demonstrate improved learning through the instruction they receive in schools.

Parents of English language learners have been found to believe strongly in the involvement of their children with disabilities in standards-based assessments alongside their native-English speaking peers (Quest, Liu, & Thurlow, 1997). Parents have reported that they believe these assessments will provide incentive for students to work hard. At the same time, these parents have stressed that the quality of instruction provided their children should be improved if their assessment results are to reflect their growth accurately and for their participation in these assessments to be meaningful (Quest, et al., 1997).

Despite the identified benefits of parental involvement in improving academic achievement among immigrant and language minority students (Mueller, Gozali-Lee & Sherman, 1996), this area of research appears to be at the very beginning stages and virtually non-existent regarding ELLs with disabilities. For example, a recent review of educational literature on Hmong parents' involvement (Vang & Barrera, 2004) yielded nine articles relating to Asian or Hmong parent involvement. Existing papers included general reports and project materials on parent involvement (California State Department of Education, 1986; Morrow, 1991; Pecoraro & Phommasouvanh, 1991), understanding Asian groups (Huang, 1993), and academic performance and

classroom behaviors of Hmong students (Abramson & Lindberg, 1982; Mueller et al., 1996). Three papers addressed issues relating to Hmong parents and their children with disabilities: a paper on the educational attitudes and beliefs of Hmong parents of children who are deaf or hard of hearing (Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002); a question and answer guide in English and Hmong about parents and students' educational rights (Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights [PACER], 1985); and a paper on the implications of Hmong perceptions of disability for vocational rehabilitation (Tatman, 2001).

Work on Latino parent involvement is usually included within discussions on involvement of “urban” and “culturally diverse” parents. For example, Sharpe (1997) examined the problem of misrepresentation and over-representation of African American, American Indian, and Latino students in special education where parent participants expressed strong support for promoting parent involvement. Lewis (1992) examined issues related to urban youth as parents. Others have examined communication issues with culturally diverse parents (Smith-Davis, 2003); parent perceptions of school involvement (Lynch, 1991); staff development and parent involvement activities (Rivera, 1990); and parent training for greater involvement (Tobias & Spiridakis, 1982).

Even less attention has been given to Somali parents and students. Of the eight papers found related to Somali learners, most addressed ways to acculturate immigrant parents and students into western culture. Issues raised included the relationships among literacy, school, and community cultures (Masny, 1999); ways to merge refugee children into mainstream school (Crabb, 1996); educational experience and expectations of recent immigrants (Schwartz, 1996); lessons to stimulate positive attitude toward teaching procedures (Merryfield, 1987); problems in implementing curriculum (Mohamed, 1983); appropriate teaching methodology (Webber & Deyes, 1986); educational attainment of immigrants (Schwartz, 1996); and improving curriculum and instruction (Merryfield, 1988). Most of this work seems to have taken place outside of the United States, indicating a limited research base about Somali students inside the United States.

In other terms, research and scholarship on the involvement of parents in the education of their immigrant and language minority children with disabilities has been limited in number and erratic in its scope. Moreover, it is important to note that much of this work seems to be speaking “about” immigrant and language minority parents and their children rather than considering these parents' views on the nature of their children's education. Many of the prescriptions for action seem to assume that Hmong, Latino, and Somali parents of children with disabilities are knowledgeable about the mainstream culture, can read in both languages, and are uninterested in what takes place in their children's classrooms. Yet, much of special education law and practice requires that parents be intimately involved in the planning and determination of their children's education (IDEA 04, Section 614—Evaluation, Eligibility, and Individual Education Programs). Research is needed to examine how parents may become directly involved in determining stan-

dards-based educational progress of their children. This issue is especially acute for parents of immigrant and language minority children with disabilities, particularly those challenged in using English during instruction.

The research project described in this report examines how parents were engaged to review and comment on the reading instruction of teachers working with English language learners identified with disabilities. Two related research questions were addressed:

1. What is an effective way to involve parents in school and classroom-based instructional issues?
2. What instructionally relevant information can Latino, Hmong, and Somali parents of English language learners with disabilities provide about standards-based instructional strategies in the classroom?

The methodology presented in this paper serves the dual purposes of explaining our procedures and exemplifying how our procedures can be used to involve parents in examining classroom activity and informing instructional practice. Results and discussion are presented together.

Method

Six Hmong, five Hispanic, and four Somali parents were interviewed during the summer of 2003 about their perceptions of classroom-based reading instruction, first for a hypothetical learner and then for their own child. The process of recruitment and data collection included an initial participant orientation, use of instructional scenarios, and bilingual interviewers in a semi-structured interview format.

Participants

Hmong participants. Six Hmong female participants were interviewed using a semi-structured interview. Two Hmong participants could speak English fluently and seemed knowledgeable about mainstream culture. These two were the youngest of the six Hmong participants, in their late 20s or early 30s, and both held full-time jobs. One of them does advocacy work for Hmong parents with children with disabilities. The other four participants were between their late 30s and 50s. Five of the six Hmong parents had spouses. Five of the six Hmong participants were interviewed in their homes and one interview was held in a Hmong community center. In addition, four Hmong participants had no formal educational training.

Latino participants. Five Latino female participants participated, two with their male spouses present.

Somali participants. Four female Somali parents participated. Three of the four Somali participants were interviewed in their homes with the exception of one participant who was interviewed out of the home.

Procedure

The parents were recruited by a disability advocacy organization that specializes in assisting parents with educational equity issues. First, the staff at the advocacy organization made the initial contact to inform them of the research study and inquire about their possible interest in participating in the study. Second, the research team and staff from the advocacy organization held informal dinner meetings to meet the parents by language group to familiarize them with the research team and provide an opportunity to ask questions about the study. Parents were given incentives (a gift certificate from a retail store) to attend the dinner meeting and asked at that time whether they would like to participate in an interview at a place of their own choosing. Parents who were not able to attend the introductory meetings were contacted to set individual meetings in their home or other chosen location to introduce them to the study and interviews.

If the parents consented to participate, bilingual interviewers set face-to-face interviews over a 6-week period in the summer. Interviews typically lasted about 45 minutes to an hour and were tape recorded with participant permission. If the parents were uncomfortable with tape recording, the interviewers took field notes. Most of the interviews were later translated and transcribed into English.

Two Hmong bilingual interpreters conducted four of the parent interviews jointly and each interpreter conducted one interview alone for a total of six interviews. All of the Hmong interviews were tape recorded except for one that was hand written. One of the bilingual interpreters transcribed the tapes.

One bilingual interviewer conducted all the Latino and Somali parent interviews individually: one Somali interviewer for the four Somali parent interviews and two Spanish-speaking Latino interviewers conducted three and two interviews respectively. The interviewers transcribed the tapes from these interviews.

Instruments

A semi-structured interview protocol was developed in English and translated into Hmong, Spanish, and Somali (See Appendix A for English version and Appendix B for Hmong version). With the consultation of a cultural advisory panel organized for the project, the research team developed an interview protocol and process using instructional data previously collected during a study with classroom teachers (Thurlow, Albus, Shyyan, Liu & Barrera, 2004). The

protocol and process consisted of three parts: (1) introducing the study and the people involved, (2) gathering background information about the parents and their children with disabilities, and (3) asking parents to respond to scenarios about reading activities conducted by teachers in a classroom.

Members of the cultural advisory panel reviewed the English version of the interview protocol and changes were made based on their feedback. The protocol was then translated into Hmong, Spanish, and Somali. The recruitment and use of Hmong, Latino, and Somali bilingual interviewers (staff, professional educators, teacher education students, paraprofessionals and community liaisons) was considered a critical component of the research process. It was believed that members of the parents' language communities who were familiar with the schools could most appropriately explain educational issues that might emerge during the interviews. This approach served to make parents feel more comfortable during the interviews and maximize their responses.

To keep the tone of the interviews conversational in nature, an interviewer guide on the protocols was developed (Appendix C). The intent of the interviewer guide was to aid interviewers in understanding the critical information needed from the interview protocol. With this guide, interviewers could then have the freedom to structure the conversation with individual parents in any way that felt comfortable so long as the required information was obtained. The interviewer guide was available in both English and the native language of the interviewer.

Interview Protocol

The first part of the interview was designed to elicit basic information about the family and the student's strengths and weaknesses at home and school, as well as the child's role in the family. The research team and cultural advisory panel thought that it was important to ask parents to talk about the whole child because the parent might not be the person most familiar with the details of what happened for that child in an academic setting. It was considered important to emphasize the positive qualities of the child with a disability at the beginning of the interview to avoid parents feeling that the negatives were most frequently discussed in relation to their child.

The second and third parts of the interview were designed to elicit parent feedback on specific reading strategies that teachers of ELLs with disabilities had said that they frequently used with these students to teach standards-based language arts (Thurlow et al., 2004). The interview protocols were written at a middle school grade reading level and parent questions about reading strategies were based on scenarios of a teacher interacting with a middle school English language learner with a learning-related disability in a reading/language arts classroom. Descriptions of teacher activities during the teaching of reading were written in every day language avoiding

educational jargon. The content of the reading used to describe teacher activities included culturally based literature to maximize parent comprehension of the material used during instruction. This approach was considered important to aid parents in comprehending what would occur pedagogically in a classroom but using content that was considered more experientially comprehensible to the parent.

The instructional scenario consisted of teachers using a folk tale commonly found in Hmong culture and that roughly correlated to similar stories found among Latino and Somali communities and described the activities the teacher might employ with that story. The story chosen was *How the Rooster Got his Crown* by Amy Lowry Poole (1999) and was translated into Hmong, Spanish, and Somali. It was believed that parents of any language background could relate to the vivid details of the story even if they were not able to read the story themselves.

The bilingual interviewers presented the story in both English and the parent's native language. Parents were asked first to respond to the strategies used by the teacher with an imaginary Hmong, Spanish-speaking, or Somali child identified with a particular disability, first to teach the child in English and then for teaching the child in one of the three native languages. Next, parents were asked to provide feedback about how the same activities might work with their own child.

Each scenario included a series of described activities (strategies) used by the teacher in English and in the learner's native language. Activities included five items used before reading, during reading, and after reading and were derived from the topmost strategies named by teachers in a previous study (Thurlow et al., 2004). Parents were then asked a series of four questions related to the scenario:

1. What do you think about the teacher using [English or native language] to teach the child how to read?
2. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for someone like [name of student]? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
3. Please look at the activities during reading. How well do you think they work for someone like [name of student]? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for someone like [name of student]? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?

Finally, the parents were asked to respond to these questions in relation to their own child.

Coding Process

The process of coding the parent data was dynamic. A graduate assistant recruited to work on this project completed the initial coding of the parent interviews. The graduate assistant served as an independent observer of the collected data. The coding included headings and subheadings of the transcribed interviews organized by question and sub-questions within the interview protocol. After initial coding, the output of the coded interview data was given to one of the original bilingual interviewers who is also a group member working on the project. She double-checked the headings and subheadings by removing the headings and subheadings created by the independent graduate assistant and creating her own headings and subheadings. After this process, both individuals discussed and resolved any disagreements for each of the sections. There were 18 differences in headings and subheadings that were resolved.

Once this initial coding was complete, the coded data were forwarded to other team members and the lead investigators to correct errors, suggest additional coding levels and inadvertent revelation of participant names and other personally identifying information. Changes were made and the coded data forwarded to one of the lead investigators of the project for additional comment and review. The reviewed content was then returned for a data analyst to complete further changes and assure consistency and accuracy.

Process of Parent Involvement

The goal of this research study was to explore effective ways in which educators could involve parents of ELLs with disabilities in the educational process and thereby gain parents' perceptions about specific structured instructional strategies in the classroom. At the initial stage, the ELL parents were introduced to the study in a large language group dinner meeting to determine which parents were truly interested in participating. Thus, initially much time and effort was devoted toward creating a comfortable environment for the parents to express and share their perceptions about the education of their children with disabilities because it was believed that issues relating to ELLs with disabilities are sensitive issues and would be more openly expressed when parents felt comfortable.

The use of instructional scenarios and the culturally-based approach described in our methods appear to provide a model in which the lack of a connection between educators and linguistically diverse parents might be bridged. It is important to recognize that solutions for dealing with complex educational problems often may not come in a neat packet with a one step solution for all. When various constituents, such as parents, students, and teachers, with their multiple perspectives, are expected to be involved in solving educational problems, solutions to collaboration can sometimes be revealed through the process used in conducting the research. We believe that the procedures used in conducting the present study revealed one possible way in

which educators can access linguistically diverse parents and their perceptions on the education of their children.

Results

The interviews proved a rich source of information from parents on both their perceptions of instruction provided to children similar to theirs and of their knowledge about their children, their disabilities, and their relationships with schools and teachers. The information provided below gives details on both these areas. First family background information is presented. Next, reported parent knowledge of their child and relationship with schools is reported. Finally, we report on parents' perceptions of instruction as described in their responses to the instructional scenarios.

Family Background Information

The number of family members for all of the 15 immigrant families ranged from 3 to 12; however, 10 out of 14 (71%) reported having 5 or more members in the family. Regarding language usage in the home, 6 out of 11 (54%) reported that their native language was the primary language used by family members, while 5 out of the 11 (45%) reported that family members used both the native language and English. Regarding length of time in Minnesota, 8 out of 11 (73%) reported that they have lived in Minnesota for at least five years or more.

This family background information indicates that the majority of the families are large and more than half still speak their native language in the home as their primary language.

Examination across the three language groups revealed that Hmong families had the largest family groups as well as having lived in Minnesota for the longest time. For example, the Hmong families ranged from 7 to 9 members while the range for Latinos was 4 to 5. Similarly, Hmong families' length of time in the United States was 14 to 20 years while the Somali families' was 3 to 10 years and Latino families ranged from 5 to 12 years.

Parent Knowledge about the Child and Disability

Parents of eight male and seven female children with various categories of disability participated in this study. Parents described the disabilities of their children using a variety of terms, including: spina bifida, other physical disabilities, multiple disabilities (n=2); cognitively slow, slow learner, cannot focus/impatient, speech impairment (n=2); brain damage/physical disabilities, hearing impairment, and temperamental. The disability types among males and females

in this sample were similar and no disability type seemed to predominate in one group or the other. Children's favorite activities were described as watching television, doing homework, drawing and coloring, singing, listening to music, fishing, walking, playing on the computer, playing games, and playing with toys. On the other hand, the parents reported child dislikes as being bothered, being alone, being pressured, and going to bed early. Further, regarding their children's favorite activities at home, the parents stated that the children liked playing and associating with people.

The range of favorite activities seemed to involve those that the children could perform alone instead of activities that would involve interactions with others. These choices of activities seem to parallel their stated dislikes—to be bothered and/or pressured. However, it is important to note that responses to child's dislikes were minimal; 9 respondents provided no answer. This lack of response may have been the result of parents forgetting to respond to a multi-theme question or lack of knowledge about their children's dislikes.

Responses regarding manifestations of the child's disabilities at home included needing help with self-care (6 of 12 responses), needing help with safety (3 of 12 responses), and needing help with "temper problems" (2 of 12).

Finally, the majority of the parents did not seem to know the exact causes of their children's disabilities. A large portion (55%) listed their own guesses as to why their children have disabilities. Responses included that the cord broke in brain, eating too many chemicals in their food, unbalanced body parts, brain damage, hardship of war, and genetics. These responses seemed to reflect culturally-based explanations. For example, one parent from the Hmong culture believed that the cause of her child's disabilities was due to the chemicals that they eat in American foods. This explanation belies a belief among many Hmong people that the food eaten in the U.S. contains chemicals that they believe lead to illness including cancer. The Hmong people came from the mountains of Laos where they have little or no exposure to modern chemicals used for farming or preserving foods. Thus, Hmong people believe that they did not develop such illness until they began to live in the U.S. where using chemicals in farming and preserving foods is common.

Parent Knowledge about the Child's School and School Activities

The grade levels of children ranged from first grade to high school. However, 8 of the 12 parents reporting in this category (67%) indicated that their child was in elementary school, three had a child with a disability in middle school, and one had a child in high school. (Numbers reported in this section do not always sum to a total 15 because of variation in the frequency of responses across interviews. This problem is acknowledged and reflects time constraints on interviewers and the sporadic nature of the conversations held with the parent respondents.)

Parents reported a mixture of educational settings from mainstream general education classrooms to English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms and special education classrooms. Five out of eight responses indicated a mix of mainstream and special education settings, three out of the eight responses indicated special education and ESL classes. Forty percent of parents stated that their children had a positive school experience and 47% reported that their child had a negative experience or academic difficulty. It should be noted that these parent participants come from cultures that greatly respect the teacher's expertise and are less likely to express negative opinions about instruction. This high degree of negative response could be interpreted as a sign of extreme desperation to gain help given that many parents feel they are not in a position to criticize the expertise of the teachers or the schools.

Parents were asked about the frequency and nature of their interactions with educators in the child's school. Five of the 11 responding (45%) indicated they visited the school more than once a month with the remainder indicating less than once a month. The child's primary teacher was reported as the main contact for parents. Five of 11 (45%) reported that they have sought or are presently seeking help from an outside agency regarding their children's needs while 4 out of the 11 (36%) reported they have not or do not know how to seek outside help. Hmong parents seemed to avail themselves of outside agency support the most. Five of the 6 Hmong parents reported more comprehensive use of various agencies whereas Latino parents were most likely to seek services in at most one area such as medical, legal, or welfare services. Somali parents were more likely to respond that they did not know where to go to seek services.

Parents' Long Term Goals for Their Children

Parents were asked to identify goals and wishes for their child. Three themes from the responses were to be independent ("self-sufficient"), to complete school and graduate, and to get a job. In general, Hispanic parents reported wanting their children to be self-sufficient while the Hmong and Somali parents tended to report wanting their children to complete their education.

Instructional Scenarios

The primary focus of this study was to gauge parent perceptions of the instructional strategies identified by teachers as effective in teaching English language learners with disabilities to meet standards-based educational outcomes. Parents were presented with the same instructional scenario for teaching reading in a classroom in three variations (see the section on "Interview Protocol" described previously). The first two variations were teaching reading using teacher-identified strategies in English or in the child's native language. The third variation was asking the parent to determine the effectiveness in using the identified strategies when used with their own child.

Instructional Scenario I—Using English to Teach the Child How to Read

The first instructional scenario established the pattern of questions to elicit responses from parents. The same scenario of a teacher using reading strategies to help an English language learner with a disability comprehend a story was presented and then parents were asked to respond to four questions related to: (a) the language of instruction and (b) questions soliciting comment on strategies used before, during, and after reading. Findings on each of these questions are discussed below, first by language of instruction (English, then native language) and regarding how parents would respond when the questions were about the use of strategies with their own child.

Question 1: What do you think about the teacher using English to teach the child how to read?

Nine out of twelve parents (75%) who responded to this question agreed that the teacher should use English to teach a hypothetical English language learner with learning difficulties to read. The primary reason given was that English is the primary language used in school. Some parents (n=2) expressed a wish for more use of interpreters in the schools both to help parents and their children in communication of needs and expectations.

Question 2: How well do you think the before-reading strategies work for the hypothetical student? What else should the teacher do?

All 12 parents who responded to this question were positive about the use of before-reading strategies to teach the child how to read. Parents provided some detailed reasons including how the pre-reading activities would help students know what they are to learn; the “*child gets to review*” and the teacher can make a “*connection/communication to determine [the] child’s ability.*” Parents reported that they thought the strategies would “*ensure understanding of [the] story and learn new words.*” Finally, several parents provided additional suggestions including that teachers should provide a “purpose/objective of the learning and why,” let the student read alone, consider the needs of the individual students, provide spelling tests of words in the story, accommodate for limited English, and provide students with a choice of books to read. Some parents raised concerns about the need for teachers to provide direct reading experiences, such as teachers reading aloud and having students actually read, rather than conduct “about reading” experiences.

Question 3: Will the during-reading strategies work?

Eleven out of 13 parents (85%) responding to this question stated that the during-reading activities would help the child with reading. However, many parents added additional suggestions to the strategies described. For example, parents commented that teaching must also occur at home, students should be allowed to work independently in addition to supported reading and that first language support, in addition to English, should also be provided (Somali parents were

particularly concerned about this point). Two parents commented that these strategies would not work because the child might be at too low a level and that it would not be good for the teacher to interrupt the child during reading. These responses seemed to reveal particular parent awareness and projection of specific disability needs of their own children that teachers might be less likely to notice.

Question 4: Will the after-reading activities work?

Twelve of 13 respondents (92%) supported this approach (one stated that “it depends”). Reasons included that teachers would know more about the child, that they would aid in assessing student comprehension, demonstrate the child’s skills on the material, and develop student confidence. One parent added that it would help if the reading was also translated into the native language. One parent raised the additional suggestion that students should be provided with opportunities to develop vocabulary.

Overarching themes in response to Scenario 1 were positive both about the strategies and using English to teach the child how to read. Parents responded directly to the question and also provided elaborations on their responses often providing additional suggestions and commentary. This kind of elaboration was also evident in responses where the parent did not agree. As a rule, parents agreed with using the reading strategies suggested and using English to teach with them.

Group Differences in Responses

Examination across the three parent groups indicated some differences in patterns of response. Hmong parents seemed to provide more critical responses about the effectiveness of strategies and they appeared to project the needs of their own children with disabilities rather than focusing on a hypothetical child. Somali parents often raised issues associated with the need for teachers to demonstrate recognition of children’s individual needs and attention to teaching students “equally and fairly.” This notion of equality and fairness was a prevalent theme in responses from Somali parents as well as their raising of the need to provide instruction in Somali despite the focus of this scenario on the teaching of English. Latino parents tended to support the strategies used more directly, but were also likely to elaborate on specific reasons for their support and provide additional suggestions for strategies to use.

Instructional Scenario 2—Using the Student’s Native Language to Teach the Child How to Read

Question 1: What do you think about the teacher using a student’s native language to teach the child how to read?

Five out of 13 parents (38%) responded that they believed teaching in the native language was a

good idea *if* teaching the child in the native language was actually possible. Most parents seemed skeptical that the teacher could actually teach in the native language. Six parents responded negatively to using the native language. Reasons primarily centered on the ineffectiveness of using the native language to develop reading when the primary mode of instruction in schools is English. Three Hmong parents and one Latino parent commented that using the native language would be “confusing.” One Hmong parent thought that the Hmong language is more complicated than English, one thought that using two languages in equal amounts in the classroom would be confusing, and the third thought that using written Hmong in the classroom would be ineffective because the written language is infrequently used in the United States. The Latino parent indicated that teaching in Spanish when the student uses English in school would be confusing. In one example, a parent pointed to the scenario information that indicated the hypothetical child’s stronger proficiency in English than in the native language. Some parents supported native language use, but alternatively indicated that both languages should be used or that English should be preferred because “it is the main language.”

Question 2: What do you think about the before-reading activities in the native language?

Four out of 11 responding parents (36%) supported the idea to teach the child in the native language using the before-reading activities. Three different perspectives seemed to be predominant: (1) teaching in the native language supports bilingualism; (2) before-reading activities can be seen as a way of gaining additional time from the teacher instead of merely as a useful way to learn; and (3) using native language as well as English can be a way to help children understand discrimination.

Question 3: What do you think about using the during-reading activities in the native language?

Five of seven parents (71%) responding supported the use of during-reading activities in the native language to teach the scenario child. Two of seven parents (29%) opposed the idea if the child is with the whole class (taught in English) or unless the teacher is bilingual. It is important to note that about half of the parents did not respond to this question.

Reasons supporting the use of during-reading strategies in the native language included that it would provide a “foundation of the English language,” “it’ll help so that she can think in both since we live in both cultures,” “the teacher would give the students more time, more resources, and tools,” and to “academically grow and develop...understanding.” Reasons opposing the use of native language during reading consisted of concerns for the child reading in the native language within a class of English speakers and the potential lack of a bilingual teacher to conduct this reading appropriately.

Question 4: What do you think about using the after-reading activities in the native language?

Seven out of eight parents (88%) who responded supported this approach. Reasons they gave included that by teaching in the native language, the teacher and child and parent can better understand each other; and that the teacher could use this approach to support parent contact on homework, that is, as a way of being able to communicate with parents about the child's education. As indicated earlier, reasons opposing the use centered on the potential lack of bilingual teachers and subsequent confusion for the student. It is important to note that about half of the parents did not respond to this question.

Overarching themes in responses to Scenario 2 seemed to project concerns about using the student's native language because English is the primary language in schools. However, this concern was primarily evident when parents responded to question 1 about use of native language as a general strategy. This concern seemed less apparent in subsequent responses from the parents who actually responded. This different pattern may have been a function of the lower number of responses to the strategy questions—those more directly opposing the use of native language simply may have responded to additional questions. Moreover, the affirmative responses to strategy questions seemed driven by the native language issue more than the professed focus on strategies. Respondents seemed more to comment on the efficacy of native language use to support parent participation and communication. This mode of response seemed to indicate that the use of instructional strategies is neither sufficient nor the primary consideration when raising the notion of native language use.

Inter-Group Differences on Scenario 2

Examination of responses across language groups revealed that Somali parents were more likely to support native language instruction and that Hmong parents were more varied in their opinions. Despite the variation among Hmong parents, they tended to produce more negative responses. Only one Latino parent responded to these questions. Her responses seemed both to support bilingual instruction (as opposed to exclusive native language instruction) and to raise the difficulty in lack of qualified bilingual educators and the primary use of English in schools. Parents tended to respond to these questions to raise the additional need of communicating with parents both about instruction and about their shared responsibilities in educating their children.

Instructional Scenario 3—Questions Pertaining to the Parents' Own Child

In this section, parents were asked to respond to the instructional scenario as if it were applied to their own children. First, parents were asked which language they preferred to be used in teaching their own child. The next three questions were about before, during, and after reading strategies in the scenario in relation to their child irrespective of the language of instruction.

Question 1: If the student was your child, what language should be taught?

Three of 11 parents (27%) who responded supported the use of English in teaching their child. Reasons included that their child “knows English more,” it would be less confusing, and because English is their native language. Seven of 11 respondents supported native or bilingual instruction. One parent stated directly that the child should be taught in the child’s native language. Six parents stated that it would be good to teach both languages, with some parents preferring that the English language either must be taught first or that it must be taught. Concern was expressed that if their child was taught in the native language, that the child would not be taught in English. One parent commented that her child was not able to communicate in either language; hence, it did not matter.

Question 2: What do you think about before-reading activities when taught to your child?

Eight of 11 respondents (73%) supported the use of before-reading strategies. Parents supporting these strategies added suggestions associated with their intimate knowledge of their own children. Examples included the need to provide direct physical assistance, individualized support, teacher-directed instruction, and increased vocabulary development. Concerns raised by some parents (3) included the difficulty of teaching a child with significant developmental deficits (“too low a level,” “too mentally slow”) and the need to provide more external motivation strategies by the teacher through stronger explanation of the need for strategies.

Question 3: What do you think about during-reading activities when taught to your child?

Seven of ten respondents (70%) supported the use of during-reading strategies. Parents added several other considerations to enhance the use of these strategies. Examples included teacher-based modeling of reading, developing vocabulary and spelling, using the native language to explain content being read, and providing individualized attention. Three parents variously indicated the lack of fit in reading strategies for their children with more severe disabilities suggesting different activities that would be more individually suited to their children’s needs.

Question 4: What do you think about after-reading activities when taught to your child?

Eight of 11 respondents (73%) supported the use of after-reading strategies with their children. Parents provided additional suggestions that included having the child write vocabulary before and after reading and providing bilingual instruction, first in English then in the native language. As in earlier questions, three parents indicated that the strategies were ill-suited to their children with more severe disabilities.

An overarching theme for this section was that when parents discussed their own child, they were more likely to provide specific comments on either the strategies or on a recommendation of additional suggestions.

Inter-Group Differences

An interesting and important result of this portion of the interviews was the overwhelming support by parents for native or bilingual instruction when strategies were directed to their own children. Contrary to discernible group differences in responses to the hypothetical scenarios, support for bilingual instruction spanned across parents from the three language groups. An interesting group difference was discernible in those opposing the use of bilingual instruction. Only Hmong parents (3) were in this group.

A more detailed examination did reveal differences among supporters of bilingual instruction. Hmong parents tended to support the use of bilingual instruction, first to support English instruction and then provide instruction in Hmong. Somali parents tended to support use of native language instruction to support academic learning and as a method to support learning English. Latino parents tended to support dual language proficiency as a desirable end in itself. (However, it is important to note that data for the Hispanic group was less complete than the other two groups.) Finally, parents as a group were found not only to support the use of the strategies named, but also to comment on ways to enhance this form of instruction to meet individualized needs of children, their own and the children of others.

Additional Parent Comments

In addition to responses on the interview question protocol, a number of parents took the opportunity to add further strategies and to comment on their perceptions of their child's needs. Many also added their perceptions of child and family relationships with schools and teachers. Three categories of additional responses were recorded in these interviews: additional instructional strategies suggested by parents, parent concerns about challenges at schools, and considerations about educational policy.

Additional Strategy Suggestions

Suggestions for strategies ranged from approaches to reading to ideas about helping their child maintain appropriate levels of attention. One parent suggested that perhaps teachers could teach children to connect words to pictures through trade books as well as to hold parent meetings with teachers on reading support in the home. Another parent suggested that teachers could have students create stories using cartoons and words learned from their readings. Some parents suggested making extended time to read as an accommodation to give their slow-reading child time to stay abreast in reading volume. Another parent suggested that the teacher provide verbal and physical (“body language”) cues to support difficult to understand text.

Several Somali parents suggested the need for teachers to be more supportive of Somali lan-

guage, culture, and religion as important to supporting their children's participation in classes. In particular, Somali, Latino, and Hmong parents in a number of ways pointed to the need for teachers to be more cognizant of the different cultural and linguistic needs facing their children as they participate in school. Several parents, though seemingly genuinely enthused about the strategies described in the study, believed that many of these strategies are not usually employed with their children. In the words of one Hmong parent:

I want there to be a teacher who will be able to make my child forget about his sickness and make him want to turn back and want to learn. When I go to visit the school it seems like they are always playing or drawing. It seems like all the teachers do is give the children paper and drawings then they leave them and go about on their own business; my child already doesn't seem to want to learn so if the teachers do this then my child will really not learn anything. I think that teachers should do what the teacher did in the scenario and read with the child and if the child doesn't want to learn then to leave that child alone; if a child doesn't want to learn then forcing them to learn will only make them not want to learn more.

Another Somali parent commented, "More trained teachers are needed for the disabled students. Some students don't like to be called disabled...I encourage new Somali language class to be added to the daily schedule of the Somali students."

Finally, as noted earlier, although Somali parents seemed the most articulate on this issue, most parents believed that when it came to their child's education, using the native language of the child was an important component that they believed would support their child's improved academic progress.

Parent Concerns about Challenges in Schools

Several parents added comments regarding the challenges they face in their interactions with teachers and how teachers interact with their children. Issues raised included that school staff often lacked the training needed to work with ELL students with disabilities and that some teachers scolded their children for not complying with teacher requests. Many parents seemed to feel that their children with disabilities especially need teachers to give positive affirmations when performing learning activities rather than impatience and negative messages. As one Latino parent put it, "All the time and mainly when we go to school, that is the moment when we are taking the first steps for our future. And...if we do not see that respect and we feel restrained...at school, or if we do not see...we are not well taken care of, well I think that that destroys the first step."

Another Hmong parent commented:

You know it's hard enough for me to take care of my son by myself, but to be told what to do by the schools; it's never going to work for any families. It does not matter if I speak English or not...I know Hmong parents have a huge language barriers [sic]...trying to meet the needs, I come up against this so many times. The teachers think that they can go ahead that they can plan their IEPs without...parents and think that would fit the child, that's not okay. The parents know what's best for their sons and daughters.

Considerations about Educational Policy

Finally, several parents commented on a range of policy issues that included concerns about schools doing their job to governmental support for parent involvement in the education of their children. One parent raised the need for parent education because parents may not know how to address the numerous challenges at schools that can result in student anger and potential dropout. Additionally, some parents raised the need for better trained teachers and increased funding to support reduced student case loads. These comments were often embedded in sincere support of the efforts of teachers despite the frustrations they may feel about how well teachers may interact with their children. Finally, the concern raised for increased bilingual forms of education was a recurring theme that implied the need for schools to increase their contingents of well-prepared teachers from the cultural and linguistic backgrounds representative of the students whom they may serve.

Implications

Although parents of English language learners seem cognizant and supportive of the fact that knowing English is a prerequisite to school success, many of the respondents in this study clearly believed that when it came to their child, schools should find ways to provide bilingual support. This support was variously identified as either for improving their children's English acquisition or to support their first language development.

Results of interview responses indicate that the Latino, Somali, and Hmong parents in this study are much concerned and have important insights to contribute regarding the education of their children with disabilities. The tenor of responses indicates that parents are looking for ways in which their children's education can be improved, especially in their academic progress in reading English. However, due to their family background factors, such as family size, length of time in Minnesota, level of education, language, knowledge of American culture, and disability types, the parents' ability to seek educational equity has been limited.

Some of the possible constraints on these families may include family size or single parenthood, language barriers, or cultural barriers. These types of constraints often minimize time availability for parents, access to resources needed to provide in-home assistance, and the ability to participate fully in advancing educational equity for their children with disabilities. Thus, parental involvement for individuals in these communities will need to account for the difficulties specifically impeding their participation. What is clear from the interviews is that parents of linguistically diverse learners with disabilities most probably are eager and able to participate in determining the course of instruction to which their children are exposed, but that sociocultural and school climate-related barriers may exist that impede this level of participation. Certainly a great deal has been written describing the limited role that parents of children with disabilities are able to play through instructional planning (Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005; Walthun-Ocama & Rose, 2002). This study illustrates that parents have much more to offer and are likely eager to engage in supporting the instruction their children may receive in classrooms.

There are several limitations to this study. First, the sample size was small (N=15) and responses to interview questions were not always uniform. This latter problem was likely a function of the semi-structured nature of the protocol and the needed differences in approaches by the bilingual interviewers to conducting meetings with different groups of parents. Although data collection may have been more difficult from this result, it was considered important by the stakeholders in this study to give interviewers enough latitude in conducting the interviews to assure maximum parent participation. Second, participants were recruited through a parent advocacy organization that primarily serves individuals with more severe physical and mental disabilities. Parents of children with learning-related disabilities tend to be less involved with the organization. Thus, the participants in this study were not representative of parents of students with all categories of disabilities. Third, most of the parents were female, with only a few male parent participants. Hence, it is likely that responses are only partially reflective of parent concerns. Fourth, interview data for Latino parents was incomplete because of technical difficulties limiting the use of tape recording and reliance on interviewer notes with this group. More complete parent data would have made the data across the three language groups more comprehensive. Finally, one-third of the parents in this study, all of them Hmong, represented large families of nine or more members. It could be that their responses were indicative of individuals who feel the pressures of dividing their attention between the educational needs of several children. The responses of this group of parents may not be representative of parents who have fewer children. Involving participants with more diverse family compositions might better reflect diverse parent perceptions about instructional strategies.

Conclusions

This study examined views of Latino, Hmong, and Somali parents of children with disabilities regarding standards-based instructional reading strategies conducted in a hypothetical classroom and subsequently related to their own children. The study included a comprehensive examination of these parents' knowledge about their child's learning experiences, disabilities, and relationships with schools. Parents were asked to determine the relative efficacy of reading strategies conducted in their native language and in English for a hypothetical student and in relation to their own children. Findings on these three issues revealed important attributes among this group of parents and their potential for meaningful participation in discussions about standards-based education of English language learners with disabilities.

Regarding the use of teacher-identified standards-based reading strategies, parents were found highly likely to support what they perceived as useful efforts to improve reading for their children. Importantly, these parents were additionally found to comment on these strategies and provide additional suggestions that may support the reading skills of their individual children. These results correspond well with previous findings of parent interest in standards-based accountability assessment (Quest et al., 1997) and elucidate with more detail the "engaged" nature of parent interest in the education of their children with disabilities concurrently striving to learn in English as a new or second language.

This sincere interest notwithstanding, parents often reported both positive and negative attributes of their and their children's relationship with teachers and schools. On the one hand, most parents seemed genuinely grateful for the efforts put forth by educators on behalf of their children. On the other, parents often reported significant concerns regarding educational equity, better communication, and collaboration with educators about their children's needs. As in earlier studies of parent interest in standards-based education (Quest et al., 1997), parents were found to be genuinely heartened to have the opportunity to discuss the education of their children. The procedures used to involve parents in this research provide a potential process that may engage linguistically diverse parents in discussing their perceptions about schools, their relationships with schools as well as about classroom instruction. Future studies involving the perceptions of parents on the education of their children with disabilities might benefit from reviewing these procedures toward eliciting parent interest and trust in collaborating with professional educators.

Finally, results of this study illuminate further the way in which Latino, Hmong, and Somali parents view the historically volatile issue of native language instruction as part of the education of children struggling to learn English as a new or second language. In earlier studies, scholarship, and political commentators from linguistically diverse communities, have been identified either as supportive or unsupportive of bilingual education or the principles of native language

instruction to improve the learning of English. Our results indicate that this dichotomy may loom more complex both among different communities and within individuals. When parents in this study were asked to comment on the use of native language instruction in a hypothetical case, differences seemed to arise among different groups (e.g., Somalis seemed to support it more emphatically). However, when this issue was presented regarding instruction of the parents' own children, a larger consensus of support for first language instruction was registered. At the same time, that higher degree of support was given through diverse motivations. Among some parents, first language instruction for their individual child was acceptable because they seemed to believe it would help their child to negotiate the new language demands in English. Among others, bilingual instruction was supported as an important end in itself because of the desirability of bilingualism as a career goal. Last, still others (especially Somali parents) thought that supporting the child's first language was an important component to support the cultural/linguistic heritage of their children. Our small and, therefore, limited study provides interesting insights into the thinking processes that may be taking place among linguistically diverse communities regarding this burning issue.

References

Abramson, S., & Lindberg, G. (1982). *Report on the education progress of Hmong students in Fresno Unified School*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED224574).

Albus, D., Barrera, M., Thurlow, M., Guven, K., & Shyyan, V. (2004). *2000–2001 participation and performance of English language learners with disabilities on Minnesota standards-based assessments* (ELLs with Disabilities Report 4). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Barrera, M. (2003). Curriculum-based dynamic assessment for new- or second-language learners with learning disabilities in secondary education settings. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 29 (1), 69–84.

California State Department of Education. (1986). *Phau ntawv tes qhia txog California txoj kev kawm txuj ci rau cov niam txiv hais lus Pawg neeg tsawg=A Handbook on California education for language minority parents—Hmong/English education*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED279747).

Coutinho, M., & Oswald, D. (2004). Disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education: Measuring the problem. Practitioner Brief Series, National Center on Culturally Responsive Educational Systems. Retrieved June 1, 2005, from http://www.nccrest.org/Briefs/students_in_SPED_Brief.pdf

Crabb, R. (1996). Working with Hassan. *Multicultural Teaching*, 14(2), 22–25.

Deslandes, R., & Bertrand, R. (2005). Motivation of parent involvement in secondary-level schooling. *Journal of Educational Research*, 98(3), 164–175.

García, S. B., & Malkin, D. H. (1993). Toward defining programs and services for culturally and linguistically diverse learners in special education. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 26(1), 52–58.

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1994). The language minority student in special education: Issues, trends, and paradoxes. *Exceptional Children*, 60(4), 310–322.

Huang, G (1993). *Beyond culture: Communicating with Asian American children and families*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED366673).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended in 2004, PL 108-446, 20 USC 1400 *et seq.*

Lewis, A. (1992). *Helping young urban parents educate themselves and their children (ERIC/CUE Digest, Number 85)*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED334808).

Liu, K., Barrera, M., Thurlow, M., Guven, K., & Shyyan, V. (2005). *Graduation exam participation and performance (1999-2000) of English language learners with disabilities (ELLs with Disabilities Report 2)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Lynch, P.S. (1991). *Parents' perceptions of their involvement in planning the transition from school to work for their children with disabilities*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED332020).

Masny, D. (1999). Weaving multiple literacies: Somali children and their teachers in the context of school culture. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12(1), 72–93.

Merryfield, M. M. (1987). *Lessons from Africa: A supplement to middle school courses in world culture, global studies, and world geography*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED290687).

Merryfield, M. M. (1988). *The African social studies programme: An effort to improve curriculum and instruction across 17 African nations* (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED291665)

Mohamed, I. J. (1983). *Investigation of problems of implementing curriculum in primary schools in Somalia*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED250167).

Morrow, R. (1991). The challenge of Southeast Asian parental involvement. *Principal*, 70(3), 20–22.

Mueller, D., Gozali-Lee, E., & Sherman, C. (1996). *Early school performance of Hmong children in comparative context*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Wilder Research Center. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED400091).

Ortiz, A. A. (1997). Learning disabilities occurring concomitantly with linguistic differences. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 321–332.

Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights (PACER). (1985). *Parents can be the key to an appropriate education for their handicapped child = Niam txiv muaj peev xwm yog tus yawm sij rau txoj kev kawm ntawv rau nkawv tus men yuam xiam oos qhab*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED259542).

Pecoraro, D., & Phommasouvanh, B. (1991). *Limited English proficient (LEP) parent involvement project. Overview [and] user's guide*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED356675).

Poole, A.L. (1999). *How the rooster got his crown*. New York, New York: Holiday House.

Quest, C., Liu, K., & Thurlow, M. (1997). *Cambodian, Hmong, Lao, Spanish-speaking and Vietnamese parents and students speak out on Minnesota's Basic Standards Tests. (State Assessment Series: Minnesota, Report 12)*. Minneapolis, MN: National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Rivera, K.M. (1990). *Developing native language literacy in language minority adults*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED358747)

Schwartz, W. (1996). *Immigrants and their educational attainment: Some facts and findings (ERIC Digest, Number 116)*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED402398).

Sharpe, M. N. (1997). *Education: A focus group study of parent perspectives. Final report phase II: Minority parents*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED446340).

Smith-Davis, J. (2003). *Issues arising from insufficient diversity among education personnel: A Monarch brief*. Monarch Center, University of Illinois at Chicago. Retrieved June 1, 2005, from http://personnelcenter.org/documents/Monarch_Issues_Arising_from_Insufficient_Diversity_2003.doc

Tatman, A. W. (2001). Hmong Perceptions of Disability: Implications for vocational rehabilitation counselors. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 32(3), 22–27.

Thurlow, M., Albus, D., Shyyan, V., Liu, K., & Barrera, M. (2004). *Educator perceptions of instructional strategies for standards-based education of English language learners with disabilities (ELLs with Disabilities Report 7)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Tobias, R., & Spiridakis, J. (1982). *Bronx multidiscipline special education bilingual program. E.S.E.A. Title VII annual evaluation report, 1980–81*. (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED231913).

Vang, H., & Barrera, M.T. (2004) Hmong parents' perceptions on instructional strategies for educating their children with disabilities. *Hmong Studies Journal*, 5, 1–20.

Wathum-Ocama, J. C., & Rose, S. (2002). Hmong immigrants' views on the education of their deaf and hard of hearing children. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 147(3), 44–53.

Webber, R., & Deyes, T. (1986). Appropriate Methodology in ELT. A Report on the Dunford House Seminar (England, United Kingdom, July 14-24, 1986). (Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] Document No. ED358708).

Appendix A

Hmong Parent Interview Written in English

Question 1) Tell me about your family.

Question 2) I would like to know about your child (son, daughter) and her/his needs at home and at school. Can you tell me what you know? You see your child most at home. Let's start by talking about your child at home.

Question 3) Now let me ask what you know about your child at school. I understand that many parents do not see their child at school very often. Share with us anything you do know.

Question 4) Can you tell me about the school where your child attends?

Question 5) What do you hope will happen when your child finishes with school?

What do you think?

Scenario 1

Mai is in the 9th grade. She came from California to Minnesota. At school Mai speaks in English most of the time. She speaks some Hmong at home. A bilingual teacher tested her English and Hmong skills. The bilingual teacher found that Mai has some trouble. It is hard for her to do school work in both languages. Her work is better in English. Last year, Mai also took English reading and math tests. These tests are given to all Minnesota students in the 8th grade. Mai's scores on these tests were very low. Most students in the English Language Arts class read at a higher level. The teacher decided to help Mai with reading in English.

Here is a sample story. We can use it to talk about some reading activities.

How the Rooster Got His Crown

Many years ago, when the earth was new, there were six suns in the sky. It was very hot in the summer, but the rain came to keep the plants alive. One summer the rain did not come and the heat of the sun dried up the plants. The people did not have enough to eat. The king called together the wise people of the village to discuss how to save the harvest. He listened to their ideas. The oldest wise person said, "We can shoot the suns out of the sky with arrows. This is the only plan that will work." The king called his soldiers. The soldiers tried to shoot the suns in the sky but their arrows did not reach far enough. The king sent for a young prince who was a famous hunter. The young prince said, "Arrows can not fly high enough to shoot the suns in the sky. We must shoot the suns' reflection in the water." He picked up his bow and arrow and went to the pond. The prince sent an arrow flying right into the middle of the first sun's reflec-

tion in the water. The sun sank to the bottom of the pond. The young prince shot another arrow and the second sun sank to the bottom of the pond. He shot five arrows and sank five suns. The sixth sun became so frightened that he hid in a cave. The people called the sun but he refused to come out. The earth was dark for a long time. The king asked the wise people how to get the sun to come out of the cave. “Maybe our voices are not loud enough,” the wise people said. “We will call the tiger.” They took the tiger to the cave. The tiger roared loudly but the sun would not come out. “Perhaps the tiger was too loud,” they said. The wise people brought a cow to the cave. The cow went “MOO!” but still the sun did not come out. The wise people did not know what to do. Just then, a small rooster with a smooth shiny head walked near the cave. “COCK A DOODLE DOO,” he called. The sun liked the rooster’s call. He looked out of the cave to see what was making the beautiful sound. The people cheered. The sun came all the way out of the cave because he felt happy. The sunshine was warm and bright. The sun wanted to say thank you to the rooster for calling him out of the cave. The sun made a small red crown and placed it on the rooster’s head. That is why, from that time until now, roosters have worn a red crown to call the sun each morning.

The teacher will use these activities.

Before reading

1. Have Mai read from a book other students are reading. Find out what words she can read and what words she needs still to learn.
2. Give Mai a story outline. Review the story with her before she reads it.
3. Have Mai write key words in the story. Let Mai hear the words, see the words, read the words aloud, and write the words.
4. Ask Mai questions on what she will read. Do this before she reads the story. Have a copy of the story in front of her. See if she understands the material she will read.

During Reading

5. Explain the kind of story it is and show how the story looks in the book.
6. Show Mai how to read the words so she can learn to see how the words are structured.

After Reading

7. Have Mai draw a picture or write the story in her own words.
8. Help Mai make a story map including key ideas in the story.

9. Teach Mai how to study key words and ideas about the story.

Questions to Parent

1. What do you think about the teacher using English to teach the child how to read?
2. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
3. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?

Scenario 2

Mai is in the 9th grade. She came from California to Minnesota. At school Mai speaks in English most of the time. She speaks some Hmong at home. A bilingual teacher tested her English and Hmong skills. The bilingual teacher found that Mai has some trouble. It is hard for her to do school work in both languages. Her work is better in English. Last year, Mai also took English reading and math tests. These tests are given to all Minnesota students in the 8th grade. Mai's scores on these tests were very low. Most students in the English Language Arts class read at a higher level. The teacher decided to help Mai with reading.

Here is the sample story written in Hmong. We can use it to talk about reading activities.

How the Rooster Got His Crown

Many years ago, when the earth was new, there were six suns in the sky. It was very hot in the summer, but the rain came to keep the plants alive. One summer the rain did not come and the heat of the sun dried up the plants. The people did not have enough to eat. The king called together the wise people of the village to discuss how to save the harvest. He listened to their ideas. The oldest wise person said, "We can shoot the suns out of the sky with arrows. This is the only plan that will work." The king called his soldiers. The soldiers tried to shoot the suns in the sky but their arrows did not reach far enough. The king sent for a young prince who was a famous hunter. The young prince said, "Arrows can not fly high enough to shoot the suns in the sky. We must shoot the suns' reflection in the water." He picked up his bow and arrow and went to the pond. The prince sent an arrow flying right into the middle of the first sun's reflection in the water. The sun sank to the bottom of the pond. The young prince shot another arrow and the second sun sank to the bottom of the pond. He shot five arrows and sank five suns. The

sixth sun became so frightened that he hid in a cave. The people called the sun but he refused to come out. The earth was dark for a long time. The king asked the wise people how to get the sun to come out of the cave. “Maybe our voices are not loud enough,” the wise people said. “We will call the tiger.” They took the tiger to the cave. The tiger roared loudly but the sun would not come out. “Perhaps the tiger was too loud,” they said. The wise people brought a cow to the cave. The cow went “MOO!” but still the sun did not come out. The wise people did not know what to do. Just then, a small rooster with a smooth shiny head walked near the cave. “COCK A DOODLE DOO,” he called. The sun liked the rooster’s call. He looked out of the cave to see what was making the beautiful sound. The people cheered. The sun came all the way out of the cave because he felt happy. The sunshine was warm and bright. The sun wanted to say thank you to the rooster for calling him out of the cave. The sun made a small red crown and placed it on the rooster’s head. That is why, from that time until now, roosters have worn a red crown to call the sun each morning.

The teacher will use these activities to help her improve her reading in Hmong.

Before reading

1. Have Mai read from a book other students are reading. Find out what words she can read and what words she needs still to learn.
2. Ask Mai questions on what she will read. Do this before she reads the story. Have a copy of the story in front of her. See if she understands the material she will read.
3. Give Mai a story outline. Review the story with her before she reads it.
4. Have Mai write key words in the story. Let Mai hear the words, see the words, read the words aloud, and write the words.

During Reading

5. Explain the kind of story it is and show how the story looks in the book.
6. Show Mai how to read the words so she can learn to see how the words are structured.

After Reading

7. Have Mai draw a picture or write the story in her own words.
8. Help Mai make a story map including key ideas in the story.
9. Teach Mai how to study key words and ideas about the story.

Questions to Parent

1. What do you think about the teacher using Hmong to teach the child how to read?
2. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
3. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?

Your Child:

1. What do you think about the teacher using English to teach your child how to read?
2. What do you think about the teacher using Hmong to teach your child how to read?
3. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
5. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
6. Is there anything else you would like to share with us about your child at school? What other activities have teachers done with your child that helped them learn to read in either English or Hmong?

Appendix B

Hmong Parent Interview Written in Hmong

Lus Xam Phaj Niam Txiv Hmoob

Nqe lus nug 1) Qhia kuv paub txog koj tsev neeg.

Nqe lus nug 2) Kuv xav paub txog koj tus menyuam (tub, ntxhais) thiab nws kev kom pab tshwj xeeb nyob hauv tsev thiab tom tsev kawm ntawv. Koj qhia puas tau qhov koj paub rau kuv? Koj pom koj tus menyuam heev tshaj tom tsev. Wb xub pib tham txog koj tus menyuam thaum nws nyob tom tsev.

Nqe lus nug 3) Zaum no, cia kuv nug txog qhov uas koj paub txog koj tus menyuam thaum nws nyob tom tsev kawm ntawv. Kuv to taub tias coob leej niam txiv tsis pom lawv tej menyuam heev nyob tom tsev kawm ntawv. Qhia peb paub txog dab tsi los xij uas koj ho paub.

Nqe lus nug 4) Koj qhia puas tau kuv dab tsi txog lub tsev kawm ntawv uas koj tus menyuam mus kawm?

Nqe lus nug 5) Lwm tus hauv zej zos xav li cas rau koj tus menyuam?

Nqe lus nug 6) Koj vam tias yuav muaj dab tsi tshwm sim thaum koj tus menyuam kawm ntawv tas?

Koj xav li cas?

Qhov kev piv txwv 1

Mai kawm nyob qib 9. Nws tau los California los rau Minnesota. Nyob tom tsev kawm ntawv feem ntau Mai tham lus Hmoob. Nws tham lus Hmoob me ntsis tom tsev. Ib tug xib fwb qhia ob hom lus tau xeeb nws kev txawj lus Askiv thiab lus Hmoob. Tus xib fwb ntawd tau pom tias Mai muaj teeb meem qho yam. Nws yog ib qho nyuaj rau Mai los ua dej num kawm ntawv ua ob hom lus. Nws ua tau zoo dua yog siv lus Askiv. Xyoo tas no, Mai twb tau xeeb nyeem ntawv Askiv thiab lej. Minnesota txhua tus menyuam kawm ntawv qib 8 tau xeeb tib yam nkaus li hais. Mai cov qhabnias nyob rau cov kev xeeb no qis heev. Cov menyuam nyob rau English Language Arts (Kev kawm Lus Askiv) feem ntau nyeem tau siab dua ntawd. Tus xib fwb tau txiav txim pab Mai rau kev nyeem Askiv.

Zaj no yog ib zaj dab neeg piv txwv. Peb siv tau los tham txog tej kev nyeem ntawv.

Tus Lau Qaib tau Nws Lub Ib Los Li Cas

Ntau xyoo dhau los, thaum lub ntuj tseem tshiab, nws muaj rau lub hnuv nyob rau saum lub ntuj. Nyob rau lub caij ntuj so nws kub heev, tiam sis nag los es ua kom tej xyooob ntoo ciaj tau. Nyob rau ib lub caij ntuj so nag tsis los thiab lub hnuv kub ua rau tej xyooob ntoo tuag tas. Cov neeg tsis muaj dab tsi txaus noj. Tus huab tais hu cov txawj laus ntawm lub zos los sib tham seb yuav cawm qoob loo tau li cas. Nws mloog lawv tej tswv

yim. Tus laus tshaj plaws hais tias, “Peb siv xib xub tua cov hnuv kom poob tawm saum ntuj. Qhov no yog tib qho uas yuav mus tau.” Tus huab tais hu nws cov tub rog. Cov tub rog sim tua cov hnuv saum ntuj tiam sis lawv ov xib xub mus tsis txog. Tus huab tais thiaj hu caum ib tug tub huab tais hluas uas muaj npe nrov tua tsiaj. Tus tub huab tais hluas hais tias, “Cov xib xub ya tsis siab txaus mus tua cov hnuv nyob saum ntuj. Peb yuav tsum tua cov hnuv cov duab nyob hauv dej.” Nws tsawv nws rab hneev thiab tus xib xub thiab mus nram lub pas dej. Tus tub huab tais hluas tua ib tug hneev nti ncaj qha rau hauv thawj lub hnuv tus duab lub plawv nyob hauv dej. Lub hnuv tog mus rau hauv qab thu pas dej. Tus tub huab tais hluas rov tua ib tug xib xub thiab lub hnuv thib ob tog mus rau hauv qab thu pas dej. Nws tua tsib tug xib xub thiab ua rau tsib lub hnuv tog tas. Lub hnuv thib rau ntshai heev ua rau nws mus nkaum hauv ib lub qhov tsua. Cov neeg hu lub hnuv tiam sim nws tsis kam tawm los. Lub ntuj tsaus ntuj tau ntev. Tus huab tais nug cov txwj laus seb yuav ua li cas thiaj ua kom lub hnuv tawm hauv qhov tsua los. Lawv hais tias, “Tej zaum peb cov suab nrov tsis txaus. Peb yuav hu tus tsov.” Lawv coj tus tsov muas tom lub qhov tsua. Tus tsov quaj nrov kawg tiam sis lub hnuv tsis tawm los. Lawv hais tias, “Tej zaum tus tsov quaj nrov hwi.” Cov txwj laus thiaj coj ib tug nyuj mus tom lub qhov tsua. Tus nyuj nqov “MOO!” tiam sis lub hnuv tseem tsis tawm los thiab. Cov txwj laus tsis paub yuav ua cas. Tam sim ntawd kiag, ib tug menyuam lau qaib uas taub hau ci tshiaj taug kev los ze lub qhov tsua. Nws qua “COCK A DOODLE DOO.” Lub hnuv nyiam tus lau qaib lub suab qua. Nws ntsia tawm ntawm lub qhov tsua seb yog dab tsi ua tau lub suab zoo tas npaud. Cov neeg qw zoo siab. Lub hnuv tawm puag hauv lub qhov tsua los vim nws zoo siab. Nws ci ua rau sov thiab pom kev. Lub hnuv xav ua tsaug rau tus lau qaib uas tau hu nws tawm ntawm lub qhov tsua los. Lub hnuv ua ib lub menyuam ib liab thiab muab txawb rau saum tus lau qaib taub hau. Vim li ntawd, txij thaum ntawd los txog tam sim no, cov lau qaib thiaj coj ib liab los hu lub hnuv txhua tag kis.

Tus xib fwb yuav siv cov no los ua.

Ua ntej yuav nyeem

1. AKom Mai nyeem los ntawm ib phau ntawv uas lwm tus menyuam kawm ntawv nyeem. Nug kom paub seb nws nyeem tau cov lus twg thiab tseem tsis tau paub cov lus twg.
2. AMuab ib lub ntsiab dab neeg rau Mai. Rov tham txog zaj dab neeg nrog nws ua ntej nws yuav nyeem.
3. AKom Mai sau cov lus tseem ceeb nyob rau zaj dab neeg. Cia Mai hnov cov lus, pom cov lus, nyeem cov lus kom nrov thiab sau cov lus.
4. AUa lus nug Mai txog qhov nws yuav nyeem. Nug li hais ua ntej nws nyeem zaj dab neeg. Muab ib qhov qauv ntawm zaj dab neeg tso ntawm nws xub ntiag. Xyuas seb nws puas to taub qhov uas nws yuav nyeem.

Thaum tseem nyeem

5. APIav qhia seb nws yog hom dab neeg twg thiab qhia seb nws zoo li cas nyob hauv phau ntawv.
6. AQhia Mai seb yuav nyeem cov lus li cas kom nws pom tau tias cov lus sau li cas.

Thaum nyeem tas lawm

7. AKom Mai kos duab los yog siv nws li lus los sau zaj dab neeg.
8. APab Mai ua ib daim qhia txog dab neeg kom muaj tej tswv yim loj nyob rau zaj dab neeg.
9. AQhia Mai kom nws paub kawm cov lus tseem ceeb thiab cov tswv yim txog zaj dab neeg.

Cov Lus Nug rau Niam Txiv

1. AKoj xav li cas rau qhov uas tus xib fwb siv lus Askiv los qhia tus menyuum kom yeem tau ntawv?
2. AThov koj xyuastej yam uas tus xib fwb tau siv ua ntej yuav nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab tau Mai npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
3. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua nyob rau thaum tseem nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab Mai tau npaum li as? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
4. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua thaum nyeem tas lawm. Koj xav tias tej no pab Mai tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?

Qhov kev piv txwv 2:

Mai kawm nyob qib 9. Nws tau los California los rau Minnesota. Nyob tom tsev kawm ntawv feem ntau Mai tham lus Askiv. Nws tham lus Hmoob me ntsis tom tsev. Ib tug xib fwb qhia ob hom lus tau xeem nws kev txawj lus Askiv thiab lus Hmoob. Tus xib fwb ntawd tau pom tias Mai muaj teeb meem qho yam. Nws yog ib qho nyuaj rau Mai los ua dej num kawm ntawv ua ob hom lus. Nws ua tau zoo dua yog siv lus Askiv. Xyoo tas no, Mai twb tau xeem nyeem ntawv Askiv thiab lej. Minnesota txhua tus menyuum kawm ntawv qib 8 tau xeem tib yam nkaus li hais. Mai cov qhabnias nyob rau cov kev xeem no qis heev. Cov menyuum nyob rau English Language Arts (Kev kawm Lus Askiv) feem ntau nyeem tau siab dua ntawd. Tus xib fwb tau txiav txim pab Mai rau kev nyeem ntawv.

Zaj no yog zaj dab neeg piv txwv uas tau sau ua lus Hmoob. Peb siv tau los tham txog tej kev nyeem ntawv.

Tus Lau Qaib tau Nws Lub Ib Los Li Cas

Ntau xyoo dhau los, thaum lub ntuj tseem tshiab, nws muaj rau lub hnuv nyob rau saum lub ntuj. Nyob rau lub caij ntuj so nws kub heev, tiam sis nag los es ua kom tej xyooob ntoo ciao tau. Nyob rau ib lub caij ntuj so nag tsis los thiab lub hnuv kub ua rau tej xyooob ntoo tuag tas. Cov neeg tsis muaj dab tsi txaus noj. Tus huab tais hu cov txawj laus ntawm lub zos los sib tham seb yuav cawm qoob loo tau li cas. Nws mloog lawv tej tswv yim. Tus laus tshaj plaws hais tias, “Peb siv xib xub tua cov hnuv kom poob tawm saum ntuj. Qhov no yog tib qho uas yuav mus tau.” Tus huab tais hu nws cov tub rog. Cov tub rog sim tua cov hnuv saum ntuj tiam sis lawv cov xib xub mus tsis txog. Tus huab

tais thiaj hu caum ib tug tub huab tais hluas uas muaj npe nrov tua tsiaj. Tus tub huab tais hluas hais tias, “Cov xib xub ya tsis siab txaus mus tua cov hnuv nyob saum ntuj. Peb yuav tsum tua cov hnuv cov duab nyob hauv dej.” Nws tsawv nws rab hneev thiab tus xib xub thiab mus nram lub pas dej. Tus tub huab tais hluas tua ib tug hneev nti ncaj qha rau hauv thawj lub hnuv tus duab lub plawv nyob hauv dej. Lub hnuv tog mus rau hauv qab thu pas dej. Tus tub huab tais hluas rov tua ib tug xib xub thiab lub hnuv thib ob tog mus rau hauv qab thu pas dej. Nws tua tsib tug xib xub thiab ua rau tsib lub hnuv tog tas. Lub hnuv thib rau ntshai heev ua rau nws mus nkaum hauv ib lub qhov tsua. Cov neeg hu lub hnuv tiam sim nws tsis kam tawm los. Lub ntuj tsaus ntuj tau ntev. Tus huab tais nug cov txwj laus seb yuav ua li cas thiaj ua kom lub hnuv tawm hauv qhov tsua los. Lawv hais tias, “Tej zaum peb cov suab nrov tsis txaus. Peb yuav hu tus tsov.” Lawv coj tus tsov muas tom lub qhov tsua. Tus tsov quaj nrov kawg tiam sis lub hnuv tsis tawm los. Lawv hais tias, “Tej zaum tus tsov quaj nrov hwi.” Cov txwj laus thiaj coj ib tug nyuj mus tom lub qhov tsua. Tus nyuj nqov “MOO!” tiam sis lub hnuv tseem tsis tawm los thiab. Cov txwj laus tsis paub yuav ua cas. Tam sim ntawd kiag, ib tug menyuum lau qaib uas taub hau ci tshiaiv taug kev los ze lub qhov tsua. Nws qua “COCK A DOODLE DOO.” Lub hnuv nyiam tus lau qaib lub suab qua. Nws ntsia tawm ntawm lub qhov tsua seb yog dab tsi ua tau lub suab zoo tas npaud. Cov neeg qw zoo siab. Lub hnuv tawm puag hauv lub qhov tsua los vim nws zoo siab. Nws ci ua rau sov thiab pom kev. Lub hnuv xav ua tsaug rau tus lau qaib uas tau hu nws tawm ntawm lub qhov tsua los. Lub hnuv ua ib tug menyuum ib liab thiab muab txawb rau saum tus lau qaib taub hau. Vim li ntawd, txij thaum ntawd los txog tam sim no, cov lau qaib thiaj ntoo ib liab los hu lub hnuv txhua tag kis.

Tus xib fwb yuav siv tej yam no los pab kom nws nyeem tau ntawv Hmoob zoo dua qub.

Ua ntej yuav nyeem

1. AKom Mai nyeem los ntawm ib phau ntawv uas lwm tus menyuum kawm ntawv nyeem. Nug kom paub seb nws nyeem tau cov lus twg thiab tseem tsis tau paub cov lus twg.
2. AUa lus nug maiv txog qhov nws yuav nyeem. Nug li hais ua ntej nws nyeem zaj dab neeg. Muab ib qhov qauv ntawm zaj dab neeg tso ntawm nws xub ntiag. Xyuas seb nws puas to taub qhov uas nws yuav nyeem.
3. AMuab ib lub ntsiab dab neeg rau Mai. Rov tham txog zaj dab neeg nrog nws ua ntej nws yuav nyeem.
4. AKom Mai sau cov lus tseem ceeb nyob rau zaj dab neeg. Cia Mai hnov cov lus, pom cov lus, nyeem cov lus kom nrov thiab sau cov lus.

Thaum tseem nyeem

5. APIav qhia seb nws yog hom dab neeg twg thiab qhia seb nws zoo li cas nyob hauv phau ntawv.
6. AQhia Mai seb yuav nyeem cov lus li cas kom nws pom tau tias cov lus sau li cas.

Thaum nyeem tas lawm

7. AKom Mai kos duab los yog siv nws li lus los sau zaj dab neeg.

8. APab Mai ua ib daim qhia txog dab neeg kom muaj tej tswv yim loj nyob rau zaj dab neeg.
9. AQhia Mai kom nws paub kawm cov lus tseem ceeb thiab cov tswv yim txog zaj dab neeg.

Cov Lus Nug rau Niam Txiv

1. AKoj xav li cas rau qhov uas tus xib fwb siv lus Hmoob los qhia tus menyuam kom nyeem tau ntawv?
2. AThov koj xyuas tej yam uas tus xib fwb tau siv ua ntej yuav nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab tau Mai npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
3. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua nyob rau thaum tseem nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab Mai tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
4. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua thaum nyeem tas lawm. Koj xav tias tej no pab Mai tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi txiv thiab?

Koj tus menyuam:

1. AKoj xav li cas rau qhov uas tus xib fwb siv lus Askiv los qhia koj tus menyuam kom nyeem tau ntawv?
 2. AKoj xav li cas rau qhov uas tus xib fwb siv lus Hmoob los qhia koj tus menyuam kom nyeem tau ntawv?
 3. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua ua ntej yuav nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab koj tus menyuam tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
 4. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua thaum tseem nyeem. Koj xav tias tej no pab koj tus menyuam tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
 5. AThov koj xyuas tej yam ua thaum nyeem tas lawm. Koj xav tias tej no pab koj tus menyuam tau npaum li cas? Tau zoo heev, tau ib nrab (ok), tau tsis zoo? Tus xib fwb yuav tau ua dab tsi ntxiv thiab?
- A 6. Puas tshuav dab tsi thiab uas koj xav qhia peb paub txog koj tus menyuam nyob
A rau tsev kawm ntawv? Tshuav dab tsi thiab uas cov xiv fwb tau siv los pab koj tus
A menyuam kom nws nyeem tau ntawv ua lus Askiv los yog lus Hmoob?

Appendix C

Hmong Parent Interview Format

Information for the Interviewer (not meant to be shared with interviewees)

The following is a semi-structured format for discussing with parents their views about instructional practices for meeting the needs of their child learners with disabilities. There are three parts to this interview: (1) introduction; (2) obtaining background information; and (3) having parents reflect on case-based instructional practices in a classroom. This format should be modified by the interviewer for clarity and sensitivity to participants' willingness to share information. Both an English and a native language version of the interview are provided for parents. You will read aloud the language version the parent prefers. *Please ask the parent to read along with you if the parent has indicated that they do read one of the languages. Be sensitive to the fact that some parents may not be literate in either language.*

In the second section, the 6 questions posed should be seen as a guide toward obtaining the information described below each question entitled [Purpose for Asking]. The description of the purpose is a guide for the interviewer to make sure that the information described is obtained from the parents' responses to the question. *Interviewers should be sure to prompt or re-direct in a thoughtful and sensitive manner so that the respondents provide the information needed. It is important that the information described under the purpose be obtained as a result of the interview.* In other words, it is important to be persistent without appearing to ask too many questions. In most cases, the information needed can be obtained during the response time as each question is asked. However, it may at times be necessary to move to a new question for the sake of continuity and time. In such cases, the interviewer should be sure to return to the questions where information is needed or to "work them in" when it is possible to do so. In all cases, the information requested should be obtained by the end of the interview. Of course, if parents state their reluctance to answer some aspects of the questions or appear to evade responding to some requests for information, the interviewer should move on and note this reluctance in her/his notes.

Part 3 of the interview includes two scenarios of a student with a suspected learning problem and for whom limited English proficiency is an issue. The first scenario describes how a teacher attempts to address the student needs in context of English instruction. The second scenario will present the same situation but the teacher, instead of focusing on English as the basis of instruction, decides to use the students' native language even though the strategies used remain the same. The respondents will be asked to comment on the strategies and whether they seem appropriate for the learner. The final portion of Part 3 is to ask the parents about their child and whether the strategies described would work for her/him.

Part 1: Introduce the study and the people involved

Thank you for talking with me today. Our names are x and y. We belong to a group of educators who want to improve teaching for students. Let me explain what we will do. Some students in schools are English language learners. Some of these students also have a disability. These students need the best possible teaching so they can learn. We hope that you and other parents will help us. Then we will know more about how to improve teaching. Parents know a lot about their children. *You may think we know everything about teaching, but in fact parents like you have great ideas about teaching.* We want to talk with you about your child at home and at school. Some of our questions about school may be hard to answer. There are no right or wrong answers. At the end, we will combine all the information. We will use this information to write some articles. Teachers and school personnel will read the articles. The information you give us can help teachers to teach your child better.

Do you have any questions you want to ask?

Ask for permission to tape record.

Part 2: Background Information

Questions and Purposes for Asking

Information about the family and their home:

Later, we will talk about some activities teachers use in the classroom. I want to know if you think those activities would work well with your child. First, I would like to know a little about your child and your family. I want to understand more about your child. Then I can better understand what you think is important for your child at school.

Question 1) Tell me about your family.

[Purpose for asking] This question and the answers to this question are meant to obtain the following information:

- a) Family members who live in the home.
- b) Country of your origin.
- c) Language spoken in the home.
- d) How long the family has lived in the Twin Cities area.

Information about the child with a disability

Question 2) I would like to know about your child (son, daughter) and her/his needs at home and at school. Can you tell me what you know? You see your child most at home. Let's start by talking about your child at home.

[Purpose for asking] This question and the answers to this question are meant to obtain the following information:

- a) A general description of the child (gender, age, country of birth, personality, place in family, relationship to other family members, likes/dislikes, activities).
- b) Strengths of the child at home.
- c) Areas of difficulty the child shows at home.
- d) Parent's description of the child's behavior at home.
- e) Child's relationship to extended family and opinions of the extended family about the child's behavior.

Question 3) Now, let me ask what you know about your child at school. I understand that many parents do not see their child at school very often. Share with us anything you do know.

[Purpose for asking] This question and the answers to this question are meant to obtain the following information

- a) Grade, level, type of class of child.
- b) Child's educational history (that adds to or varies with school records).
- c) What the child is good at in school.
- d) Parent's description of the child's disability.
- e) Age when problem was first noticed and/or when diagnosed.
- f) Parents ideas about the cause of their child's disability.

Information about the parents' perception of the school where their child(ren) attend

Question 4) Can you tell me about the school where your child attends?

[Purpose for asking] This question and the answers to this question are meant to obtain the following information

- a) Parent's interactions with the school.
- b) Person at school whom parents most often contact.
- c) Places or persons that parents have contacted for help.

Parents Perceptions about the Child and Community Environment

Question 5) What do you hope will happen when your child finishes with school?

[Purpose for asking] This question and the answers to this question are meant to obtain the following information

- a) Parents' feelings about child's future.

Part 3: What do you think?

Now I will ask you some questions about activities that teachers use in school. I will describe the way a Hmong-speaking student (not your child) is being taught to read. I will ask you to tell me what you think about the activities. The paper in front of you is the story and I will read it to you.

Scenario 1.

Mai is in the 9th grade. She came from California to Minnesota. At school Mai speaks in English most of the time. She speaks some Hmong at home. A bilingual teacher tested her English and Hmong skills. The bilingual teacher found that Mai has some trouble. It is hard for her to do school work in both languages. Her work is better in English. Last year, Mai also took English reading and math tests. These tests are given to all Minnesota students in the 8th grade. Mai's scores on these tests were very low. Most students in the English Language Arts class read at a higher level. The teacher decided to help Mai with reading in English.

Here is a sample story we can use when we talk about reading activities:

How the Rooster Got His Crown

Many years ago, when the earth was new, there were six suns in the sky. It was very hot in the summer, but the rain came to keep the plants alive. One summer the rain did not come and the heat of the sun dried up the plants. The people did not have enough to eat. The king called together the wise people of the village to discuss how to save the harvest. He listened to their ideas. The oldest wise person said, "We can shoot the suns out of the sky with arrows. This is the only plan that will work." The king called his soldiers. The soldiers tried to shoot the suns in the sky but their arrows did not reach far enough. The king sent for a young prince who was a famous hunter. The young prince said, "Arrows can not fly high enough to shoot the suns in the sky. We must shoot the suns' reflection in the water." He picked up his bow and arrow and went to the pond. The prince sent an arrow flying right into the middle of the first sun's reflec-

tion in the water. The sun sank to the bottom of the pond. The young prince shot another arrow and the second sun sank to the bottom of the pond. He shot five arrows and sank five suns. The sixth sun became so frightened that he hid in a cave. The people called the sun but he refused to come out. The earth was dark for a long time. The king asked the wise people how to get the sun to come out of the cave. "Maybe our voices are not loud enough," the wise people said. "We will call the tiger." They took the tiger to the cave. The tiger roared loudly but the sun would not come out. "Perhaps the tiger was too loud," they said. The wise people brought a cow to the cave. The cow went "MOO!" but still the sun did not come out. The wise people did not know what to do. Just then, a small rooster with a smooth shiny head walked near the cave. "COCK A DOODLE DOO," he called. The sun liked the rooster's call. He looked out of the cave to see what was making the beautiful sound. The people cheered. The sun came all the way out of the cave because he felt happy. The sunshine was warm and bright. The sun wanted to say thank you to the rooster for calling him out of the cave. The sun made a small red crown and placed it on the rooster's head. That is why, from that time until now, roosters have worn a red crown to call the sun each morning.

The teacher will use these activities.

Before reading (items in bold with * need visual)

1. Have Mai read from a book other students are reading. Find out what words she can read and what words she needs still to learn.
2. Give Mai a story **outline***. Review the story with her before she reads it.
3. Have Mai write **key words*** in the story. Let Mai hear the words, see the words, read the words aloud, and write the words.
4. Ask Mai questions on what she will read. Do this before she reads the story.

Have a copy of the story in front of her. See if she understands the material she will read.

During Reading

5. Explain the kind of story it is and show how the story looks in the book.
6. Show Mai how to read the words so she can learn to see how the words are structured.

After Reading

7. Have Mai draw a picture or write the story in her own words.
8. Help Mai make a **story map*** including key ideas in the story.
9. Teach Mai how to study key words and ideas about the story.

Questions to Parent

I would like to ask you some questions. The questions ask about the activities the teacher used with Mai.

1. What do you think about the teacher using English to teach the child how to read?
2. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
3. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?

Now, I'm going to describe to you a similar situation for Mai. In this situation, Mai is receiving some instruction in Hmong. I'm going to ask you the same kinds of questions about reading activities but I want to know what you think of doing the activities in Hmong. Remember there are no right or wrong answers to the questions. I am interested in hearing your opinion.

Scenario 2:

Mai is in the 9th grade. She came from California to Minnesota. At school Mai speaks in English most of the time. She speaks some Hmong at home. A bilingual teacher tested her English and Hmong skills. The bilingual teacher found that Mai has some trouble. It is hard for her to do school work in both languages. Her work is better in English. Last year Mai also took English reading and math tests. These tests are given to all Minnesota students in the 8th grade. Mai's scores on these tests were very low. Most students in the English Language Arts class read at a higher level. The teacher decided to help Mai with reading. The teacher will use these activities to help her improve her reading in Hmong.

Here is the same story for reference—(needs to be in Hmong)

How the Rooster Got His Crown

Many years ago, when the earth was new, there were six suns in the sky. It was very hot in the summer, but the rain came to keep the plants alive. One summer the rain did not come and the heat of the sun dried up the plants. The people did not have enough to eat. The king called together the wise people of the village to discuss how to save the harvest. He listened to their ideas. The oldest wise person said, "We can shoot the suns out of the sky with arrows. This is the only plan that will work." The king called his soldiers. The soldiers tried to shoot the suns in the sky but their arrows did not reach far enough. The king sent for a young prince who was

a famous hunter. The young prince said, “Arrows can not fly high enough to shoot the suns in the sky. We must shoot the suns’ reflection in the water.” He picked up his bow and arrow and went to the pond. The prince sent an arrow flying right into the middle of the first sun’s reflection in the water. The sun sank to the bottom of the pond. The young prince shot another arrow and the second sun sank to the bottom of the pond. He shot five arrows and sank five suns. The sixth sun became so frightened that he hid in a cave. The people called the sun but he refused to come out. The earth was dark for a long time. The king asked the wise people how to get the sun to come out of the cave. “Maybe our voices are not loud enough,” the wise people said. “We will call the tiger.” They took the tiger to the cave. The tiger roared loudly but the sun would not come out. “Perhaps the tiger was too loud,” they said. The wise people brought a cow to the cave. The cow went “MOO!” but still the sun did not come out. The wise people did not know what to do. Just then, a small rooster with a smooth shiny head walked near the cave. “COCK A DOODLE DOO,” he called. The sun liked the rooster’s call. He looked out of the cave to see what was making the beautiful sound. The people cheered. The sun came all the way out of the cave because he felt happy. The sunshine was warm and bright. The sun wanted to say thank you to the rooster for calling him out of the cave. The sun made a small red crown and placed it on the rooster’s head. That is why, from that time until now, roosters have worn a red crown to call the sun each morning.

Before reading

1. Have Mai read from a book other students are reading. Find out what words she can read and what words she needs still to learn.
2. Ask Mai questions on what she will read. Do this before she reads the story. Have a copy of the story in front of her. See if she understands the material she will read.
3. Give Mai a **story outline***. Review the story with her before she reads it.
4. Have Mai write **key words*** in the story. Let Mai hear the words, see the words, read the words aloud, and write the words.

During Reading

5. Explain the kind of story it is and show how the story looks in the book.
6. Show Mai how to read the words so she can learn to see how the words are structured.

After Reading

7. Have Mai draw a picture or write the story in her own words.
8. Help Mai make a **story map*** including key ideas in the story.
9. Teach Mai how to study key words and ideas about the story.

Questions to Parent

1. What do you think about the teacher using Hmong to teach the child how to read?
2. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
3. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for someone like Mai? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?

Your Child:

Now think about your child. If the student in the story was your child, not Mai, how would you answer these questions?

1. What do you think about the teacher using English to teach your child how to read?
2. What do you think about the teacher using Hmong to teach your child how to read?
3. Please look at the activities the teacher used before reading. How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
4. Please look at the activities during reading? How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
5. Please look at the activities after reading. How well do you think they work for your child? Really great, ok, not so well? What else should the teacher do?
6. Is there anything else you would like to share with us about your child at school? What other activities have teachers done with your child that helped them learn to read in either English or Hmong?

