STARS

2014

Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners Through Reading Strategies and Interventions(RSI) Workshops

Milagros Rivera
University of Central Florida

Part of the Education Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

STARS Citation

Rivera, Milagros, "Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners Through Reading Strategies and Interventions(RSI) Workshops" (2014). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4483.
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4483

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

ENHANCING THE READING STRATEGIES OF PARENTS OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LEARNERS THROUGH READING STRATEGIES AND INTERVENTIONS
(RSI) WORKSHOPS

by

MILAGROS RIVERA
B.A. InterAmerican University of Puerto Rico, 1980
M.Ed. Tarleton State University, 1997
M.Ed University of Texas, 1991

A dissertation proposal submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Child, Family and Community Sciences
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2012

Major Professor: Suzanne Martin

ABSTRACT

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandated that school districts and schools ensure that English Language Learners (ELLs) are provided with equitable opportunities and experiences that support student success academically. However, many ELL students have faced challenges at school, have not been academically successful, and struggle to read on grade level. NCLB has also mandated that elementary schools give parents the tools needed to support their children's learning in the home. Researchers have supported the importance of parental involvement in the academic success of children.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions increase after participating in a series of workshops specifically designed for the parents of English Language Learners. The professional development activities were delivered in a series of three workshops from March 26 to April 16 of 2011for three hours each Saturday. Results indicated that parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions increased after participating in the workshops

This dissertation is dedicated to my loving family, my husband, Luis Ramon, my daughter Vivian Marie, my son, Luis Fernando, my mother, Blanca and my father, Fernando. Thank you for your love, encouragement and support. This has been a long journey and without your support I could not have accomplished this goal.

To my children, Vivian and Luisito, I want you to know that one of the reasons I have pursued this doctoral degree is to help model and motivate you to continue your own education. Things in life don't come easy and one must work hard to overcome the obstacles and challenges that come our way. Perseverance! I love you both and only want the best for you.

To my husband, Luis Ramon; thank you for believing in me. Your love, encouragement, and support have gotten me where I am today. For all of the times you asked, "Are you finished yet?", I can now tell you, honey, that I am! Te quiero con todo mi corazon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge Dr. Suzanne Martin and thank her for her insight and vision in creating the National Urban Special Education Leadership Initiative. It was her determination that made this program possible for aspiring leaders. It is her love for serving students with disabilities and their families that inspired her to write a wonderful grant of which we became part. I am deeply grateful and honored to learn from you. Be assured that you can always count on me in the future.

I would also like to acknowledge all of the other members of the National Urban Special Education Leadership Initiative Cohort. Anna, Bruce, Gabe, Ilene, Karen, Kim, Lorrie, Maria, Mark, Margaret, Martha, and Tom; you are quite a group of individuals who gave me support and a shoulder to lean on throughout this journey. I am so grateful to have been part of such a dynamic group of leaders. These past five years have been quite an experience, and I thank God that we were able to share it together.

I also need to thank my committee members: Dr. Haiyan Bai, Dr. David Boote, and Dr. Jonathan McIntire. Thank you for reading my chapters, providing insight and your kind words throughout this process. I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, Tracey, Mary, Frida, Maggie, and Carmen for their encouragement and support. I am blessed to have you all in my life.

Lastly, I need to thank my family--Mami, Papi, Luis Ramon, Vivian, and Luisito and my sisters, Alice, Blancie, and Diana. Thank you for your love, support, and encouragement. It has been a long road, and you all have been there for me. I thank God for letting you all be part of my life. Gracias a todos! Los quiero muchisimo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education
Act (IDEA) mandate that school districts and schools ensure that English Language Learners
and students with disabilities are academically successful. Both laws require that high standards
are implemented in the instruction of reading with the goal of increasing academic achievement
within all identified subgroups in grades K-12. With the intent of all students become efficient
readers, both laws require specific standards be used when implementing reading instruction.
Through the implementation of research based intensive reading interventions, students can learn
to read and become academically successful (Henry & Peyton, 2006).

The number of students who are not reading on grade level has been increasing over the
years (NRP, 2000). Different methods and approaches have been used to teach children how to
read. The whole language approach to teaching reading is one method that gained strong
following in the 1980s and 1990s. It grew out of Chomsky's view of linguistic development and
Goodman's ideas that reading and writing were ideas that should be considered as wholes
(Goodman, 1967). However, the demographics have been dramatically changed in the United
States, and schools have been faced with teaching reading to a culturally and linguistically
diverse population. Many students from cultural and linguistically different backgrounds may
not have the foundation, skills and adequate vocabulary to learn to read in English. For this
reason, many of these students have not been academically successful and have been retained.
Because of the severity of the problem, the United States Congress asked the Department of

Education as well as the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to form a Reading Panel (1997) to conduct research on how children learn to read.

It was found, in research conducted by the National Reading Panel, that the best approach to reading instruction was one that incorporates explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, systematic phonics instruction, methods to improve fluency, and ways to enhance comprehension (NRP, 2000). Since these findings were published, this approach has been implemented in many schools throughout the United States.

Statement of the Problem

As the number of immigrant children has increased in the nation's public schools, so has the necessity for a quality education for all of them. The educational system has experienced significant difficulty finding effective ways to support the achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse students. There are many English Language Learners (ELLs) who are not reading on grade level and are not being successful academically compared to their non ELL peers. The United States Department of Education has estimated that more than five million school-age students in the United States are English Language Learners (National Clearinghouse for Language Acquisition, 2006).

Between 1979 and 2008, the number of school-age children (ages 5-17) who spoke a language other than English at home increased from 3.8 to 10.9 million or from 9% to 21% of the population in this age range. An increase from 18% to 21% was also evident between 2000 and 2008 (National Center for Education Statistics NCES, 2010). As reported in the Title III Biennial Report to Congress in 2006, there were more than 400 languages spoken by ELL

students attending American schools with nearly 80% of them identified as Spanish speakers and 5% speaking various Asian languages.

In order to meet the needs of the diverse school population in the United States, teachers and administrators have required additional training and preparation on how to teach children who speak English as a second language and come from different cultural backgrounds. With the accountability requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, states have become responsible for developing challenging academic standards, assessing students, and determining adequate yearly progress for schools and school districts. NCLB accountability measures have required public school districts to produce students who are proficient in speaking English and who can consistently perform well on subject matter assessments.

Background

Researchers have consistently reported that it takes an English Language Learner five to seven years to acquire a second language (Collier, 2001; Cummins, 1994). English Language Learners who enter U.S schools in the primary grades typically make good academic progress; however, many students fall behind around third grade because of the increasing cognitive demands of print based instruction. In the lower grades, students learn to read, and in fourth grade they start reading for content. In order for students to be academically successful, they must be able to read and comprehend what they are reading. This can be especially challenging for students trying to become proficient in English if they have not acquired the skills of decoding the English language. While simultaneously being required to use academic vocabulary and language, many students experience failure.

Throughout the United States, there has been an increase in the number of students not reading on grade level. The National Center for Education Statistics (2010) reported that the 2009 NAEP results indicated that the reading scores for U.S. fourth graders over the prior two years had remained flat, and the scores of eighth graders increased by one point. According to the president of the International Reading Association, Patricia Edwards, "The NAEP reading results indicate that we need to increase our efforts to provide ongoing, high-quality professional development in reading to educators at all levels. . . [thus] helping close the achievement gap and a need for increased emphasis on supporting children in poverty, English Language Learners and struggling readers" (Edwards, 2011, p. 3). Score gaps in reading persisted between White students and their Black and Hispanic peers. "Neither the 27-point score gap in 2009 between White and Black students nor the 22-point gap between White and Hispanic students was significantly different from the score gaps in previous assessment years, (Edwards, 2011, p. 3).

Reading

It is quite clear that reading is very important. However, a great number of students who struggle with reading beyond third grade exist. Focused and intensive reading intervention is the key to helping English Language Learners. The National Reading Panel reviewed research-based methodologies and overwhelmingly advocated a systemic approach to teach reading (Lyon & Chhabra, 2004). The use of a systemic, explicit, and intensive instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension yields fluent readers for struggling readers and English Language Learners as well (National Reading Panel, 2000).

Goodman (1996) claimed that the process readers use to make sense of text is a universal process. Whether students are reading in Spanish or Creole, they use the same background knowledge. They use the same linguistic cueing systems, and the same psychological strategies. Jensen (2006) proposed that the processes are the same in any language because of the similarities in brain physiology and function. This universal reading process helps explain why ELLs with adequate formal schooling who are literate in their first language learn to read in English more rapidly than students who are not fully literate in their first language (Linan-Thompson & Vaugh, 2007). Students with first language literacy still have to determine how the new language is structured in order to transfer many of the skills they use to read in their first language to English (Cummins, 1994).

The state of Florida has had a mandatory third grade retention law whereby students in third grade who score a level 1 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) cannot progress to the next grade unless they attend a four-week summer school and show an increase in their reading scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Thus, it has been critical in Florida, and throughout other parts of the country, that students receiving ELL services, including those with physical, intellectual, or emotional problems, receive instruction in reading that effectively improves their reading fluency and comprehension. Educators cannot accomplish this goal by themselves. They need to form partnerships with their students' family members and provide them with the tools to help their children become successful readers.

Parental Involvement

Parental involvement has been a priority of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002). Children benefit when parents and school work collaboratively. The U.S. Department of Education defined parental involvement as "regular two-way and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities" (NCLB, 2002). Henderson and Mapp (2002) reviewed studies on parental involvement and found that "students with involved parents, no matter what their income or background, were more likely to earn higher grades and test scores, be promoted, attend school regularly, have better social skills and improved behavior and graduate" (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 7). They also found that schools that succeed in engaging families from diverse backgrounds share three key practices:

1. Focusing on building trusting collaborative relationships among teachers, families and community members;
2. Recognizing, respecting and addressing families' needs and any class and cultural differences;
3. Embracing a philosophy of partnership where power and responsibility are shared. (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 7)

Schools have been challenged with developing ways to reach out to parents who traditionally have been isolated from the schools because of language differences. Many times, the strengths of parents from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are overlooked. Just because parents do not speak English does not mean that they cannot play a significant role in the education of their children. Regardless of parents' linguistic and academic backgrounds, they can and should play a significant role in supporting students' academic progress. Schools have the obligation to facilitate this collaboration.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether parents' knowledge of reading strategies and intervention increased after participating in a series of workshops specifically designed for the parents of English Language Learners. Also investigated was whether parents were able to apply the reading strategies they learned with their child at home. Increasing the knowledge of parents on reading strategies should positively affect a child's school performance and academic achievement (Sheldon, 2003).

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. Does the participation of parents of English Language Learners in Reading Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops increase their knowledge on reading strategies and interventions?

2. What relationship, if any, exits between family demographics (e.g.: gender, ethnicity, education level, income) and participants' learning outcomes from participating in the RSI workshops?

3. What feedback, if any, did parents report after attending the RSI workshops about the implementation of reading strategies used at home to support their child's reading achievement?

<center>Dependent Variables</center>

The dependent variables were the knowledge scores of the pre/posttests. These scores were derived using multiple choice questions.

<center>Independent Variable</center>

The independent variable in this study was the series of reading strategies and intervention workshops conducted for parents. The workshops, as defined in the definition of terms section, used materials from the Families Building Better Readers (FBBR), Blueprint of Success. FBBR was funded by the Florida Department of Education's Just Read, Florida Initiative, managed by the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium. The FBBR was recognized by the 2004 State Legislature in Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 364 that provided for participation in FBBR, as one of the options for supplemental services required of third-grade students scoring Level 1 on the FCAT.

Workshop I included basic background knowledge on how English Language Learners learn a second language and a systemic approach to reading. Workshop 2 included Practice Makes Perfect and Games Readers Play. Workshop 3 included Everyday Reading, You Are What You Read, and Reading Interventions via Technology.

<center>Research Design</center>

This research used a mixed method design. This study used a quasi-experimental pre- and posttest design. Focus interview questions were used to access qualitative data.

<center>8</center>

The population of the United States has been dramatically increasing with English Language Learners (ELL), and this trend has been seen in Orange County and throughout Florida. Because there was a large population of English Language Learners in Orange County Public Schools, the researcher targeted the Spanish speaking parents of ELL students for this study.

The Spanish speaking parents of English Language Learners from four Title I schools in the Southwest Learning Community of Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida were recruited to participate in this study since the majority of the ELL students at the four participating schools were Hispanic. These schools offer both One-Way Bilingual Spanish and sheltered programs and have a high percentage of ELL students.   The primary goal of the One Way Bilingual Spanish program is for students to develop bilingual and biliterate proficiencies and to achieve academically at grade level. Sheltered instruction is an approach for teaching content to English Language Learners in strategic ways that make the subject matter concepts comprehensible while promoting the students' English language development.

Sample

A flyer was sent to all of the Spanish speaking parents of English Language Learners at the four schools inviting them to be part of the study. Follow-up calls were made to responding parents. All respondents interested in participating in the study constituted the sample and were randomly assigned to either the treatment group or control group. The treatment group

participated in the Reading Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops. The control group did

not receive any training.

<p style="text-align:center">Data Analysis</p>

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to obtain frequencies, percentages, and means

relative to the variables of gender, ethnicity/nationality income, and education level. A t- test

was used to examine pre- and posttest data. An alpha level of .05 was used as the criterion for

level of significance. Based on interviews conducted to obtain qualitative data, the researcher

documented themes that emerged.

<p style="text-align:center">Definitions</p>

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS): conversational language that is both

context-embedded and cognitively undemanding. It takes an ELL about 2 years for ELLs to

develop BICS (Freeman & Freeman, 2007).

Bilingual Education: Any program that makes some use of both the student's primary

language and English for instruction (Freeman & Freeman, 2007).

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP): language that is context-reduced

and cognitively demanding. It takes four to nine years for ELLs to develop CALP (Freeman &

Freeman, 2007).

Cognates: words that are similar in form and meaning in both English and another

language (Linan-Thompson & Vaugh, 2007).

Families Building Better Readers (FBBR): Blueprint for Success, a family literacy program that was developed by Angela Martin for the Florida Department of Education in 2003.

Sheltered Instruction: instruction for ELLs using techniques to make the academic content taught in English more comprehensible. This approach allows students to learn language and content as the same time (Freeman & Freeman, 2007).

English Language Learners (ELL): national-origin-minority students who are Limited English Proficient (LEP). The term ELL is often used over Limited English Proficient as it highlights accomplishments rather than deficits (U.S. Department of Education, (2010).

Grapheme: the smallest part of written language that represents a phoneme in the spelling of a word (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Knowledge: identified as the level of information acquired by participant (Freeman & Freeman, 2007).

Phoneme: the smallest part of spoken language that makes a difference in the meaning of words (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Phonemic Awareness: the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the individual sounds-phonemes in spoken words (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Phonics: the understanding that there is a predictable relationship between phonemes and graphemes (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Phonological Awareness: the broad term that includes phonemic awareness, In addition to phonemes, phonological awareness activities can involve work with rhymes, words, syllables, and onsets and rimes (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Reading Fluency: the ability to read quickly, knowing what the words are and what they mean, and properly expressing certain words--putting the right feeling, emotion, or emphasis on the right word or phrase (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Reading Comprehension: intentional thinking during which meaning is constructed through interaction between text and the reader (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Regular Education: A set of educational experiences which a child would receive in a school or school district in which that child enters at kindergarten and proceeds through school without being labeled "handicapped" or in a need of special services (Lilly, 1998).

Self-efficacy: "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations" (Bandura, 1995, p. 2).

Systemic Approach: explicit instruction in skill building where children divide a complex skill such as reading into its smallest components (letters) before moving on to tackle larger components (sounds, words, and sentences). By learning these letter-sound relationships the student is provided with a decoding formula that can be applied whenever they encounter an unfamiliar word (National Reading Panel, 1997).

Limitations

This study was limited to the parents of English Language Learners attending four Title I schools in the Southwest Learning Community in Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida, the 10th largest school district in the United States. At the time of this study, the demographics of the area were primarily culturally and linguistically diverse with many families who had limited financial resources. All of the schools included in the sample had Title I status,

indicating at least 75% of the students in attendance were provided with the Free and Reduced

Meal Program. Therefore, the findings of this study will be applicable to a discrete section of the

ELL population and their families.

<center>Significance of Study</center>

This study was anticipated to provide information that could guide elementary schools to

ordain the enhancement of the reading strategies of the parents of English Language Learners

after participating in RSI workshops. It has also resulted in a contribution to the literature on

parental involvement and English Language Learning. Although there has been research

conducted on parental involvement and its impact on student achievement, the literature on

parental involvement and the reading achievement of English Language Learners has been

limited. This study contributes to the Families Building Better Readers initiative by adding an

ELL component to it.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of the literature related to the central issues with which

this research is concerned. Literature related to reading and parental involvements in schools are

two major topics that have been addressed. Discussed in the chapter are (a) literacy problems of

children in the United States, (b) the influence of state and federal government and national

organizations, (c) various approaches to teaching reading, and (d) the impact of family and

school engagement on literacy acquisition.

Reading

For decades, teachers have been teaching children how to read. It is known that reading

has been the foundation of an effective education and is allows students to be successful in

school. However, "approximately eight million young people between fourth and twelfth grade

struggle to read at grade level." Classrooms across America are filled with students who come

with a wide range of skills, abilities, and English proficiency. Some of the students are on grade

level, while others are not. Illiteracy in the United States is growing at a disturbing rate and that

fact has not changed much over the years. It continues to be a critical problem for the children

and our nation. There is still controversy over which instructional approach and method yield

higher reading achievement results (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2003). While the

debate continues over what approach to use, reading deficiencies continue to grow. According to

the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2005), the number of functionally illiterate adults is increasing by approximately two and one quarter million persons each year.

Since the implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002, retention of students due to deficiency in reading has significantly increased. The rate of retention in the U.S. has been estimated at about 15% each year (National Association of School Psychologists, 2003), and between 30% and 50% of all students have been retained at least once before their ninth grade year (National Association of School Psychologists, 2004). In addition to these statistics, the percentage of children identified as having a learning disability has increased from 2% in 1973 to over 12% in 2004 (Kilgore, 2005). This situation is alarming because, according to Lyon (2002), students can learn to read regardless of their backgrounds. According to Lyon (2002), Chief of the Child Development and Behavior Branch of the National Institutes of Health, in order to make it in life, people living in America need to learn to read. Reading supports the development of all other academic skills and is the predictor of academic success. Even though there has been much written on how to teach reading, scores have not increased over the years. There needs to be a change on how reading is taught to students.

Reading and the Brain

Scientists have studied how the brain works to learn the best ways to teach students how to read. By using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) technology, scientists have been able to track brain activity during the reading process. According to Shaywitz (2003), skilled readers rely significantly on the parieto-temporal and occipito-temporal areas in the back of the brain. On the contrary, poor readers "underutilize" these areas in the back of the brain.

Researchers have found that the brain activity of struggling readers can be changed by using evidence-based reading instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics (Aylward et al., 2003; Shaywitz et al. 2004). Several of the approaches that have been used to teach reading are explained further.

<div align="center">Evidence-based Programs</div>

Researchers have stressed the use of evidenced based programs. To be described as evidence based, the program must have been tested and shown to have a record of success in which children can be expected to make adequate gains in reading achievement. The term, research-based instruction, has also been used to convey the same meaning. The International Reading Association, (2007) argued that in order for a program or practice to be effective, it needs to be objective, valid, reliable, and systematic. However, the use of an evidence based reading instructional program does not guarantee reading success for all students. Instructional leaders and teachers must evaluate methods and programs very carefully for their school and student populations. It is imperative that they select and then implement with fidelity the instructional strategies and materials that are a good match for their students.

<div align="center">International Reading Association Recommendations</div>

Two instructional methodologies that are recognized by the International Reading Association and used to teach reading are phonics or systemic approach, and the whole language approach. In the systemic approach, children are taught to dissect unfamiliar words into parts and then join the parts together to form words (Lyon & Chhabra, 2004). The whole language approach is less focused on the practice of using phonics as a reading instructional practice.

(Lyon & Chhabra). It stresses the flow and meaning of the text, emphasizing reading for meaning and using language in ways that relate to students' lives and cultures (Kilgore, 2005). Supporters of the whole language approach have stated that it can be used across the curriculum to teach reading. In contrast, backers of a systemic approach to instruction insist that a direct, sequential mode of teaching enables students to master reading in an organized way.

Whole Language

Children in whole language classrooms typically do as well or better on standardized reading tests and subtests (Ribowsky, 1985) than their non-whole language counterparts. In the Kasten and Clarke study (1989), the whole language kindergartners performed significantly better than their counterparts on all subtests of the Metropolitan Readiness Test. In the Manning, Manning, and Long (1989) study, children in the whole language classroom did better on the Stanford Achievement Test's subtest on word parts. They also read with greater comprehension and with greater accuracy than children who are taught with other reading methodologies.

In Freppon (1988, 1991), the skills group attempted to sound out words more than twice as often as the others, but the literature-based group was more successful in doing so as evidenced by a 53% success rate compared with a 32% success rate for the skills group. Children in whole language classrooms seem to develop vocabulary, spelling, grammar, and punctuation skills as well as or better than children in more traditional classrooms (Elly 1991). They seem to be more able to read for meaning (Stice & Bertrand, 1990). These studies indicated that children academic achievement in reading was higher in classrooms that used the whole language approach. The whole language approach was widely used across the nation in

the 1980s and 1990s; however, once the National Reading Panel (NRP) released its recommendations, which were subsequently included in the No Child Left Behind legislation, a systemic or phonic approach to reading became the preferred approach by public schools in the United States.

<div align="center">Systemic Approach</div>

In 1997, the United States Congress asked the Department of Education and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to form a Reading Panel to research how children learn to read. As part of this research, the panel was given the task of finding the most effective research based strategies and methods to teach children how to read. The panel was composed of individuals who were involved in scientific reading research, teachers, and school administrators. They examined the work of the National Research Council (NRC) Committee on the prevention of reading difficulties which had conducted extensive research on the acquisition of beginning reading skills (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). However, the NRC had not addressed which instructional strategies or approaches worked well with widely diverse student subpopulations. The National Reading Panel reviewed more than 100,000 studies and examined research that had addressed achievement of one or more skills in reading with large population of students that were effective with different subgroups, e.g., ELL, black, white, and special education. Only studies that were regarded as high quality and peer-reviewed were included in their review. On April 13, 2000, the National Reading Panel submitted its report, "The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read," at a hearing before the U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and

Education. This report led to major changes in how reading instruction is provided throughout the country.

The National Reading Panel's Findings

The National Reading Panel's analysis made it clear that the best overall approach to reading instruction was one that incorporates explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, systematic phonics instruction, methods to improve fluency, and ways to enhance comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000): children who learned to read through specific instruction in phonemic awareness improved their reading skills more than those who learned without attention to phonemic awareness.

The findings of the National Reading Panel were highlighted in President George Bush's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (2002). They were also endorsed by the National Institute for Literacy (NICHD), which is a part of a larger organization called National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the U.S. Department of Education who formed the Partnership for Reading. The Partnership works to ensure that the methods of reading instruction used in the classroom reflect evidence-based methods (Partnership for Reading, 2001).

The National Reading Panel reported its findings which were incorporated in the NCLB which mandated schools meet the needs of all students. However, they did not provide specific direction as to how English Language Learners best learn to read. The current study builds upon and contributes to work on reading interventions for use with English Language Learners (ELLs) and how with Parental Involvement students can become academically successful.

Although studies in reading have been conducted to examine how children learn to read, there has not been extensive research on what works best with ELL students and how to include their families in helping their children become better readers. As such, this study provides additional insight into how schools can form partnerships with parents of ELL students and provide them with the necessary tools to help their children at home. Also investigated in this study was the extent to which parents were able to apply reading strategies and interventions they learned in RSI workshops with their children. Increasing the knowledge of parents on reading strategies should positively affect a child's school performance and academic achievement.

<div align="center">English Language Learners</div>

Research studies have been conducted over the years on bilingual education programs for English Language Learners. There has been considerable debate and controversy as to whether children should be taught in their first language or in English. Many states and school districts offer bilingual education for their students. However, states such as California have eliminated their bilingual programs even though researchers have reported that children who are taught in their first language are able to become academically successful in English. Regardless, there needs to be more focus on the quality of instruction for English Language Learners (August & Hakuta, 1997; Christian & Genesee, 2001).

According to Fitzgerald (1995), effective beginning reading programs for English Language Learners are likely to be similar to those students who are English proficient as long as appropriate accommodations are provided to them. The following are several programs that have shown to be effective with English Language Learners: Success for All (Slavin &

Madden, 2000, 2001), Direct Instruction (Adams & Engelmann, 1996); Reading Recovery (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer,1994), phonetic tutoring (Wasik & Slavin, 1993) and the Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC) (Calderón, Hertz-Lazarowitz, & Slavin 1998).

In 2006, The National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth reported the following: (a) Acquiring reading skills in a second language is similar to the process of acquiring reading skills in a first language; the essential components of effective reading instruction have a positive influence on the literacy development of English Language Learners; (b) English Language Learners also need more work in oral language development, vocabulary and text comprehension than English speakers; and (c) When feasible, students should be taught to read in their first language in order to develop their literacy in English (August & Shanahan 2006).

The Voyager Passport Reading Intervention Program is a research based reading program that integrates the five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension (Voyager Expanded Learning, 2008). This program provides for flexible pacing so that students can have additional time to master concepts. It has been used as a reading intervention program with ELL students who are not reading on grade level in many bilingual and sheltered classes in Orange County Public Schools.

Although there has been extensive research on reading, there are many ELL students not reading on grade level. Researchers such as Yan and Lin (2002) have determined that greater parent involvement in children's learning positively affects the child's performance.

Researchers, over a period of 40 years, have clearly demonstrated the importance of parental and family involvement in children's education. Parents are a child's first teacher. A parent is the one who teaches a young child how to eat, talk, and walk, just three examples of a myriad of skills. Once a child enters school, partnerships need to be formed between the school and the family in order to assist in a child's learning. Greater parent involvement in children's learning positively affects the child's school performance, including higher academic achievement (Yan & Lin, 2002).

Parental Involvement has been a priority in NCLB (2002). It mandates that elementary schools give parents the tools they need to support their child's learning in the home, communicate regularly with families about their children's academic progress, provide opportunities for family workshops, and offer parents chances to engage in parent leadership activities at the school (NCLB). NCLB also advocated the need for English Language Learners to make annual yearly progress in reading and math. With the changing demographics, and a growing rate of non- English speakers, schools need to be creative and persistent, in their efforts to connect with educationally and disadvantaged parents.

Schools have the challenge of reaching out to a group of parents who traditionally have been isolated from the schools because of language differences. Many times, the strengths of parents of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are overlooked. The bond between parents and children is the most important relationship in society. Regardless of parents' linguistic and academic backgrounds, they can play a significant role in supporting students' academic progress. Schools have the obligation to facilitate this collaboration.

In discussing effective outreach strategies, Delgado-Gaitan (2004) stressed the importance of educators understanding the ways which members of different cultural communities viewed their roles in the schooling of their children. In many cultures, the responsibility for schooling is seen to rest on the teachers and the schools (Chrispeels & Rivero, 2001). Another challenge is that many parents would like to help, but they believe that they cannot support their children's academic development because of their lack of formal education or lack of English proficiency. In order to change this mindset, parents need to be encouraged to partner with the school in order to support their children.

According to Camacho (2007) culture is a significant influence when working with families of diverse backgrounds. It is critical when initiating contact with parents that professionals be sensitive and respectful of the different customs, values and beliefs of parent involvement. Cultural identity is influenced on an array of factors including gender, religion, age, social status, nationality and ability. A parent's ability varies from culture to culture in the context of their needs and public perceptions.

Reyes-Blanes (2002) provided a framework on what to consider when designing activities to increase parent involvement with cultural diverse families. Educators need to provide accommodations in the areas of need of cultural diverse families. When working with culturally and linguistically diverse families, four areas need to be addressed: specific information and support, the use of the first language, creating culturally sensitive environments and the availability of resources.

Martinez & Perez (2008) of the National PTA stated that traditionally Latino men did not get involved in their children's education. It seemed rude for parents to interfere with the school

and their child's education. However, Latino families have begun to play a larger part in the

U.S. educational system. Latino men have "broken the mold" by becoming involved in their

children's education. It is not only the mothers who attend PTA meetings and get involved in

their child's school; it also the fathers.

One of the barriers to developing and maintaining open communication and collaboration

between schools, parents, and teachers, has been the language. There are many parents who do

not speak English and are intimidated regarding school attendance because they feel that they

will not be able to communicate with teachers and staff. Schools need to be a place where both

students and parents feel welcome at all times. Effective partnerships result when reciprocal

relationships are established between families and schools that allow for the development and

enhancement of mutual trust (Powell, Zehm, & Garcia, 1996).

Organizing for parental involvement and community outreach takes on an added element

in schools comprised of students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Educators

should consider such questions: What happens to second language learner when they enter

schools and begin a new journey of learning English? What does it mean to become an English

speaker, both to the students and their families? What can schools do to maximize the schooling

experience?

Increasing student achievement is the mission of a school, but it can have the added

benefit of strengthening family ties as well. When English Language Learners enter school, they

move into a new world that does not resemble what is familiar to them and their parents.

Children of immigrant families in the United States are more likely to learn English and move

more quickly than their parents into the new culture. Schools need to ensure that they

24

communicate with parents in their native language when feasible. The Florida Partnership for Family Involvement in Education has indicated that the most effective forms of parental engagement are (a) providing parents with oral and written communication and (b) school wide activities.

A leading model of parent and community involvement was developed by Epstein at John Hopkins University (Epstein, Coates, Salinas, Sanders, & Simon, 1997, 2001). It has been adopted by the National Parent Teacher Association (National Standards for Family and School Partnerships, 2009). This research based model outlines six types of parent and community involvement.

1. Parenting--Help all families establish home environments to support children as student.

2. Communicating--Design effective forms of school-to-home and home-to-school communication about school programs and children's programs.

3. Volunteering--Recruit and organize parent help and support.

4. Learning at Home--Provide information and ideas to families about how to help students at home with homework, and other curriculum-related activities, decisions, and planning.

5. Decision Making--Include parents in school decisions and in the development of parent leaders and representatives.

6. Collaborating with Community--Identify, integrate resources and services from the community to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning and development.

According to Epstein (2004), these six types of involvement "can guide the development of a balanced, comprehensive program of partnerships, including opportunities for family involvement at school and at home" (p. 15). Important results for students will occur if implemented well.

Family and School Engagement

Research indicates that children benefit significantly when their families are involved in their education (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). Lopez, Rosenberg and Westmoreland of the Harvard Family Research Project (2009) explained that family engagement is a shared responsibility. Families, schools and communities can create a shared responsibility for children's learning and academic success. "This three dimensional approach includes: (1) creating opportunities for family engagement; (2). building roles that outline families' and school's responsibilities; and (3) learning about effective ways to engage families in children's learning" (p.1).

Providing Opportunities

Schools need to provide parents and family members with different activities to support and enhance children's learning. Activities such as open house, parent-teacher conferences and PTA meetings are part of family engagement. However, many families see engagement as what they do at home with their children. When parents help their children with homework, or studying for a test, they are engaged. Family engagement takes place when student learning occurs.

Roles

Families and schools need to actively engage in conversations with each other in order to agree on the roles they will assume. Partnerships can evolve and roles can be defined though parent-teacher conferences. Parent-teacher conferences can take place a variety of ways such as face to face, via phone call, email, or daily agendas. Teachers have the responsibility of sending work home and informing parents of their child's progress by writing in the student's daily agenda. Parents need to check their child's agenda on a daily basis and communicate with the teacher. Family engagement will take place if this is done consistently.

Schools and administrators also have a role in family engagement. They must establish clear expectations, compacts, and accountability standards for family engagement. It is an administrator's responsibility to ensure that families are provided with numerous opportunities throughout the school year for them to be part of their child's learning. This can be accomplished by having flexible scheduling of workshops and training to accommodate parents' work schedules.

Learning

The third dimension of family engagement consists of learning from personal experiences, peers, and research. Together, families and schools can learn from activities they have including teacher-parent conferences, workshops, and curriculum nights among other events and activities. Parents need to look at the activities in which they participate and how to improve them. Additionally, administrators need to investigate what high performing schools do in the area of family engagement and replicate it in their schools.

Parental Involvement and Literacy Acquisition

Researchers have indicated that involving parents in their children's literacy acquisition will result in better outcomes for the children. It is important, therefore, that parents understand which of the many parent-child interactions are associated with a child's improvement in literacy.

According to Fantuzzo, Tighe, & Childs (2000) and Hill and Craft (2003), parental involvement can be categorized in three areas: (a) school-based involvement; (b) home-school conferencing; and (c) home based involvement. In the first category, school-based involvement, parental activities are in the child's school environment. Parents could volunteer in the child's classroom, chaperone field trips, help with fundraising and help teachers with classroom activities. In the second category, home-school conferencing, communication between parents, teachers and school staff regarding children's academic achievement and progress takes place. This could occur during parent/teacher conferences or through daily agendas, phone calls, and emails. The third category, home-based involvement, involves parents actively encouraging their children to engage in learning in the home setting. Parents can review their child's homework, spend time working with their child on reading and writing skills, or bring home books or educational videos for their children.

Joint book reading is one of the most significant parent-child activities that promotes early literacy (Bus, van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995). Parents' listening to their children read also has a positive effect on literacy development. Toomey (1993) found that schools that sent books home with general information about how to encourage children to read and techniques on

how to coach children on reading showed greater benefits for children who were at risk of reading failure.

In 2006, Senechal conducted a meta-analytic review of family literacy interventions. She looked at 14 intervention studies that represented 1,174 families and found that parental involvement has a positive impact on children's reading acquisition. There were three types of parental involvement in the review, and they differed in their effectiveness. She found that when parents taught a "specific literacy skill to their children, it was two times more effective than having parents listen to their children read and six time more effective than encouraging parents to read to their children" (Senechal, 2006, p. i). It was also noted that it did not matter if parents received supportive feedback during the intervention. In addition, the "duration of the intervention did not moderate its effectiveness" (p.i).

Researchers have determined that parents can teach their children to read. However, schools need to teach parents how to do so. One study showed that parent education programs can have a significant effect on motivators of parental involvement at both the elementary and secondary levels by increasing parents' knowledge of how to be involved. When schools provide information in a culturally sensitive manner, Latino families will respond (Chrispeels & Rivero, 2001).

In 2005, Jeynes conducted a meta-analysis of 77 studies to determine the overall effects of parental involvement on K-12 students' academic achievement. He found higher student achievement is linked to parental involvement. Students whose parents were highly involved had higher academic scores that those of parents who were less involved. Similarly, Henderson and Mapp (2002) conducted research on behalf of the Southwest Educational Laboratory and found

that students who have involved parents, no matter their income or background, were likely to have "(1) higher grades and test scores, (2) better attendance, (3) higher graduation rates, and (4) greater enrollment in post-secondary education" (p. 7).

According to Turnbull (2006), it is essential for families/professional partnerships to recognize that families are diverse and have unique dynamic social systems. Educators need to gather information before, during, and after interactions with families. Such valuable information is required in order to plan and carry out successful parent involvement interactions.

This researcher acknowledges that parents have strengths and can influence their children's education if they are taught how to support them with reading development in the home. In order for students to be academically successful in school they must be able to read and comprehend what they are reading. By increasing the knowledge of parents on reading strategies and interventions students' academic achievement should be impacted.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was conducted with Spanish speaking parents of English Language Learners from four Title I bilingual center schools in the South West Learning Community in Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida. Data collected were analyzed to determine (a) if there was an increase in reading strategies and interventions parents used with their children and (b) parents' perceptions of how best to work with their children at home as participants in their child's education.

This chapter includes a description of the methods and procedures used to conduct the research. Included is information related to the design of the study, the research questions, the population, and sample size. The Reading Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops, which were conducted for parents of English Language Learners, are described. Also discussed are the procedures employed to collect and analyze data including reliability and validity issues.

Research Design

This research used a mixed method design, which was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. In quantitative research, numeric data are used to conduct hypotheses test and answer quantitative research questions (Ary, Jacobs, Rasavieh & Soresnsen, 2006). A quasi-experimental pre- and posttest design was employed. Interview questions were used to obtain qualitative data. "Interviews are used to gather data on subjects' opinions, beliefs and feelings about a situation in their own words" (Ary et al., 2006, p. 480).

<u>Research Questions</u>

The following research questions were used to guide the study:

1. Does the participation of parents of English Language Learners in Reading

    Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops increase their knowledge on

    reading strategies and interventions?

2. What relationship, if any, exits between family demographics (e.g.: gender,

    ethnicity, education level, income) and participants' leaning outcomes from

    participating in the RSI workshops?

3. What feedback, if any, did parents report after attending the RSI workshops

    about the implementation of reading strategies used at home to support their

    child's reading achievement?

<u>Dependent Variables</u>

The dependent variables were knowledge scores of the pre/posttest. The scores were

collected using multiple choice questions.

<u>Independent Variable</u>

The independent variable in this study was the series of Reading Strategies and

Intervention workshops conducted for parents. The workshops, defined in the definition of terms

section, used materials from the Families Building Better Readers (FBBR), Blueprint of Success.

FBBR was funded by the Florida Department of Education's Just Read, Florida Initiative,

managed by the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium. The FBBR was recognized, by the

2004 State Legislature in Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 364 that provides participation in FBBR, as one of the options for supplemental services required of third grade students scoring Level 1 on the FCAT.

Workshop I included basic background knowledge on how English Language Learners learn a second language and a systemic approach to reading. Workshop 2 included Practice Makes Perfect and Games Readers Play. Workshop 3 included Everyday Reading, You Are What You Read, and Reading Interventions via technology.

Population

Parents of English Language Learners from four Title I schools in the Southwest Learning Community of Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida were recruited to participate in this study. A flyer was sent to all of the Spanish speaking parents of English Language Learners at the four schools inviting them to be part of the study (Appendix A). Follow-up calls were made to responding parents.

Sample

The sample consisted of a single group comprised of all responding parents from which two groups (treatment and control) were randomly created. The treatment group participated in the RSI workshops. The control group did not receive any treatment.

Participants

The participants were randomly selected from the Spanish speaking parents of ELL students whose children were enrolled at any of the four Title I bilingual center schools in the

South West Learning Community of Orange County Public Schools. The goal was to have 50

participants in the treatment only group. The final number of participants was 26.

Procedures

A questionnaire/survey, printed in both English and Spanish, served as a pretest which

was administered to all parents prior to the first workshop (Appendix B). The three workshops,

conducted in both English and Spanish, were held at Sadler Elementary School on Saturday

mornings for three hours per week during the months of March 2011 and April 2011. Materials

were also provided in English, and Spanish. This was important as many of the attending parents

were English Language Learners themselves. The posttest was administered upon completion of

all of the workshops. Finally, a focus group responded to four questions at the end of the last

workshop.

The series of RSI workshops incorporated the Families Building Better Readers (FBBR),

Blueprint for Success, a family literacy program that was developed by Angela Martin for the

Florida Department of Education in 2003. FBBR demonstrates ways parents can help their

children with reading practices at home. There are 10 strategies that are referred to as blueprints

which are grouped and organized by the following four themes: (a) Practice Makes Perfect

which includes choosing the right book and guiding reading practice, (b) Games Readers Play

demonstrates how to build reading fluency, increase the number of sight words, and understand

the relationship between letters and sounds, (c) Everyday Reading provides practice reading

real-world texts and expanding a child's vocabulary through rich conversation, and (d) You Are

What You Read provides ways to find inexpensive reading materials, how to select high-interest

motivating reading material, and how to model to children what effective readers do through interactive read-alouds.

Through the RSI workshops, the researcher provided participants with (a) background knowledge on how ELL students acquire a second language and (b) the five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. Although FBBR, Blueprint for Success workshops were conducted in both English and Spanish, they did not specifically address of needs of the parents of ELL students in regard to basic interpersonal communication skills and the cognitive academic language proficiency.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was a pre-/posttest developed by the researcher and the Educator in Residence of the University of Central Florida. The test questions were created based on information provided in the FBBR trainer and participants' manuals, *Putting Reading First* and *Classroom Instruction that Works with English Language Learners*. The pre-/posttest questions were validated by a panel of experts (reading specialists, reading coaches, and multilingual/RTI coaches from Orange County Public Schools).

Data Collection

The following procedures were used to collect the quantitative and qualitative data for this research study. First, IRB approval was requested from the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once IRB approval was granted (Appendix C), a letter was submitted to the Director of Testing and Accountability of Orange County Public Schools

requesting permission to conduct the study with a letter explaining the purpose of the study.

Once approval was granted by Orange County Public Schools (Appendix D), the principals of

the four schools in the South West Learning Community were contacted and given details about

the workshops (Appendix E). A flyer was sent to the schools inviting the Spanish speaking

parents of ELL students to attend the workshops and be part of the study (Appendix B).

Participants were randomly assigned to either the intervention or control group and registered for

the workshops. A participant survey was sent to each parent requesting biographical information

and pre-test data to be completed prior to the first workshop (Appendix B). Agendas (Appendix

F), workshop reminders (Appendix G), related materials (Appendix H), and evaluations

(Appendixes I and J) were provided for each of the workshops. At the conclusion of the study,

participants completed a post workshop test (Appendix A). A focus group was also conducted,

and four questions (Appendix K) were posed to parents in a group setting regarding their

perceptions as to how parent participation in the RSI workshops might help their children

improve in reading.

Data Analysis

This study was conducted to investigate if selected components in a series of RSI

workshops were helpful to the parents of English Language Learners in supporting their children

in reading. Specifically, the research examined the relationship between the treatment

(participation in the RSI workshop) and the participants' knowledge of reading strategies used to

support their child. Also examined was the influence that participating in the workshops had on

the level of knowledge participants had about using reading strategies and interventions.

Demographics were also studied to determine any correlations with outcomes in knowledge gains.

Descriptive statistics were used to obtain frequencies, percentages, and means relative to the variables of gender, income, and education level. A t-test was used to examine pre- and posttest data. An alpha level of .05 was used as the criterion for level of significance. Qualitative data were obtained using a focus group, and themes emerging from the interviews were documented. Both multiple choice questions and open ended questions were used in this study.

Due to the fact that the relatively small sample yielded somewhat small group sizes, a nonparametric test was run to address this issue. Since nonparametric statistics do not depend on meeting normality assumptions, these tests are good choices for very small samples.

Research Question 2 was posed to examine whether parents meeting different demographic criteria varied in their test scores between pre- and posttests. If this examination were to utilize parametric statistics, a mixed-model ANOVA would be the test of choice, as it would involve one repeated, within-subjects measure (pre to post) and one independent, between-subjects measure (demographic group).

In order to accommodate this issue, the difference value between the pre- and posttest served as the dependent variable. To keep the focus on the difference in independent group results on the gain score, two different alternatives statistical methods were selected. For the variables of parent level of education and nationality, the Kruskal-Wallis test was selected. This test is the nonparametric equivalent of a one-way ANOVA in which a difference in mean rank is sought between three or more groups. For the variables of gender and income, the Mann-Whitney was

selected. This nonparametric equivalent of an independent t-test determines the presence of a difference in mean, ranks between two groups.

Reliability and Validity

A pre-/posttest developed by this researcher and the Educator in Residence at the University of Central Florida was utilized for the current study. The questions were formulated with the assistance of information provided in the FBBR trainer and participant's manuals, Putting Reading First and Classroom Instruction designed for working with English Language Learners. The pre-/posttest questions were validated by a panel of experts including reading specialists, reading coaches, and Multilingual/RTI coaches from Orange County Public Schools. A series of three workshops on reading strategies and interventions were conducted as the treatment. Because the information obtained from the FBBR questionnaire was qualitative in nature, there was no need to provide a statistical test of reliability.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether parents' knowledge of reading

strategies and interventions increased after participating in a series of workshops specifically

designed for the parents of English Language Learners. Also examined was the extent to which

parents were able to apply the reading strategies they learned with their child at home.

Enhancing the reading strategies of parents of English Language Learners through Reading

Strategies and Intervention (RSI) Workshops were delivered in a series of three workshops from

March 26 to April 16, 2011. The workshops were designed to address (a) how English Language

Learners acquire a second language, (b) the five components of reading, (c) reading strategies

from Families Building Better Readers, and (d) reading interventions and technology. The

workshops were each three hours in length and were held on three Saturdays. They were provided

in both Spanish and English by the researcher, an ESOL Consultant, and a Parent Coordinator.

Following is a summary of the analysis of the data for the three research questions which

were used to guide the study. Each research question is stated followed by supportive narrative

and tabular displays used to present the results.

Data Analysis for Research Question 1

Does the participation of parents of English Language Learners in Reading Strategies and

Intervention (RSI) workshops increase their knowledge on reading strategies and

interventions?

To examine if the participation of parents of English Language Learners in Reading

Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops increased their knowledge on reading strategies and

interventions, a 14- item pre- and post- multiple choice test developed by the researcher and the

Educator in Residence from the University of Central Florida was administered to all of the

participating parents. The test was administered on the morning of the first workshop and again at

the end of the final workshop. To keep the individual participant's scores anonymous, each

participant was assigned a number which they put on the top of their test as an identifier.

Participants had the choice of taking the test either in English or Spanish. A total of 26

participants took the pre- and posttests. Twenty-five of the participants elected to take their tests

in Spanish. Only one participant chose to take the test in English because she is English dominant.

She had attended school in Texas and learned to read and write in English. She learned to speak

Spanish at home. Participants were reassured that they did not need to worry if they did not know

the answers on the pre-test since they would be learning these concepts during the three days of

workshops.

Data for all of the 26 participants who attended the final workshop and completed the pre-

and posttests were included in the statistical analysis (N = 26). Responses to each of the questions

were entered on a spread sheet for both the pre- and posttests for each participant. Responses were

scores, and a percentage was obtained for each participant's pre- and posttest. An independent t-

test was used to determine if there were any differences between the pre- and posttest scores. The

average was found for each pre- and posttest score pair. Review of Skewness = -.09 and Kurtosis

= .03 indicated that both values were well within the -2 to 2 range, indicating normality of the

data. Review of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test $D = .12$; $p = .20$ indicated that normality could be assumed.

Though the sample size was small and statistical power was a concern, the test result was significant. There was a significant difference ($t = -11.82$, $p < .001$) between the Pretest ($M = 53.04$, $SE = 3.26$) and the Posttest ($M = 93.5$, $SE = 1.75$). Thus participation in the workshops did show an increase in the participants' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions. These data are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Results of Paired Samples T-Test for Pre- and Posttest Scores

| Pair | *M* | *SD* | *SE M* | 95% CI | | *t* | *p* |
				LL	UL		
Pre-Post	-40.46	17.45	3.42	-47.51	-33.41	-11.82	< .001**

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit. *df* for test = 25.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

Parents' responses to the interview and open ended questions validated the results of the data analysis. Parents had the option of answering additional questions as to the reading strategies they learned and planned to use at home. Each response was translated into English and checked for accuracy of the translation by the researcher and the school's parent coordinator. The five strategies that parents said that they learned in the RSI workshops were: (a) the use of flash cards,

(b) Three Strikes, (c) Ready, Set, Read, (d) choosing the correct book, and (e) Mystery words.

The following are examples of parent responses:

> Choosing the right book and guiding reading practice. We take turns reading out loud and ask questions about what was read. Echo reading, this is when your child mimics what you have read. Ready, Set, Read, you let your child read a passage not longer than a minute. Then the child will read it again, while you time how long it took them to read it. This is how a child builds fluency in reading. Three strikes, you win--you write the words that the child needs to learn on separate index cards. Each correct word read is a strike, three strikes to win. Word mysteries--choose an interesting object giving clues and sounds until the child guesses what the object was.

> I learned to select age appropriate books for my children for them to read with me at home. We play games to develop their love for reading. I learned to encourage them to read using short passages and how to use cognates for learning new words. In addition, I will use educational videos and computer programs for learning.

> I like to use phonemic awareness putting sight words on flash cards. Another strategy I like to use is fluency. When I have my child read I help her read the words she doesn't know and record the fluency of her reading. I use mystery words with my older daughter. I use them in English and Spanish.

> I learned to use cognates to increase my vocabulary and the use of the internet. Presently I am using the program of MyOn.com and my children love it. I plan to continue using it to learn more about it. I use these strategies in both English and Spanish.

Data Analysis for Research Question 2

What relationship, if any, exits between family demographics, (e.g., gender, ethnicity/nationality, education level, income, and participants' learning outcomes) from participating in the RSI workshops?

Both Mann-Whitney and the Kruskal-Wallis tests determine whether there is a significant difference in mean ranks between groups on the gain scores. Essentially, all of the values are arranged from high to low and provided with a rank. If one group features more observations on the lower end of the number line than other groups (smaller gains), the mean rank for that group

will be lower in value (closer to 1) than in other groups. In this case, larger mean rank values would signify a group or groups with overall greater gains.

Parent Level of Education

The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that there was no significant difference in mean ranks in pre-post gains between parents with varying levels of education, $\chi^2(3) = 3.17$, $p = .37$. Generally, those parents with the highest education had smaller mean ranks than those parents who had less education. Parents with the highest education had the smallest mean gain scores ($M_r = 8.44$, $n = 9$), and those who finished only through grade eight or below had the largest mean ranks ($M_r = 14.00$, $n = 4$). Between those two values were those who completed a two-year college program ($M_r = 9.33$, $n = 3$) and parents who finished high school ($M_r = 12.50$, $n = 4$). Results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Kruskal-Wallis Results for Score Gains by Level of Education (N = 20)

Level	n	M_r
Grade 8 or below	4	12.50
High school	4	14.00
Two-year college	3	9.33
Four-year college	9	8.44

Note. $\chi^2(3) = 3.17$, $p = .37$

Gender

The Mann-Whitney test indicated that there was no significant difference in mean ranks in pre-post gains between male and female parents, z=-0.99, $p = .32$. Male parents had lower mean ranks, ($M_r = 10.50$, $n = 5$) than female parents ($M_r = 14.21$, $n = 21$). However, once again, these differences were not significant. Results are summarized in Table 3. Complete results are contained in Appendix L.

Table 3

Mann-Whitney Results for Score Gains by Gender (N = 26)

Gender	n	M_r
Female	21	14.21
Male	5	10.50

Note. Z=-0.99, $p = .32$

Nationality

There were 26 participants in this study. All of the participants were Hispanic from the following countries: Argentina, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico, Peru, Spain, and Venezuela.

The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that there was no significant difference in mean ranks in pre-post gains between those parents of different nationalities, $\chi^2(3) = 3.01$, $p = .39$. Parents from Puerto Rico had the highest mean ranks, ($M_r = 16.00$, $n = 6$), and parents from the Dominican Republic had the lowest mean ranks ($M_r = 9.62$, $n = 4$). Parents from Mexico had the second-highest mean ranks ($M_r = 15.20$, $n = 10$), and parents from other nations had the second-lowest

44

mean ranks (M_r = 10.75, n = 6). However, once again, these differences were not significant.

Results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Kruskal-Wallis Results for Score Gains by Home Country (N = 26)

Home Country	n	M_r
Mexico	10	15.20
Puerto Rico	6	16.00
Dominican Republic	4	9.62
Other	6	10.75

Note. $\chi^2(3) = 3.01$, $p = .39$

Income (via Free or Reduced Lunch Status)

The Mann-Whitney test indicated that there was no significant difference in mean ranks in pre-post gains between parents of families of different income levels, z= 1.91, p = .06. Parents of children who were not on free or reduced lunch had greater mean ranks (M_r = 21.33, n = 3), but parents whose children were eligible for free or reduced lunch had smaller mean ranks (M_r = 12.48, n = 23). Results are summarized in Table 5. Complete results are contained in Appendix L.

Table 5

Mann-Whitney Results for Score Gains by Free or Reduced Lunch Status (N = 26)

Lunch Status	n	M_r
Not receiving free or reduced lunch	3	21.33
Receiving free or reduced lunch	23	12.48

Note. z= 1.91, *p* = .06

Data Analysis for Research Question 3

What feedback, if any, did parents report after attending the RSI workshops about the implementation of reading strategies used at home to support their child's reading achievement? Qualitative data were used to answer this question.

A total of 26 parents completed the workshops and rated the sections. The results of the ratings are displayed in Table 6.

In regard to overall workshops, 100% of the parents rated the overall workshops as excellent; the usefulness of program content as excellent; and the visuals aids presented as excellent. The opening session was rated by 24 (92%) of the parents as excellent and 2 (8%) as good. A question about the value of the parent toolkit received the same rating. The trainers' ability to teach the session was also rated as excellent by 100% of parents.

Games Readers Play, Everyday Reading, You Are What You Read, and the Wrap-Up session received overall ratings of excellent from all (100%) of the parents. The materials for each session received identical ratings of excellent from 24 (92%) of the parents and good from 2

(8%) of the parents. The trainers' ability to teach each of the sessions was also rated as excellent

by 100% of parents.

Table 6

Evaluation of Families Building Better Readers Workshop (N = 26)

Sessions and Descriptors	Percentage	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Overall Workshop: How would you rate					
Overall program quality	100%				26
Usefulness of program content	100%				26
The visual aids presented	100%				26
Opening Session: How would you rate					
This session	8%			2	24
The parent tool kit	8%			2	24
The trainer's ability to teach the session	100%				26
Games Readers Play: How would you rate					
This session	100%				26
The materials for this session	8%			2	24
The trainer's ability to teach the session	100%				26
Everyday Reading: How would you rate					
This session	100%				26
The material' s for this session	8%			2	24
The trainer's ability to teach the session	100%				26
You are What You Read: How would you rate					
This session	100%				26
The material's for this session	8%			2	24
The trainer's ability to teach the session	100%				26
Wrap-up Session: How would you rate					
This session	100%				26
The material's used for this session	8%			2	24
The trainer's ability to teach the session	100%				26

In summary, results from the evaluation of the Families Building Better Readers Workshop indicated that at least 24 of the 26 (92%) of the Hispanic parents of English Language Learners rated both the workshops and materials provided as "excellent." A total of 100% of the parents rated the trainers as being "excellent." One parent stated that "the workshops were conducted with professionalism and were very interesting. I recommend them 100%." These results indicate a higher percentage of parents rating the overall workshops and materials as excellent in comparison to the results reported by the Volunteer Florida Foundation in 2010.

Parents had the option of answering an additional question as to the reading tips they planned to use at home. Each response was translated into English and checked for accuracy of the translation by the researcher and the school's parent coordinator. A total of 14 parents, (54%) responded regarding reading tips they planned to use at home. The following comments are based on parents' self-reported data:

"Practice reading everyday and have everything I need handy."

"Use flashcards, read aloud, mystery words and others as my child grows."

"I will use flashcards and motivate my child to read. I will look for books that are age appropriate for my children."

"These workshops have helped me learn different ways that I can help my child and has motivated me to learn."

The top three strategies parents selected were: (a) reading aloud, (b) using visual and flash cards, and (c) fluency. Parents increasingly began to use the terms and strategies that they learned in the workshops. They explained that they felt more confident in working with their children and that they were motivated to learn. A parent expressed that she did not know how to speak or read

English, but that for the first time she could help her child with reading and homework because she had learned these strategies. Another parent shared that she made flash cards by cutting out vocabulary words from the FBBR toolkit and gluing them on index cards. She made both Spanish and English flashcards for her child. A total of 58% of the parents shared additional comments on their evaluations. Some of the comments follow:

"Thank you for showing us these wonderful tools. Great job!"

"I have always said that if you train the parents, the parents can help teach their children."

"I like being part of this program and if in the future there will be others, I would like to be part of them."

"Everything was very good, I learned a lot."

There were several themes that emerged from the parents' written responses. By participating in the RSI workshops, parents not only gained knowledge of the different reading strategies and interventions, they became empowered and motivated as learners themselves. One parent wrote, "These workshops have helped me learn different ways that I can help my child and has motivated me to learn."

Focus Group Interview Questions

To obtain additional qualitative data, four interview questions were asked of a focus group of five parents after the workshop ended. Parents were given a copy of the interview questions in the language of their choice. Four of the five parents chose to answer the questions in Spanish, and one answered in both English and Spanish. The responses of parents were audio-recorded, translated into English by the researcher, and verified by the school's parent

49

coordinator for accuracy. Parents were thanked for taking extra time to be part of the focus

interview group. Parents were a little nervous at first since they were being recorded; however

once the session began, the group relaxed, became more at ease and answered the questions.

In the following discussion, each of the interview questions is stated, followed by a brief

discussion of the theme(s) identified in the responses. Selected representative responses of

participants have been reproduced that support the identified theme(s).

<div align="center">Focus Group Interview Question 1</div>

Why do you think it is important for the parents of English Language Learners to be

involved in the education of their children?

The theme that emerged in the responses to the first interview question was the importance

of parental involvement. When parents are involved in their children's education, students feel

supported, motivated and successful. It is important for children to see that their parents are also

learning in school. Selected comments supporting this theme were as follows:

> Parents who are involved in the education of their children are able to help them learn
> and become better readers. It makes them feel special and important if they know that
> mommy and daddy care about them.

> It is of great importance that when your children learn they see that you are interested in
> what they are learning. At the same time that you review with them you are learning and
> practice your English. Your children need to feel that you support them, and this makes
> them feel safe.

> I think it is important that parent engage themselves in the education of their children.
> Your children feel more confident and secure when they see that you are involved. When
> parents get involved it helps children become successful in their education.

It is important that parents involve themselves in the education of their children no matter if you are learning English. To me it's a way of motivating my children and help them in improve what they know and need help in.

Our children are learning in English and it is important that we learn ways that we can help them be successful. The more that we get involved, the better communication we have with the school.

Focus Group Interview Question 2

Please list the top five strategies that you learned in these workshops that you use with

your child at home?

The five strategies that parents reported that they would use with their children were: (a)

flash cards, (b) Three Strikes, (c) Ready, Set, Read, (d) choosing the correct book, and (e) Mystery

words. The following comments were reported:

Choosing the right book and guiding reading practice. We take turns reading out loud and ask questions about what was read. Echo reading, this is when you're child mimics what you have read. Ready, Set, Read, you let the child read a passage not longer than a minute then the child will read it again timing how long did he/she took reading it. Three strikes, you win--you write the words that the child needs to learn on separate index cards. Each correct word read is a strike, three strikes to win. Word mysteries--choose an interesting object giving clues and sounds until the child guesses what the object was.

Choosing a book according to their age, flash cards, play games that involve reading, use of the public library, less television and I use English.

Choose books according to their reading level. Play games to develop their love for reading. Encourage them to read using short passages, use cognates for learning new words. I will use video, audiovisuals and computer programs for learning.

Flash cards, Ready, Set, Read you let the child read a passage not longer than a minute then the child will read it again timing how long did he/she took reading it. Three strikes, you win, and mystery words.

Focus Group Interview Question 3

Of the five strategies you listed above, what were the two most effective? Did you use

the strategies in English or your native language?

The responses were mixed as to parents' perceptions of the most effective strategies. Two

of the strategies that parents mentioned in responding to this question were the use of flash cards

to develop vocabulary and choosing the right book for their children to read. All of the parents

commented that they used the strategies in English. One indicated that both English and Spanish

were used when working with these strategies. Selected comments were as follows:

> I like to use phonemic awareness putting sight words on flash cards. Another strategy I
> like to use is fluency. When I have my child read I help her read the words she doesn't
> know and record the fluency of her reading. I use mystery words with my older daughter.
> I use them in English and Spanish.

> The use of cognates to increase vocabulary and the use of the internet. Presently I am
> using the program of MyOn.com and my children love it. I plan to continue using it to
> learn more about it. I use them in both English and Spanish.

> Choosing a book according to their age and using the resource of the Public Library. I
> use them [in] English.

Focus Group Interview Question 4

Would you recommend these workshops to other parents and why?

All of the parents responded that they would recommend the RSI workshops to other

parents. They reported that they learned strategies that they could use to help their children with

reading. They also shared their feelings of empowerment to help their children with their school

work and believed they had benefited from learning of other resources that they could use to help

their children be successful in school. They all had positive comments and expressed that they

would continue participating in other workshops.

52

Yes, I would recommend these workshops to other parents so they also can learn on how to help their child/children become successful readers, and helping them on strategies that can help them learn in other subjects. They helped me learn how to help my children in reading. I learned about cognates in English and Spanish.

Yes, because you acquire knowledge as to what is taught in your child's school and what they doing. We learn of alternatives and resources to help our children when they have difficulty studying.

Yes, 100%, because I have learned how to teach my children on how to get interested in reading and the importance that reading is for their progress in school. The school should offer more workshops like these. I would like to continue participating in other workshops.

The experience of these workshops met my expectations. I have learned new and useful strategies that I can use to improve my daughters reading skills. In addition the workshops were conducted with professionalism and were very interesting. I recommend them 100%.

Post Hoc Analysis

The purpose of this study was to determine if parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions would increase after attending a series of workshops. Results on the posttests and parents' self-reported comments indicated that parental knowledge did increase after attending the workshops. In addition to the themes identified in this study as to the importance of parental involvement, empowerment, and motivation, qualitative responses indicated parents' increased in self-efficacy and confidence. Parents reported that they "felt good to educate themselves." As adult English Language Learners, their confidence level in being able to help their children with reading at home increased.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions increased after participating in a series of workshops specifically designed for the parents of English Language Learners. Also examined was the extent to which parents applied the reading strategies they learned in the workshops with their child at home.

Researchers have indicated that parental involvement influences student achievement (Sheldon, 2003). This included students who were culturally diverse, English Language Learners, and those who came from minority backgrounds (Jeynes, 2005). Due to the dramatic increase of English Language Learners throughout the United States, especially the high percentage of Hispanic students attending public schools, the targeted population of this study was Spanish speaking parents of English Language Learners.

To address the research questions which guided this study, three workshops were delivered to a group 26 parents of English Language Learners from four Title I schools in the Southwest Learning Community in Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida. The steps taken in planning for and delivering the three workshops are detailed in Appendix M. Following is a summary of the findings for each of the three research questions.

Research Question 1

Does the participation of parents of English Language Learners in Reading Strategies and Intervention (RSI) workshops increase their knowledge on reading strategies and interventions?

Summary of Findings for Research Question 1

The results presented in Chapter 4 were based on a sample of 26 parents of English Language Learners from four Title I schools in the Southwest Learning Community of Orange County Public Schools in Orlando, Florida. Parents completed a 14-item multiple choice test on the morning of the first RSI workshop and again at the end of the last workshop. The 26 parents who attended the last workshop and completed the pre- and posttest were included in the statistical analysis (N = 26). Responses to each of the questions were entered into a spread sheet for both the pre- and posttest for each parent. Responses were scored, and a percentage was obtained for each parent's pre- and posttest. An independent T-test was used to determine if there were any differences between the pre- and posttest scores.

Even though the sample was small, there was a significant difference between the pretest ($M = 53.04$, $SE = 3.26$) and the posttest ($M = 93.5$, $SE = 1.75$). Thus, participation in the workshops did show an increase in the participants' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions. According to Chrispeels and Rivero (2001), parent education programs can have a significant effect by increasing parents' knowledge of how to be involved. When schools provide

information in a culturally sensitive way, Latino families will respond. Researchers have

indicated that children benefit significantly when their families are involved in their education

(Epstein & Salinas, 2004).

Discussion of Findings for Research Question 1

Many parents of English Language Learners may not know how to speak or read English.

However, they can contribute to their children's education. They just need to be given the

appropriate tools to do so. Every year, the researcher's school hosts reading, math technology

nights and parent teacher conferences for the school's parents. Teachers share what their students

are learning in school.

Parents, however, need more than the traditional reading nights. They need to be provided

with classes that will teach them specific strategies and interventions they can use at home with

their children. Parents need to feel that the school and their children want them involved

(Henderson & Mapp, 2002). When it was first mentioned to a group of Hispanic parents that the

researcher would be providing Saturday workshops for them on reading strategies and intervention

as part of her dissertation research, many of parents were excited to hear of this opportunity. They

commented to the researcher that they really wanted to learn how to help their children. They

understood the importance of reading and that if their children did not master the appropriate

skills, they could be retained in third grade.

This study was designed as professional development for parents using good pedagogical

practices in their native language. When planning and designing activities for cultural diverse

families, it is important to use the first language and provide a sensitive environment and resources (Reyes-Blanes, 2002).

The FBBR was selected as part of the workshops because it was designed to teach parents reading strategies that they could use with their children at home. However, the 10 strategies were to be taught in 2 ½ hours using the toolkit, and only a survey was provided in the toolkit to get feedback on parents' overall satisfaction with the workshops. FBBR does not give a pre/pot test to parents. This study added to the FBBR workshops by first providing the parents with background knowledge on how English Language Learners acquire a second language, taking into consideration their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. These professional development activities incorporated cooperative learning where the parents could work in small groups in Spanish, and brainstorm ideas on how their children learn a second language. Parents were able to chart their thoughts, and each group was able to present to the other groups. This is not a typical activity at traditional reading nights or PTA meetings. Professional development needs to be sensitive and respectful of the different cultures, values, and beliefs (Camacho, 2007). This study adds to Camacho's study because the workshops were designed and presented in a culturally sensitive manner. The reading strategies were taught over the span of the three workshops, allowing the parents time to understand, practice at home with their children, and return to the workshop setting and present to the entire group each week. Additionally, experts in the field of second language acquisition, reading, parenting and instructional technology presented the workshops to the parents. These experts had the background knowledge to work with ELL parents and gain their trust. Parents' affective filter was lower due to the level of trust they felt during the workshops (Cummins, 1994). According to Powell, Zehm & Garcia (1996), effective partnerships result

when reciprocal relationships between families and schools allow the development and enhancement of mutual trust.

A review of all of the three workshops was provided prior to the administration of the posttest. The accommodation of reading the test in Spanish was provided for the parents who were not fluent readers in English. All of the parents made learning gains on their posttest.

As stated in Chapter Two, substantial research suggests that parental involvement positively influences students' academic success. This is true even when students come from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds (Camacho, 2007, Epstein & Sheldon, 2004).

<div align="center">Research Question 2</div>

What relationship, if any, exits between family demographics (e.g.: gender, ethnicity/nationality, education level, income) and participants' learning outcomes from participating in the RSI workshops?

Summary of Findings for Research Question 2

This research question investigated the relationships that exist between participants' demographic information and the results obtained from the study. The dependent variable for this question was the gains made by participants on the posttest scores.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests indicated that there were no significant differences in the mean ranks in pre-post gains between parents of different nationalities, education, income levels and gender.

<u>Discussion of Findings for Research Question 2</u>

According to Henderson & Mapp (2002), regardless of parental income or background, the children of involved parents are likely to get higher grades and do better in school. In this study, however, parents did, show an increase on their posttest scores. Regardless of their backgrounds, they improved from pretest to posttest. Camacho (2007) concluded that enhancing the knowledge and involvement of Hispanic families through specifically designed family workshops students' increases academic achievement for children.

Traditionally, Hispanic males from low socio-economic status have not been actively involved it their children's education. Child rearing and communication with school has been left up to the Hispanic females in the family; ranging from the mother to grandmother to older female siblings. This was reflected in this study. A total of 22 of the participants were females, and only four were males. The fathers who attended the workshops were of diverse Hispanic backgrounds; Dominican, Mexican, Puerto Rican and Spaniard. According to the National PTA, more Latinos and specifically Latino men are recognizing the significance of being involved in their children education (Martinez & Perez, 2008). PTA has been focusing its efforts on creating awareness of the research on parental involvement, especially as it concerns Latino families. Martinez & Perez (2008) stated that there is a direct link between parent involvement and student achievement. Decades of research have shown that students succeed when a parent is involved in their child's education, regardless of race, religion, or socioeconomic status.

The findings in this study corroborate the observations of the National PTA that more Latinos are recognizing the importance of being involved in their children's education. Responses to the Focus Interview Question 1 indicated the importance of parental involvement: "Parents

who are involved in the education of their children are able to help them learn and become better readers" "It is important that parents engage themselves in the education of their children." Parents want their children to be academically successful, and they want to be part of their education.

Both groups of parents did increase on their knowledge of reading strategies and interventions per their posttest scores. The effectiveness of the RSI workshops contributed to the parents increase on posttest scores.

Research Question 3

What feedback, if any, did parents report after attending the RSI workshops about the implementation of reading strategies used at home to support their child's reading achievement?

Summary of Findings for Research Question 3

Parents were provided with the Families Building Better Readers Toolkit which contained both English and Spanish booklets explaining 10 reading strategies. Each reading strategy was explained and modeled for the parents by two trainers. Parents were asked to practice the strategies during the week at home with their children. They then shared the reading strategies they used with their children at the following Saturday workshop.

Discussion of Findings for Research Question 3

According to The National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth (2006), English Language Learners also need more work in oral language development, vocabulary and text comprehension than English speakers. This research provided the parents of

English Language Learners with strategies that The National Literacy Panel recommended for second language learners. Parents were able to learn and help their children with vocabulary development and text comprehension.

As one of the trainers in this study, the researcher noted that parents' knowledge base increased over time span of the three workshops. Each reading strategy was introduced, explained and modeled. As one example, the researcher modeled (in English) how to do a read aloud for the parents using a favorite children's book, *I Love You Forever*. After a picture walk, reading the book aloud, parents were asked what was happening as the baby grew to a teenager and eventually into a grown man. Hispanic parents are very family oriented, and this story hit home for many of them since they have sons and elderly parents. They saw how a book can stir emotions and how to model a read aloud for their children. Reading aloud to a child, helps develop a child's love for reading. According to Senechal (2006), parental involvement has a positive impact on children's reading acquisition. When parents teach a "specific literally skill to their children, it was two times more effective than having their children read to them" (Senechal, 2006, p. i). Children need to read to be academically successful, but an equally important goal is for them to love reading.

The workshops were instrumental in helping those who attended have a better understanding of reading strategies. They also developed an appreciation of the importance of their working with their children on a daily basis.

Post Hoc Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions would increase after attending a series of workshops. Results on the post tests and parents' self-reported comments indicated that parental knowledge did increase after attending the workshops. In addition to the themes identified in this study, i.e., the importance of parental involvement, empowerment, and motivation, qualitative responses indicated parents' increased in self-efficacy and confidence. Parents reported that they "felt good to educate themselves." As adult English Language Learners, parental confidence level in being able to help their children with reading at home increased. In learning the differences between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), the social language and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency Skills (CALPS), the academic language, parents made connections on how they could use the strategies learned to help their children (Cummins, 1994). It did not matter that they were English Language Learners themselves. Their personal confidence levels increased as did their competence in being able to apply the reading strategies at home. Their willingness to work in collaborative groups and share their new knowledge with other parents indicated how they had become learners themselves. According to Bandura (1995), people with high self-efficacy believe they can perform well and are more likely to view difficult tasks as something to be mastered rather than something to be avoided.

By learning what cognates were, parents realized that they knew more English vocabulary words than they originally thought. They were able to make connections between Spanish and English words, for example: accident-accidente, ambulance-ambulancia, police-

policia. This allowed them to begin transferring skills and knowledge from Spanish to English in order to help their children at home.

As parents knowledge of reading strategies increased throughout the study so did their self-efficacy and confidence. Although this study was not designed to obtain data in these two areas, they did emerge. In retrospect, it would have been prudent to administer a scale to the parents on which their confidence levels at the beginning and end of the study could have been registered.

<div align="center">Implications for Practice</div>

The results of this study support the literature indicating that parental involvement has a positive impact on children's reading acquisition (Senechal, 2006). In order to close the achievement gap in reading of English Language Learners, parents need to be provided with the necessary tools. Schools have the challenge to reach out to parents who traditionally have been isolated from the schools because of language differences. For years, parents of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds have been overlooked by schools. In spite of parents' linguistic and academic backgrounds, they can play an important role in their child's education.

There has to be collaboration between the school and families they serve. Schools need to offer academic workshops to parents in the language they understand and at different times of the day since many parents work. Flexible scheduling of workshops and trainings need to occur in order to accommodate working parents. This research was successful because it taught the parents reading strategies and interventions in their native language and on Saturdays. The workshops were from 9 a.m. until noon. Breakfast and snacks were provided. Parents who did not have child

care could bring their children. Children were able to work on the computers in the Media Center and read books while their parents attended the workshops. A celebration with a potluck luncheon was held on the last day of the workshops. Door prizes, books, and food boxes were also provided.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

There are several modifications that could be made in regard to future research initiatives. First, offering more workshops at the targeted schools in a learning community may generate more participation. Second, extending the number of workshops would permit the inclusion of more hands-on activities and use of technology for parents. Third, to ensure the effectiveness of the workshops, the number of participants should be limited to 30 in order to give individualized attention to parents who need assistance reading and answering written questions in Spanish. Presenters need to know the background of their audience in order to meet their needs during the workshops. There were some parents who only attended elementary school in their native country and could not read fluently in Spanish. Fourth, presenters need to be fluent Spanish speakers with an ELL background. Fifth, cooperative learning is recommended to be used for group activities in order for the parents to collaborate and brainstorm with each other (Hill & Flynn, 2006). Sixth, a question should be constructed to quantitatively assess self-efficacy. Parents could rate themselves at the beginning of the workshops and at the end. Other recommendations for future studies include measuring the influence of the workshops on student academic success and providing the RSI workshops to Hispanic parents of children with disabilities.

<u>Summary</u>

The purpose of this study was to determine whether parents' knowledge of reading strategies and interventions increased after participating in a series of workshops specifically designed for the parents of English Language Learners. This study was also conducted to examine the extent to which parents were able to apply the reading strategies they learned with their child at home. The results indicated that parents gained knowledge and were able to apply what they learned.

This study specifically targeted Hispanic ELL parents. Findings of the study indicated that providing professional development to Hispanic ELL parents increased their confidence in helping their children learn to read in English. The provision of three workshops to 26 Hispanic ELL parents allowed them to realize that they knew more English vocabulary than they thought they did. In addition, the findings showed that by providing culturally sensitive activities, parents were more than willing, in fact were excited, to work closely with school personnel.

Although there has been research conducted on parental involvement and how it increases student achievement, there has not been as much focus on parental involvement and the reading achievement of English Language Learners. This study will add to that specific body of literature.

APPENDIX A
RECRUITMENT MATERIALS

Rivera, Milagros

From:	Rodriguez, Frida Y.
Sent:	Wednesday, March 02, 2011 10:54 AM
To:	Rivera, Milagros
Subject:	Parent Training Suveey

Ms. Rivera,

Ms. Mary Pena and I translated the various documents you requested for your parent study: flyer, demographic information, and pre/post test questions. We checked each other's translations to verify accuracy in the proper use of meanings and academic jargon to be used with the Spanish speaking population served by the school's in your study. Please let me know if further assistance is needed for other material to use in the study.

Frida Y. Rodriguez
Assistant Principal
Sadler Elementary

Email: frida.rogdriguez@ocps.net
Phone: 407.354.2620 x2235
IPT: 389.2235

March 15, 2011

Dear Parents/Guardians:

I am working on my dissertation at the University of Central Florida on Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners (Spanish Speakers).

There will be three Workshops on Saturdays from 9:00 am -12:00 p.m. at Sadler Elementary School, 4000 W. Oak Ridge Rd., Orlando, Fl 32809, 407-354-2620, ext. 2251. The dates for these workshops are: March 26, April 9 & 16, 2011.

If you are interested in being part of this study and attending the 3 workshops, please fill out the information below and return to your child's teacher. Parents who are selected to be in the study will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Milagros Rivera

Principal

Sadler Elementary School

****

___Yes I am interested and will commit to these 3 days of Literacy Workshops

___No I am not interested at this time, however would be interested in the future.

___Cannot attend now but willing to complete questionnaire.

Name: _____ Child's Name_____

Address: _____ Child's School_____ Grade_____

Home Telephone #:_____ Cell Phone #_____

15 de marzo del 2011

Apreciados Padres/Encargados

Estoy trabajando en mi disertación en la Universidad de la Florida Central en estrategias de lectura para los padres de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo ingles (hispano hablantes).

Habrá tres talleres los sábados de 9:00 a.m. a 12:00 p.m., en la Escuela Elemental Sadler, 4000 W. Oak Ridge Rd., Orlando, Fl 32809, 407-354-2620, ext. 2251. Los días de estos talleres son: marzo 26, abril 9 & 16, 2011.

Si usted está interesado en ser parte de este estudio y asistir a los tres talleres, favor de completar la información que sigue y devolver al maestro de su niño. Los padres seleccionados para estar en este estudio se le pedirán que contesten un cuestionario demográfico.

Sinceramente,

Milagros Rivera
Milagros Rivera

Principal

Sadler Elementary School

****

___Sí,estoy interesado(a) y me comprometeré a estos 3 días de Talleres de Lectura

___No me interesa por ahora, pero en un futuro sí.

___No puedo asistir ahora pero podré contestar el cuestionario.

Nombre: _____ Nombre del niño(a) _____

Dirección: _____ Escuela del niño(a)_____ Grado _____

Teléfono: _____ Celular:_____

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPANTS' SURVEY (PRE- AND POSTTEST)

PARTICIPANTS' SURVEY

Thank you so much for taking the time to complete this survey, your participation will help us in the design and future presentation of workshops targeting the specific needs of Parents and families of English Language Learners.

 This survey is composed of 3 sections:

I) You will be asked to provide your personal information (please do not write your name. In an effort to protect your identity, your survey will be numbered as you turn it in).

II) You will respond to questions related on English Language Learners and Reading topics.

III) You will respond to questions related to family involvement in the education of English Language Learners.

Part I:
Please respond to all the question by writing an "X" on the left side of the most appropriate response. If you do not see a response that is appropriate to your situation, please mark "other" and use the given space to write your response. Anytime you read a question that refers to "your child", please know that we are referring to the person for whom you are attending these workshops.

** If you have more than one child receiving Bilingual, Sheltered or ESOL services, please base your responses on the oldest child.

1) How did you find out about these workshops?
___ my child's school ___ a friend ___ Other:_____

2) Which of the following is the highest degree you have obtained?
___ K-8 ___ K-12 ___2 yrs of college ___4 yrs of college Other: _____

3) How many people live in your house? (numbers represent amount of persons)
___ 2-4 ___ 5-6 ___ 7-8 ___ More than 8

4) Do you have more than one child receiving Bilingual, Sheltered or ESOL services?
___No ___Yes: _____(how many?) Which grades are they in?_____

5) What are the ages of the persons who live at your home? (please no names)
(write the age) Person 1: ___ Person 2: ___ Person 3: ___ Person 4: ___
Person 5: ___ Person 6: ___ Person 7: ___ Person 8: ___

6) Approximately, how many hours per week do you work outside the home?
___ Less than 20 ___ 20-40 ___ 40-60 ___ More than 60 ___ work at home___do not work

7). Does your child receive free or reduced meals at school?
___Free __Reduced ____No

8) Is transportation a barrier for your participation in workshops such as the ones offered in this study?
___Yes ___No ___Sometimes

9) Which is your first/native language? (the first language you learned)
___ Spanish ___ English ___

10) Can you speak English comfortably?
___ very __somewhat ___ No

11) Can you understand English comfortably?
___ Very __Somewhat ___ No

12) In which language do you usually communicate at home?
___English ___Spanish ___English and Spanish equally, ___

13) In which language do you prefer to communicate information related to your child?
___English ___Spanish ___English and Spanish equally___

14) Have you taken Adult ESOL classes?
_____Yes_____No

15) In which country did you live prior to moving to the United States? (write n/a if it doesn't apply)
_____

16) If you have lived in the United States all your life, what is the country of your family's origin? (write country's name)

17) From what country is your spouse from?
(write country's name): _____

18) In which country was your child born in?
(write country's name): _____

19) At what age did your child begin receiving Bilingual, Sheltered or ESOL services?
___5-7 ___ 8-10 ___ 11-13
20) How old is your child now?
___5-7 ___ 8-10 ___ 11-13

21) Do you read at home?
____Always_____Often_____Sometimes_____Never

22) Do you read with your child at home?
____Always_____Often_____Sometimes_____Never

23) In what language do you read with your child?
____English_____Spanish_____Both English and Spanish

24) Do you feel your child understands what they are reading?
____Always_____Often_____Sometimes_____Never

25) Do you help your child with homework?
_____Always____Often_____Sometimes_____Never

26) Do you have a computer at home? If so, do you have access to the internet?
____Yes____No   ____Yes____No
Please check any of the following computer programs that your child has used?
        ____SuccessMaker
        ____FCAT Explorer
        ____Voyager-Ticket to Read
        ____Read 180
        ____Other_____

27) Has your child attended tutoring at school?
____Yes , please check all of the ones they have attended.   ____No
____AM Tutoring
____PM Tutoring_____21st Century_____SES
____Saturday FCAT School

28) Does your child receive Special Education Services?
___Yes, If yes, please check all services   _____No
___Resource Room
___VE Self-Contained classroom
___IND self-contained classroom
___Speech
___OT/PT
___Other

Part II-III Pre/Post Test

Please answer the following questions by using an "X" to mark your response next to the corresponding letter. Please only one answer per question.

1) What is BICS?
A. __ Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills
B. __ Basic Interpersonal Communication Scale
C. __ Basic Interdependence Communicative Skills

2) What is CALP?
A. __Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency
B. __Comprehensive Academic Language Profile
C. __Cognitive Ability Linguistic Profile

3) How long does it take to acquire BICS?
A. __3 years
B. __6 months to a year
C. __6 months to two years

4) How many years does it take to acquire CALP?
A. __2 -3years
B. __4-5 years
C. __5-7years

5) What are cognates?
A.___ words that are hard to pronounce
B.___ words that sound the same and mean the same thing in English and another langauge
C.___words that have different meanings

6) What is the difference between phonemic awareness and phonics?
A. __phonemic awareness focuses on the sounds in spoken words and phonic focuses on the letters and the sounds
B. __phonic focuses on the sounds, phonemic awareness focuses on the letters
C. __there is no difference

7) Why is reading fluency important?
A. __It's important because it lets the student finish reading faster
B. __It helps them become better spellers
C. __It frees the student to understand what they read

8) How does knowing sight words help your child learn to read?

A. __they are the most common words found in text

B. __they don't have to ask an adult for the answer

C. __they will become better spellers

9) If your child can't name the main character in the story, what should you do?

A. __Give the child a hint

B. __Encourage the child re-read particular sections

C. __Give the child the first sound of the character's name

10) If your child has difficulty summarizing, what should you do?

A. __Help your child guess

B __Break down the reading into smaller sections

C. __ Time your child while reading

11) How can you help your child increase the number of sight words he/she knows?

A. __ Read aloud

B. __Practice using flash cards

C. __ Go to the library

12) When your child has difficulty reading a word, what should you do?

A. __Practice sight words

B. __Look up the word in the dictionary

C. __Encourage the child to look at the word parts

13) Why is reading aloud to your child helpful to your child's reading?

A. __The child sits quietly

B. __It develops the child's love for reading

C. __They learn sight words

14) Which of these are not one of the 5 components of reading?

A. __Reading Aloud

B. __Phonics

C. __Vocabulary

ENCUESTA DE LOS PARTICIPANTES (Questionnaire-Spanish)

Muchas gracias por sacar de su tiempo y contestar esta encuesta. Su participación nos ayudara a diseñar talleres que señalen las necesidades de los padres y familias de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo el idioma ingles.

Esta encuesta se compone de tres secciones:

I) Se le preguntara que provea información personal (favor de no escribir su nombre). En un esfuerzo para proteger su identidad, su encuesta será enumerada a la entrega de la misma.
II) Usted responderá a preguntas relacionadas a su conocimiento de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo el lenguaje ingles y temas de lectura.
III) Usted responderá a preguntas relacionadas al envolvimiento de la familia en la educación de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo el idioma ingles.

Parte I:

Favor de responder a todas las preguntas escribiendo una "X" al lado izquierdo de la contestación más apropiada. Si usted no ve una respuesta que sea apropiada a su situación, favor de marcar "otro" y use el espacio para escribir su respuesta. En cualquier momento que lea una pregunta que se refiera a su "niño(a)", Sepa que estamos refiriéndonos a la persona por la cual está asistiendo a estos talleres.

**Si usted tiene más de un niño(a) que recibe los servicios Bilingüe, "Sheltered" o ESOL, favor de responder a las preguntas basándose al mayor.

1) Como se entero de estos talleres?
___en la escuela del niño ___un amigo ___Otro

2) Cuál de los siguientes es el grado escolar que usted ha obtenido?
___K-8 ___KL-12 ___2 Años de colegio ___4 Años de colegio

3) Cuantas personas viven en su casa? (los números representan la cantidad de personas)
___2-4 ___5-6 ___7-8 ___Mas de 8

4) Tiene usted más de un niño(a) recibiendo los servicios Bilingüe, "Sheltered" o ESOL?
___No ___Si:___(cuantos?) En que grados están? _____.

5) Cuáles son las edades de las personas que viven en su hogar? (favor nombres no) (escribe la edad). Persona 1___ Persona 2___ Persona 3___ Persona 4___ Persona 5___ Persona 6___ Persona 7___ Persona 8___

6) Aproximadamente, cuantas horas usted trabaja fuera de la casa?
___Menos de 20 ___20-40 ___40-60 ___Mas de 60 ___Trabaja en la casa
___No trabaja.

7) Su niño(a) recibe comida gratis o reducida?
___Gratis ___Reducida ___No

8) Transportación es una barrera para participar en talleres tales como el del estudio de ofrecido?

___Si ___No ___A veces

9) Cuál es su lenguaje primero/nativo? (el primer lenguaje aprendido).

___Spanish ___English ___Other

10) Habla el Ingles cómodamente?

___Muy ___Un poco ___No

11) Entiende ingles cómodamente?

___Muy ___Un poco ___No

12) En que lenguaje se comunica usted en el hogar?

___ingles ___español ___ingles y español por igual

13) En qué idioma prefiere usted comunicar información relacionado con su niño(a)?
___ingles ___español ___ingles y español por igual

14) Ha cogido usted clases ESOL para adultos?
___Si ___No

15) En qué país vivió antes de mudarse para los Estados Unido? (escriba n/a si no aplica).

_____

16) Si has vivido en los Estados Unidos toda su vida, cual es el país de origen de su familia? (escriba el nombre del país)

_____

_____

17) De que país es su cónyuge?
   (escriba el país) _____

18) En que país nació su niño(a)?
   (escriba el país) _____

19) A qué edad comenzó su niño(a) a recibir servicios Bilingües, "Sheltered" o de ESOL?
   ___5-7   ___8-10   ___11-13

20) Qué edad tiene su hijo?

   ___5-7   ___8-10   ___11-13

21) Usted lee en su casa?
   ___siempre   ___a menudo   ___a veces   ___nunca

22) Usted lee con su hijo en la casa?
   ___siempre   ___a menudo   ___a veces   ___nunca

23) En qué idioma le lee usted a su hijo?

   ___ingles   ___español   ___ en los dos ingles & español

24) Usted entiende que su hijo comprende lo que lee?
   ___siempre   ___a menudo   ___a veces   ___nunca

25) Usted le ayuda a su hijo con las tareas?
   ___siempre   ___a menudo   ___a veces   ___nunca

26) Usted tiene una computadora en la casa? Si tiene, tiene internet?

   ___Si   ___No   ___Si   ___No

Favor de marcar cualquier programa de computadora que usted entienda que su hijo ha usado.

   ___SuccessMaker

   ___FCAT Explorer

   ___Voyager-Ticket to Read

   ___Read 180

   ___Otro_____

27) Usted está al tanto que su hijo haya asistido a tutorías en la escuela?

    ___Si, favor de marcar las que ha asistido.   ___No

    ___tutorías en la mañana

    ___tutorías en la tarde

    ___tutorías los sábados FCAT

28) Recibe su hijo servicios de Educación Especial?

    ___Si, favor de marcar los servicios   ___No

    ___Salón de Recursos

    ___VE Self-Contained classroom

    ___IND Self-Contained classroom

    ___ Speech

    ___OT/PT

    ___Otro

Parte II: Pre- prueba –(Pre-Test/Post Test- Spanish)

Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas usando una "X" para marcar su respuesta junto a la letra que corresponde. Por favor solo escoja una respuesta por pregunta. Usualmente cuando uno toma una prueba antes de una clase no sabe las respuestas a muchas de las preguntas.

1) ¿Qué es " BICS" ?
A. __ Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (Destrezas básicas interpersonales de comunicación)
B. __ Basic Interpersonal Communication Scale (Escala básica interpersonal de comunicación
C. __ Basic Interdependence Communicative Skills (Destrezas básicas interdependientes de comunicació

2) ¿Qué es " CALP" ?
A. __Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Proeficiencia cognoscitiva de lenguaje académico)
B. __Comprehensive Academic Language Profile (Perfil comprehensivo de lenguaje academico)
C. __Cognitive Ability Linguistic Profile (Perfil linguistic de habilidad cognoscitiva)

3) ¿Cuánto de tarda adquirir "BICS"?
A. __3 años
B. __6 meses a un año
C. __6 meses a dos años

4) ¿Cuántos años se tarda el adquirir "CALP"?
A. __2 -3 años
B. __4-5 años
C. __5-7 años

5) ¿Qué son los cognatos?
A.___ palabras que son difíciles de pronunciar
B.___ palabras que suenan iguales y significan lo mismo en inglés y en otro idioma.
C.___palabras con diferentes significados

6) ¿Cuál es la diferencias entre conocimiento de los fonemas y fonética?
A. __ el conocimiento de los fonemas enfatiza los sonidos de las palabras habladas y la fonética enfatiza las letras y sus sonidoss
B. __ la fonética enfatiza los sonidos y la fonética las letras
C. __no hay ninguna diferencia

7) ¿ Por qué la fluidez en la lectura es importante?
A. __Es importante porque le permite al estudiante terminar de leer más rápidamente
B. __Le ayuda a deletrear mejor
C. __Libera al lector para que entienda lo que lee

8) ¿ Cómo el saber las palabras de reconocimiento visual ayuda a que su hijo(a) aprenda a leer?
A. __son las palabras más comúnes encontradas en los textos
B. __no tienen que preguntarle a un adulto por las contestaciones

C. __se convierten en mejores deletreadores

10) Si su hijo(a) no puede nombrar el personaje principal de una historia, ¿qué debe hacer?
A. __darle una idea de cual es
B. __motivarle a que vuelva a leer ciertas parted de la historia
C. __darle el primer sonido del nombre del personaje

11) Si su hijo(a) tiene dificultad resumiendo, ¿qué debe hacer?
A. __ayudarle a que adivines
B __dividir la lectura en secciones más pequeñas.
C. __ tomar el tiempo mientras lee.

12) ¿Cómo puede ayudarle a que su hijo(a) aumente la cantidad de palabras de reconocimiento visual q
conoce?
A. __ Leerle en voz alta
B. __Practicar con tarjetas de práctica
C. __ Ir a la biblioteca

13) Cuando su hijo(a) tiene problemas leyendo una palabra, ¿qué debe hacer?
A. __practicar las palabras de reconocimiento visual
B. __buscar la palabra en el diccionario
C. __motivarle a que mire las partes de la palabra

14) ¿ Por qué el leerle a su hijo(a) le ayuda al desarrolo de su la lectura?
A. __se sienta calladamentey
B. __desarrollo su amor a la lectura
C. __aprenden las palabras de reconocimiento visual

15) ¿Cuáles de los siguientes no es uno de los 5 componentes de la lectura?
A. ___ leer en voz altad
B. __fonética
C.__vocabulario

APPENDIX C
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Milagros Rivera**

Date: **March 21, 2011**

Dear Researcher:

On 3/21/2011, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners through Reading Strategies and Interventions (RSI) Workshops.
Investigator:	Milagros Rivera
IRB Number:	SBE-11-07502
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Joseph Bielitzki, DVM, UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 03/21/2011 01:48:19 PM EST

IRB Coordinator

Page 1 of 1

83

APPENDIX D
DISTRICT APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to:	Orange County Public Schools	Your research proposal should include:

Submit this form and a copy
of your proposal to:
Accountability, Research, and
Assessment
P.O. Box 271
Orlando, FL 32802-0271

Orange County Public Schools

RESEARCH REQUEST FORM

Your research proposal should
include:
• Project Title
• Purpose and Research Problem
• Instruments
• Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis

Requester's Name_ Milagros Rivera

Date_ 11/23/10

E-mail_ milagros.rivera@ocps.net

Phone_ 407 251-4382 Home

Address_ 6469 Cherry Grove Circle
Street

Orlando, Florida
City, State

32809
Zip

Institutional Affiliation_ University of Central Florida

Project Director or Advisor_ Dr. Suzanne Martin

Phone_ 407 823-4260

Degree Sought:
(check one)

☐ Associate
☒ Doctorate

☐ Bachelor's
☐ Not Applicable

☐ Master's

☐ Specialist

Project Title:_ Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners through Reading Strategies
and Interventions(RSI) Workshops.

ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT

PERSONNEL/CENTERS	NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)	SPECIFY SCHOOLS BY NAME AND NUMBER OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, ETC.
Students	0		
Teachers	3	3 days, 3 hours per day	Sadler (4 staff members)
Administrators	1	3 days, 3 hours per day	Sadler
Schools/Centers	4	3 dyas, 3 hours per day	Sadler, Shingle Creek, Waterbridge, Millennia
Others (specify)	1	3 days, 3 hours per day	Sadler, Parent Coordinator

Specify possible benefits to
students/school system:_ This study will provide reading strategies and interventions to the parents of English Language
Learners in Orange County Public Schools. Students whose parents are involved in their education do better
academically. This study will serve as a guide elementary schools can follow in order to enhance the reading
stragegies of the parents of English Language Learenrs after participating in the RSI workshops.

ASSURANCE

Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the
Orange County Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of
Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Reports and materials shall be supplied as specified.

Requester's Signature_ *Milagros Rivera*

Approval Granted: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Date: 11-23-10

Signature of the Senior Director for
Accountability, Research, and Assessment

NOTE TO REQUESTER: When seeking approval at the school level, a copy of this form, signed by the Senior Director, Accountability,
Research, and Assessment, should be shown to the school principal who has the option to refuse participation depending upon any school
circumstance or condition. The original Research Request Form is preferable to a faxed document.

Reference School Board Policy GCS, p. 249

OCPS1044ARA (Revised 2/10)

APPENDIX E
LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Rivera, Milagros

From:	Suprenard, Laura M.
Sent:	Tuesday, March 01, 2011 4:26 PM
To:	Rivera, Milagros
Subject:	RE: Dissertation Study

Millie,
You may invite my parents to be a part of your study.

Laura Suprenard
Principal
Shingle Creek Elementary
(407) 354-2650 ext. 2222
laura.suprenard@ocps.net

From: Rivera, Milagros
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Suprenard, Laura M.; Gullett, Diane; Lynaugh, Anne
Subject: Dissertation Study

Dear Principals,

As you all know, I will be conducting my Dissertation Study on "Enhancing the Reading Strategies of the Parents of English Language Learners". I will be offering 3 Saturday classes during March and April for Hispanic parents of ELL students from 9 am-12 pm.
My study has been approved by Lee Baldwin and now I am needing your approval to invite your parents for my IRB process.

I would greatly appreciate your endorsement to invite your parents to be part of my study. I will be including reading strategies from the Families Building Better Readers that will help your parents work with their children.

Thank you in advance.

Milagros (Millie) Rivera
Principal
Sadler Elementary School
(407) 354-2620 ext. 2222
riveram6@ocps.net

Phone# 407-354-2620
Fax# 407-354-2665
4000 West Oak Ridge Rd. Orlando, FL 32809
★Successful ★Prepared ★Involved
★Respectful ★Integrity ★Take Pride

Rivera, Milagros

You have my approval. Good luck.

Diane V. Gullett, EdD
Principal
Waterbridge Elementary
407-858-3190

*We are building rigor, relevance and relationships
through student engagement using 21st century skills*

Dear Principals,

As you all know, I will be conducting my Dissertation Study on "Enhancing the Reading Strategies of the Parents of English Language Learners". I will be offering 3 Saturday classes during March and April for Hispanic parents of ELL students from 9 am-12 pm.
My study has been approved by Lee Baldwin and now I am needing your approval to invite your parents for my IRB process.

I would greatly appreciate your endorsement to invite your parents to be part of my study. I will be including reading strategies from the Families Building Better Readers that will help your parents work with their children.

Thank you in advance.

Milagros (Millie) Rivera
Principal
Sadler Elementary School
(407) 354-2620 ext. 2222
riveram6@ocps.net

88

APPENDIX F
WORKSHOP AGENDAS

Workshop Sessions
Agenda

Workshop 1:
1. Welcome
2. Pre-Test
3. Background knowledge on how English Language Learners acquire a second language.
4. Systemic approach to reading

Workshop 2:
1. Welcome
2. Practice Makes Perfect
3. Games Readers Play

Workshop 3:
1. Welcome
2. Everyday Reading
3. You Are What You Read
4. Reading Interventions via Technology
5. Post-test
6. Interview
7.

Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners

Through Reading Strategies and Interventions (RSI) Workshops

March 26, 2011

9:00 am- 12:00 pm

Agenda

- Welcome   Bienvenida   Milagros Rivera

- Breakfast   Desayuno

- Explanation of Research-Explicacion de la Investigacion   Rivera

- Questionnaire   Cuestionario   Rivera

- Break   Receso

- Pre-Test   Pre-Preuba   Rivera/ Pena

- Power Point on Second Language Learning   Maggie Pagan/Rivera

- Cognate Activity   Actividad de Cognados   Pagan/Pena

- Preview of Workshop Session II - April 9th   Rivera

- Preview of Workshop Session III- April 16th   Rivera

- Door Prizes   Premios   Pena

Thank you for your participation- Gracias por su participacion

<div align="center">

Session Two

Agenda

April 9, 2011

</div>

Welcome

Read Aloud- *Bulldog Llamada Noelle*

Review of Session One/White Board Activity

The Language Of Literacy

Five Areas of Reading Instruction

- Phonemic Awareness
- Phonics
- Fluency
- Vocabulary
- Text Comprehension
- How To Build A Better Reader
    - Part One Practice Makes Perfect
        - Choosing the Right Book
        - Guiding Reading Practice

Enhancing the Reading Strategies of Parents of English Language Learners through Reading Strategies and Interventions (RSI) Workshops

Agenda
April 16, 2011
9:00-12:00

- Welcome/Bienvenida

- Breakfast/Desayuno

- Homework: Reflection of Reading Strategies Used at Home
  Asignación: Reflexión de estrategias de lectura usadas en casa

- *Part Two*: Games Readers Play (Pages 5 - 7)
  Parte Dos: Juegos a los que juegan los lectores (Páginas 5 - 7)

- Three Strikes, You Win! (Pages 8-20)
  Tres Strikes, Ganaste (Páginas 8 -20)

- Word Mysteries (Page 22-23) / Palabras Misteriosas (Páginas 22 23)

- *Part Three*: Everyday Reading/ If You See It, Read It! (pages 24-25)
  Parte Tres: Lectura Cotidiana/ Si lo ves, léelo (páginas 24 -25)

- Mr. Draggon Presents: Technology Programs used to support language, literacy, and content area Learning
  Sr. Draggon presenta: Programas de tecnología que se usan para apoyar el idioma, lectura y el área de contenido de aprendizaje.

- **Break/ Receso**

- Talking is Cheap, and it Works (Page 26)
  Platicar no es costoso y da resultado (página 26)

- **Part Four**: You Are What You Read: Books on a Shoestring Budget (Pages 27-28)
  Parte Cuatro: Eres lo que lees: Libros dentro de un presupuesto reducido (Pagina 27-28)

- Picky Readers Book List (page 29)
  A escoger lo mejor para los lectores exigentes (Página 29)

- Model Read Alouds (Page 30-31)
  Ejemplificación de lectura en voz alta (Páginas 30-31)

- Review/Repaso

- Post Test

- Door Prizes/ Premios

- Lunch/Celebration

- Focus Group meets with Ms. Rivera/Grupo de enfoque con la Sra. Rivera

APPENDIX G
WORKSHOP REMINDERS

8 de abril del 2011

RECORDATORIO-TALLER 2

Fue un verdadero placer poder compartir con los padres en el Taller #1. Mañana, sábado, 9 de abril, 9-12:00 pm se ofrecerá el Taller #2. Cuento con su compromiso y nuevamente saludarlos. Traigan a otra persona, recibirán un premio.

Nos vemos mañana.

Saludos, Sra. Rivera, Pagan & Peña

13 de abril del 2011

RECORDATORIO-TALLER 3

Fue un verdadero placer poder compartir nuevamente con ustedes en el Taller #2. El próximo sábado, 16 de abril, de 9-12:00 pm se ofrecerá el Taller #3, que es la última reunión de esta serie de talleres. <u>No olviden traer algo para compartir.</u>

Saludos, Sra. Rivera, Pagan & Peña

April 8, 2011

REMINDER-WORKSHOP 2

It was a pleasure being able to participate with the parents in Workshop #1. Tomorrow, Saturday, April 9, 2011, 9-12:00 p.m. we will be having our Workshop #2. I am counting with your commitment and once again greet you. Bring another person and you will receive a gift.

See you tomorrow.

Regards, Mrs. Rivera, Pagan & Peña

April 13, 2011

REMINDER-WORKSHOP 3

Once again it was a pleasure being able to participate with you during Workshop #2. Next Saturday, April 16, 2011, at 9-12:00 p.m. we will be having Workshop #3, our last meeting of this series of workshops. <u>Don't forget to bring a plate to share.</u>

Regards, Mrs. Rivera, Pagan & Peña

APPENDIX H
SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Resaltando las Estrategias de Lectura de Padres de Aprendices de Inglés A través de Talleres Sobre Estrategias e Intervenciones de Lectura

MILAGROS RIVERA & MAGGIE PAGAN

Second Language Acquisition

Think About:
- Think about a baby acquiring his first language.
- Think about a person acquiring a second language.

What similarities and differences are there in the two processes?

BICS & CALP

BICS - Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills

CALP –Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

BICS - Basic Interpersonal Communication Skill

- Everyday conversational language
- Use in familiar context
- Visible aspects of language
- Is developed within 6 months to 2 years
- The language skills needed in social situations.
- Support the day-to-day language needed to interact socially with other people.

CALP –Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

- This level of language learning is essential for students to succeed in school.

- Unfamiliar concepts are encountered

- Less visible clues are provided

- This includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing about subject area content material

- Takes 5 to 7 years to become proficient

Which is Which?

- Takes up to 2 years
- Face-to-face communication
- Survival English
- Playground language

Takes 5-7 years
- Specific vocabulary
- Complex sentence structure
- Higher level thinking skills
- School language

Language Acquisition
BICS   CALP

- Takes up to 2 years
- Face-to-face communication
- Survival English
- Playground language

- Takes 5-7 years
- Specific vocabulary
- Complex sentence structure
- Higher level thinking skills
- School language

Cognates

Exploracion del lenguaje

What is a Cognate?

Words that look alike and have similar meanings in English and Spanish are called Cognates (Cognados).

examples:

Spanish	English
popular	popular
Usar	to use
guitarra	guitar
Computadora	computer

With a partner...

1. Make a list of seven cognates in English and Spanish
2. Share with the group

Sample Cognates word...

- música
- practicar
- televisión
- guitarra
- teléfono

Strategy

Recognizing cognates

Becoming skilled at recognizing cognates will help you understand what you read and will increase your academic vocabulary.

Vamos a leer un cuento en español con muchos cognados.

Un Horrible Accidente

Ayer ocurrió un horrible accidente. Mi hermano estaba conduciendo su auto en la ciudad. Él es un chófer muy competente y muy cuidadoso. De repente (suddenly) otro automóvil pasó la luz roja y chocó (collided) con el vehículo de mi hermano. Vino el policía; pidió (asked for) la documentación de los dos conductores. El imprudente no tenía ni póliza de seguros ni otros documentos necesarios. Resultó que su auto era robado (stolen). Así, el perpetrador fue llevado a la prisión y mi hermano fue llevado al hospital porque sufrió una postración nerviosa.

What is the general meaning of the story...?

- My brother was driving in the city.
- He is a competent and careful chauffer.
- Another car runs a red light and collides with him.
- The police ask both drivers for their license.
- The other driver didn't have the car license and was driving a stolen car.
- The other driver went to jail and my brother went to the hospital.

Un Horrible Accidente

Ayer ocurrió un horrible accidente. Mi hermano estaba conduciendo su auto en la ciudad. Él es un chófer muy competente y muy cuidadoso. De repente (suddenly) otro automóvil pasó la luz roja y chocó (collided) con el vehículo de mi hermano. Vino el policía; pidió (asked for) la documentación de los dos conductores. El imprudente no tenía ni póliza de seguros ni otros documentos necesarios. Resultó que su auto era robado (stolen). Así, el perpetrador fue llevado a la prisión y mi hermano fue llevado al hospital porque sufrió una postración nerviosa.

What is the general meaning of the story...?

- My brother was driving in the city.
- He is a competent and careful chauffer.
- Another car runs a red light and collides with him.
- The police ask both drivers for their license.
- The other driver didn't have the car license and was driving a stolen car.
- The other driver went to jail and my brother went to the hospital.

6

What are cognates?

- English words that look alike and have the same meaning in Spanish.
- 40% of all English words have similar cognates in Spanish.
- If English Language Learners learn to recognize these cognates, bridging the gap will be more attainable.

Cognates help with Comprehension

Example
- The computer is a modern invention.

- La computadora es una invencion moderna.

More Examples of Cognates

- Family   Familia
- Center   Centro
- Gorilla   Gorila
- Alarm   Alarma
- Artist   Artista
- Circle   Circulo

Everyday Activities

THANK YOU

Gracias

APPENDIX I
FAMILIES BUILDING BETTER READERS WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Families Building Better Readers Workshop Evaluation

~Please circle the number that represents your most accurate impression~

Date: _____

Location: _____

Trainer(s): _____

1. Overall Workshop: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Overall program quality	1	2	3	4
Usefulness of program content	1	2	3	4
The visual aids presented	1	2	3	4

2. Opening Session: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
This session	1	2	3	4
The parent tool kit	1	2	3	4
The trainer's ability to teach the session	1	2	3	4

3. Games Readers Play: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
This session	1	2	3	4
The materials for this session	1	2	3	4
The trainer's ability to teach the session	1	2	3	4

4. Everyday Reading: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
This session	1	2	3	4
The materials for this session	1	2	3	4
The trainer's ability to teach the session	1	2	3	4

5. You Are What You Read: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
This session	1	2	3	4
The materials for this session	1	2	3	4
The trainer's ability to teach the session	1	2	3	4

6. Wrap-Up Session: How would you rate	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
This session	1	2	3	4
The materials for this session	1	2	3	4
The trainer's ability to teach the session	1	2	3	4

Please fill out and leave at your table.

What reading tips do you plan to use at home?

_____

_____

Other comments:

_____

_____

Panhandle Area Educational Consortium

110

APPENDIX J
FAMILIES BUILDING BETTER READER WORKSHOP EVALUTION RESULTS 2010

SurveyMonkey

survey title:
2010 Families   •
Building Better   design survey
Readers   •
Elementary   collect responses
Workshop   •
Evaluation Edit   analyze results
Title

View Summary

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

current report: FBBR Responses for 2009-10 ▢ Edit Report Add Report

Response Summary for "FBBR Responses for ..."   **Total Started Survey: 1,243**
Total Completed Survey: 1,243 (100%)

PAGE: PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

1. Overall Workshop: How would you rate   **Create Chart**   **Download**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
Overall program quality:	0.3% (4)	0.8% (10)	22.1% (262)	76.8% (912)	1,188
Usefulness of program content:	0.3% (3)	1.4% (16)	18.1% (215)	80.3% (951)	1,185
The visual aids presented:	0.2% (2)	2.0% (24)	20.9% (247)	76.9% (907)	1,180
				answered question	1,194
				skipped question	49

2. Opening Session: How would you rate

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
This session:	0.2% (3)	1.8% (22)	24.8% (301)	73.1% (888)	1,214
The materials for this session:	0.1% (1)	0.8% (10)	19.9% (238)	79.2% (949)	1,198
The trainer's ability to teach the session:	0.2% (2)	1.6% (19)	17.3% (209)	81.0% (979)	1,209

answered question		1,220
skipped question		23

3. Games Readers Play: How would you rate

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
This session:	0.2% (2)	1.7% (20)	24.2% (292)	74.0% (892)	1,206
The materials for this session:	0.2% (2)	1.6% (19)	22.9% (275)	75.4% (907)	1,203
The trainer's ability to teach the session:	0.2% (2)	1.8% (22)	17.7% (212)	80.3% (960)	1,196

answered question		1,208
skipped question		35

4. Everyday Reading: How would you rate   Create Chart   Download

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
This session:	0.3% (4)	1.4% (17)	22.4% (271)	75.8% (917)	1,209
The materials for this session:	0.1% (1)	1.5% (18)	22.2% (267)	76.2% (915)	1,201
The trainer's ability to teach the session:	0.3% (3)	1.3% (15)	19.0% (228)	79.5% (954)	1,200

answered question	1,210
skipped question	33

5. You Are What You Read: How would you rate   Create Chart   Download

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
This session:	0.3% (3)	1.8% (22)	22.7% (272)	75.2% (902)	1,199
The materials for this session:	0.2% (2)	1.5% (18)	22.7% (270)	75.7% (902)	1,192
The trainer's ability to teach the session:	0.2% (2)	1.4% (17)	18.5% (220)	79.9% (948)	1,187

answered question	1,201
skipped question	42

6. Wrap-Up Session: How would you rate

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Response Count
This session:	0.1% (1)	1.7% (20)	21.4% (247)	**76.8% (888)**	1,156
The materials for this session:	0.1% (1)	1.3% (15)	20.8% (239)	77.8% (895)	1,150
The trainer's ability to teach the session:	0.1% (1)	1.2% (14)	18.8% (215)	79.9% (912)	1,142

answered question	1,157
skipped question	86

Site Links

- Home
- About Us
- Contact Us
- We're Hiring

Help

- Help Center
- Tutorials
- FAQs
- Contact Support

Policies

- Terms of Use
- Privacy Policy
- Anti-Spam Policy
- Email Opt Out / Opt In

Use Cases

- Customer Satisfaction
- Performance Review
- Employee Satisfaction

- Market Research

Languages

- English ▼

116

APPENDIX K
FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Focus Group Interview Questions (in English)

1.	Why do you think it is important for the parents of English Language Learners to be involved in the education of their children?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
	_____

2.	Please list the top 5 strategies that you learned in these workshops did you use with your child at home? Did you use the strategies in English or your native language?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
	_____

3.	Of the 5 strategies you listed, what were the two most effective?
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4.	Would you recommend these workshops to other parents?

_____
_____
_____
_____
	_____

Focus Interview Questions (in Spanish)
Parte III. Preguntas para la entrevista del grupo de foco

1. ¿Por qué crees que es importante que los padres de niños que están aprendiendo inglés se envuelvan en la educación de sus hijos?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
        _____

2. Enumere las 5 estrategias más importantes que aprendió en estos talleres que usa en casa con sus hijos? ¿Uso la estrategia en ingles o en su propio idioma?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
        _____

3. ¿De las 5 estrategias enumeradas arriba, cuáles fueron las dos más efectivas?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
        _____

4. ¿Le recomendaría estos talleres a otros padres? ¿Por qué?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
        _____

APPENDIX L
KRUSKAL-WALLACE/MANN-WHITNEY STATISTICAL DOCUMENTATION

```
GET
  FILE='M:\Documents\Consults\Rivera\RiveraPrePost.sav'.
DATASET NAME DataSet1 WINDOW=FRONT.
COMMENT Education Level.
NPAR TESTS
  /K-W=Diff BY Q2(1 4)
  /MISSING ANALYSIS.
```

NPar Tests

[DataSet1] M:\Documents\Consults\Rivera\RiveraPrePost.sav

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks

	Education Level	N	Mean Rank
Diff	K-8	4	12.50
	K-12	4	14.00
	2 Yr College	3	9.33
	4 Yr College	9	8.44
	Total	20	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Diff
Chi-Square	3.185
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.367

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Education Level

```
COMMENT Gender.
NPAR TESTS
  /M-W= Diff BY Gender(0 1)
  /MISSING ANALYSIS.
```

NPar Tests

[DataSet1] M:\Documents\Consults\Rivera\RiveraPrePost.sav

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Diff	Female	21	14.21	298.50
	Male	5	10.50	52.50
	Total	26		

Test Statistics[a]

	Diff
Mann-Whitney U	37.500
Wilcoxon W	52.500
Z	-.988
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.323
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.340[b]

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

b. Not corrected for ties.

COMMENT Nationality.
NPAR TESTS
  /K-W=Diff BY Nationality_Grp(1 4)
  /MISSING ANALYSIS.

NPar Tests

[DataSet1] M:\Documents\Consulting\Rivera\RiveraPrePost.sav

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks

	Nationality Group	N	Mean Rank
Diff	Mexico	10	15.20
	Puerto Rico	6	16.00
	Dominican Republic	4	9.63
	Other	6	10.75
	Total	26	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Diff
Chi-Square	3.009
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.390

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Nationality Group

COMMENT Income.
NPAR TESTS
  /M-W=DIFF BY FRL(0 1)
  /MISSING ANALYSIS.

NPar Tests

[DataSet1] M:\Documents\Consults\Rivera\RiveraPrePost.sav

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks

	Income	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Diff	Not FRL	3	21.33	64.00
	FRL	23	12.48	287.00
	Total	26		

Test Statistics[a]

	Diff
Mann-Whitney U	11.000
Wilcoxon W	287.000
Z	-1.909
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.056
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.064[b]

a. Grouping Variable: Income

b. Not corrected for ties.

APPENDIX M
PROCEDURAL GUIDE

Reading Strategies and Interventions (RSI) Parents Workshops Procedural Guide

Purpose and Audience

The No Child Left Act of 2002 (NCLB Act) mandates that school districts and schools ensure that English language learners (ELLs) are provided with equitable opportunities and experiences to enhance academic success. The NCLB Act includes ELLs as one of the mandated subgroups whose test scores are used to determine whether schools and school districts are meeting goal or what the law refers to as "adequate yearly progress" (AYP), based on state-level performance standards. With the growing population of English language learners, schools are faced with the challenges of academic achievement and reading development that many ELLs experience in U.S. schools. The NCLB Act provides a framework through which families, educators, and communities can work together to improve teaching and learning. The parental involvement provision of the NCLB Act specifically stresses the shared accountability between schools and parents for high academic achievement. The new legislation of NCLB Act ensures that parents have the information and the training they need to share the responsibility of helping their children achieve high academic standards.

The main purpose of this Reading Strategies and Interventions (RSI) Parents Workshop procedural guide is to provide schools and school districts a framework to assist in implementing reading workshops that will give families the tools needed to support their children's learning at home. The guidelines assume basic knowledge of concepts related to reading strategies, such as the use of a systemic, explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary and reading comprehension for the parents of English language learners.

Goal of RSI Workshops

The overall goal of the RSI parent workshops is to form a partnership with families and provide the skills, strategies, and resources to support reading development in the home to support academic achievement in school. Educating families on the reading process impacts how parents engage with their children in reading activities is the first step in accomplishing the above goal.

Procedures for Implementing Interventions (RSI) Parents Workshops:

The overall objectives of the RSI parent workshops are the following:

- To establish a relationship with parents.

- To provide parents information about the process of developing a second language.

- To provide parents information on the five areas of reading instruction.

- To demonstrate ways parents can help their children with the reading process at home.

- Objectives will be measured with the Pre & Post Test and the FBBR Evaluation Form.

At the first workshop, parents were provided with the Families Building Better Readers Toolkit which contained both English and Spanish booklets explaining 10 reading strategies, a book, a white board, markers, index cards, glue, and a pen. Each reading strategy was explained and modeled for the parents by the researcher and an ESOL Consultant. Additionally, parents were taught the difference between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) and how long it takes to acquire both. They were also

provided with an extensive list of cognates in Spanish and English. From this lesson, they learned

that they knew more vocabulary words in English than they thought. Parents were encouraged to

find as many of the words they knew in Spanish that are also the same in English once they

returned to their homes.

Parents were asked to practice the reading strategies and the use of cognates at home

during the week with their children. Throughout the study, the parents shared the reading

strategies they used with their children and how they responded. Parents were very excited about

being able to use what they had learned at the workshops with their children in Spanish or English.

Parents commented that they were also learning to be better readers along with their children.

Parents were asked to complete an evaluation of the Families Building Better Readers Workshop

on the last day. This evaluation which was included in the FBBR toolkit was comprised of six

sections including a discussion question on what reading tips participants planned to continue

using at home after the training was complete. Parents were asked "How would you rate?" in

regard to each of the workshop components presented during the three session

Areas of Responsibility

Putting together a team to plan, develop and implement RSI parent workshop is essential. Roles

and responsibilities include:

     I.   School Administration

          a. Create a synopsis of audience to be targeted.

          b. Contact neighboring school administrators.

          c. Prepare a survey questionnaire to gather biographical information.

          d. Provide adequate facility site.

e. Obtain approval of site

f. Approve any written communication concerning the training.

g. Obtain approval of material and food purchases.

h. Request needed technology such as computer, microphone, Promethean Board.

II.   Workshop Organizers

a. Coordination and setup of facility site.

b. Identify needed technology.

c. Prepare materials and handouts.

d. Prepare workshop agendas.

e. Prepare presentation.

III. Family contact person

a. Send out invitation letters to parents.

b. Prepare a confirm parent roster.

c. Arrange for child care services.

d. Contact families who have not responded via phone or letter.

e. Follow initial contact with a reminder contact to confirm participants.

f. Make copies of handouts.

g. Facilitate language translation.

h. Collaborate with workshop facilitator.

IV. Workshop facilitator

a. Responsible for planning and collaborating with team.

b. Identify resources to be used.

c. Create engaging activities.

d. Plan and develop the content of each workshop session.

e. Reflect on participants learning gains.

Steps of Implementation:

Preplanning Session:

1. Survey families with a questionnaire to gather biographical information. This information will be used to determine family members' knowledge of reading strategies and intervention as it related to academic success. (See appendix B)

2. Create a synopsis from the surveys detailing who the audience member will be.

3. Develop appropriate activities that will engage the audience such as ELLs parents, Hispanic parents, primary grades, struggling learners, or all parents.

4. Review the ten reading strategies outlined in the FBBR Instructor's Manual and *Putting reading first. The research building blocks for teaching children to read* publication.

5. Invite content experts such as Title I Technology Resource Teacher to demonstrate the use of the Promethean Board, FCAT Explorer, My On.Reader, Ticket to Read, Safari Montague, Success Maker; ELL Consultant and Classroom Teachers.

6. Create sign in sheets, agenda, and participants' handouts and name tags.

7. Contact and confirm participants' attendance to each workshop via phone or letter.

8. Purchase snacks, beverages and door prizes.

9. Prepare and set up materials for group activities such as markers, charts paper, pens, pencils, post-its.

10. Arrange for child care services and activities for children.

<p align="center">During the Workshop:</p>

11. Provide a welcome speech and introductions. Have all members and parents share a brief introduction.

12. Review agenda/objectives for the workshop.

13. Have participants complete a pre-test in Spanish or English (See Appendix B).

14. Distribute FBBR kits which include Workshop Booklet, White Board, markers, pen, index cards, and a children's book.

15. Encourage active participation by parents such as group presentations, group processing collaboration and peer conferencing. Ask for opinions, feedback and concerns from participants.

16. Model reading strategies and allow practice time.

17. Paraphrase and chunk information in family friendly language.

18. Provide real world examples so parents can make connections such as the use of cognates in Spanish and English to increase comprehension.

19. Review RSI workshop strategies on the last session

20. Administer post test and Family Building Better Readers Workshop Evaluation (See Appendix B)

21. Celebrate learning with a potluck luncheon.

After Workshops:

22. Provide participants with certificate of completion.

23. Correct post test and analyze parents' responses on the FBBR Workshop Evaluation.

24. Continue communication with parents.

25. Continue to provide opportunities for parental involvement throughout the year.

REFERENCES

Adams, G.L., & Engelmann, S. (1996). *Research on direct instruction: 25 years beyond DISTAR*. Seattle, WA: Educational Achievement Systems.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., Rasavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education (7th ed.).* Thompson Wadsworth .

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.

August, D. and Shanahan, T., (Eds.) (2006). Developing literacy in second-language learners: report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Aylward , E.H., Richards, T.L., Berninger, V.W.,Nagy, W.E., Field, K.M., Grimme, A.C. . . Cramer, S.C. (2003). Instructional treatment associated with changes in brain activation in children with dyslexia. *Neurology 61*, 212-219.

Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from: http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teacher

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.

Borman, G., Hewes, G., Overman, L., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *73*, 125-230.

Brisk, M.E. (1998). *Bilingual education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bus, A.G., van IJzendoorn, M.H., & Pellegrini, A.D. (1995). Joint book reading makes for success in learning to read: A meta-analysis on intergenerational transmission of literacy. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 1-21.

Calderón, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R.E. (1998). Effects of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students making the transition from Spanish to English reading. *Elementary School Journal, 99*, (2), 153-165.

Camacho, M. (2007). *Enhancing the knowledge of involvement of Hispanic families of children with disabilities through specially designed family workshops* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida). Retrieved from http:www.ucf.edu.

Chrispeels, J.H., & Rivero, E. (2001). Engaging Latino families for student success. How parent education can reshape parents' sense of place in the education of their children. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(2), 119-169.

Christian, D., & Genesee, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Bilingual education*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Collier, C. (2001). *Cognitive learning strategies for diverse learners*. Ferndale, WA: Crosscultural Developmental Education Services.

Cummins, J. (1994). The role of primary language development in promoting educational Success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-46). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Edwards, P. IRA responds to NAEP data. *Reading Today*, December 2010/ January 2011, 3

Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning*, *41*(3), 375-411.

Epstein, J.L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Epstein, J.L., & Salina, K.C. (2004). Partnering with Families and Communities. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 12-17.

Fantuzzo, J., Tighe, E., & Childs, S. (2000). Family involvement questionnaire: A multivariateassessment of family participation in early childhood education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 367-376.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995). English as a second language instruction in the United State: A research review. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 115-152.

Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org

Francis, D.J., Kieffer, M, Lesaux, N, Rivera, H., &Rivera, M. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction academic interventions*. Posrtsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Freppon, P. (1991). Children's concepts of the nature and purpose of reading in different instructional settings. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *23*(2), 139-163.

Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist, May*, 126-135.

Harvard Family Research Project (2006/2007). *Family Involvement in elementary school children's education*. Cambridge, MA: Available at http:.gse.harvard.edu.

Henderson, A. & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.* Austin,TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Henry, M.K., & Peyton, J. (2006). Research foundations of voyager passport. Retrieved from http://www.voyagerlearning.com/news/archives.jsp

Hill, J.D., & Flynn, K.M. (2006). *Classroom instruction that works for English language learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hill, N.E., & Craft, S.A, (2003). Parent-school involvement and school performance: Mediated pathways among socioeconomically comparable African American and Euro-American families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 74-83.

Jensen, E. (2006). *Teaching with the brain in mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jeynes, W. H (2005). *Parental involvement and student achievement: A meta-analysis*. Cambridge, Harvard Family Research Project.

Kasten, W. C., & Clarke, B. K. (1989). *Reading/writing readiness for preschool and kindergarten children: A whole language approach*. Sanibel, FL: Educational Research and Development Council. ERIC: ED 312 041.

Kilgore, S., (2005). Comprehensive solutions for urban reform. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 62,* 44-47.

Linan-Thompson , S., & Vaugh, S. (2007). Research-based methods of reading instruction for English language learners, K-4. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*,

Lyon, G.R., & Chhabra, V; (2004). The science of reading research. *Educational Research*, 61, 12-17.

Lyon, G.R. (2002). Reading development, reading difficulties, and reading instruction: Educational and public health issues. *Journal of School Psychology* 40, pp. 3-6.

Manning, M., Manning, G., & Long, R. (1989). *Effects of a whole language and a skill oriented program on the literacy development of inner city primary children*. ERIC: ED 324 642.

Martin, A. (2003). *Families building better readers: Blueprints for success: A family workshop for the elementary grades*. Florida Department of Education's Just Read Florida.

Martinez, J., & Perez, M. (2008). Latino men answer the call to get involved. *PTA Magazine*, February/March @ http:www.pta.org/2065.htm.

National Assessment of Educational Progress, (2004). *2005 long trend assessment results in reading.* Retrieved October 21, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard

National Association of School Psychologists (2003).

National Association of School Psychologists (2004).National Center for Education Statistics (2005). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics (2010). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Reading Panel (1997). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

National Research Council (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

No Child Left Behind Act, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425, 2002. U.S.C. (2002).

Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students (2008). *Biennial report to Congress on the implementation of the Title III state formula grant program, school years 2004–06.* Washington, DC; 2008. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/3/Biennial_Report_0406.pdf

National Standards for Family and School Partnerships: An Implementation Guide. (2009). Arlington, VA: Parent Teacher Association. Retrieved from http://www.pta.org/documents/national standards

Partnership for Reading (2001). *Put reading first. The research building blocks for teaching children to read.* Retrieved from National Institute for Literacy @ www.nifl.gov.

Pinnell, G., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 9-40.

Powell, R. R., Zehm, S., & Garcia, J. (1996). *Field experience: Strategies for exploring diversity in schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Reyes-Blanes, M. (2002). *Partnering with Latino migrant families of children with disabilities. a challenge, a mission*. Presented at the Annual National Conference Proceedings of the American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES). Reno, NV. March 7-9, 2002.

Ribowsky, H. (1985). *The effects of a code emphasis approach and a whole language approach upon emergent literacy of kindergarten children*. Alexandria, VA: Educational Document Reproduction Service. ERIC: ED 269 720.

Rosenberg, H., Lopez, M.E., & Westmoreland, H. (2009). *Family engagement: A shared responsibility*. Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved from www. hfrp.org

Senechal, M. (2006). *A meta-analytic review of the effects of family literacy interventions on children's acquisition of reading from Kindergarten to Grade 3*. National Center for Family Literacy.

Senechal, M., & LeFevre, J. (2002). Parental involvement in the development of children's reading skill: A 5-year longitudinal study. *Child Development, 73*, 445-460.

Shaywitz, S.; & Shaywitz, B.; (2004). Reading disability and the brain. *Educational Research*, *61*(6), 6-11.

Sheldon, S.B. (2003). Linking school-family-community partnerships in urban elementary Schools to student achievement on state tests. *The Urban Review, 35*(2), 149-165.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (2000). Research on achievement outcomes of success for all: A summary and response to critics. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(1), 38-40, 59-66.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (2001). *One million children: success for all.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Snow, C.E., Burns, S.M., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Stice, C. F., & Bertrand, N. P. (1990). *Whole language and the emergent literacy of at risk children: A two-year comparative study*. Nashville: Center of Excellence: Basic Skills, Tennessee State University. ERIC: ED 324 636.

Turnbull, A.,Turnbull, R., Erwin, E., & Soodak, L. (2006). *Families, professionals, and exceptionality: Positive outcomes through partnerships and trust*. Columbus. OH: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

U.S. Department of Education (2008). *National assessment of educational progress in reading and mathematics, 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education (2007). *Reading first: Student achievement, teacher empowerment, national success*. http://www.ed.gov/nclb.methods/readingfirst.html.

Voyager Expanded Learning (2008). *Voyager passport teacher's guide, level d.* Dallas, TX.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), pp. 89–100.

Yan, W., & Lin, Q. (2002, April). *Parental involvement and children's achievement: Race and income differences.* Paper presented at the annual conference of American Research Association, New Orleans, LA.