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Abstract
This narrative study explored the perspectives of six Francophone African-born family members who have pre-school aged children attending early childhood care and education settings in the Little Senegal section of Harlem in New York City. It examined the personal experiences they reported regarding their own early language and literacy development, their descriptions of home factors that mediated their children’s language and literacy acquisition, and their reports of the ways in which they experienced the efforts of educators within early childhood care and education settings. A qualitative narrative method framed the study. Purposeful sampling was utilized to identify research participants, and semi-structured interviews were employed. Presentations of individual narratives, as well as an inclusive thematic analysis, were the basis of the findings. The study found that oral traditions and multilingualism were prevalent in the lives of the Francophone African-born parents as children and continued to be valued in their lives as adults. The study also discovered the complex manner in which participants foster an environment in their homes for sustaining their heritage languages while simultaneously supporting English language development, but their narratives indicate a tension resulting from striving to satisfy both aims. Finally, this study found that the interchanges of participants with early childhood care and education setting educators were largely one-way and prescriptive and ignored the multicultural heritage and bi/multilingualism of families. The implications of this study suggest how a recognition of the complex nature of the identities, multinational migration patterns, and multilingual backgrounds of African-born immigrants potentially inform pedagogy, curricular decisions, policy, and scholarship.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Personal Background

My interest in literacy experiences and practices of culturally and linguistically diverse families emerged from both my personal and my professional life. I was born in the United States of America (U.S.) to parents that emigrated from Guyana, South America. I grew up in what I fondly consider a Caribbean village in Brooklyn, New York. During my childhood, I was completely immersed in a prescribed set of norms, values, and expectations that were expressed through language, oral history, music, and cuisine. These various facets of my culture fostered a connection to my community and a certainty about my identity. I was eager as a child to display the manifestations of my culture through my ability to speak the dialect, dance to traditional rhythms, appreciate the spicy cuisine, and identify with the music of my village—patois, calypso, chutney, and reggae. My appreciation of these various aspects of my community filled my family, friends, and me with pride. Among this group of family and friends, I felt known for who I was sculpted to be, accepted for upholding our traditions, and connected to an international community that I had not met.

Oral history, told by my parents and family members, was a crucial part of stimulating my early experiences, knowledge, and awareness about what was valued in my community and illuminated who I was. It was through listening to vibrant renditions in English patois that I accepted the unquestioned knowledge of elders and a strong respect for superstition. I also learned to value strength, adventure, sacrifice, and joy. I could picture my grandmother and grandfather raising six children on meager earnings. My grandmother was a savvy market seller who could weave elaborate stories that made people want to purchase her goods. My grandfather was a day laborer who was known for his ability to make spectacular dishes out of anything and
his fondness for children. One of the prevailing stories in my family that signified the importance of remaining connected was my grandfather’s passing. It was articulated to the new generation that he passed away because of a broken heart. All his children had transitioned to the United States to chase the American Dream—advanced education, a stable income, and access to provisions. My grandfather was left alone without his familial support. It was through stories like these that I learned the importance of honoring the knowledge of the past and making decisions that enhanced the progress of our community. I also learned the power of expressive language and being able to both captivate and teach through narrative. Kegan (1982) stated, “there is no feeling, no experience, no thought, no perception independent of a meaning-making context” (p. 11). My culture, language, and environment have influenced how I filter various experiences.

When I entered public school, however, I became uncertain about who I was and my ability to learn. At school, I no longer heard the familiar stories from home, nor did I see myself reflected in the behavior, values, and expectations of my teachers. I was now introduced to reading texts, which I could not relate to, and was reluctant to exhibiting behaviors not commended at home. I underwent a “disorienting dilemma,” as the values and expectations at home and school were not always aligned (Mezirow, 1990). It was during this time, my family has expressed, that I transformed from a vibrant and talkative child to a quiet and observant one. Throughout my elementary school years, I found myself filled with questions that I was unsure how to express. Some of the questions that I could recall having during these early years were:

Why do people keep asking me if I was Jamaican? Why do I have to write everything? Why do I have to speak so loudly in front of people? Why do the children look their teachers in the eye? Why can’t my teacher understand my mother? While I was making my adjustments to perform
well in school, my parents and family members encouraged and inspired me to excel in school, which they viewed as a necessity to obtain the American Dream.

My early experiences and identity inspired my commitment to working with culturally and linguistically diverse families. For over 10 years, I have worked in various capacities in urban elementary schools. While my professional positions have changed over these years, my sensitivity to the experiences of diverse families and my desire to develop partnerships between home and school has remained steadfast. Primarily, I have worked in schools where the prevailing belief is that the school can remedy the persistent educational disparities. Lunenburg (2010) described a misunderstanding that can exist in learning environments that orient with “a closed system theory [which] views schools as sufficiently independent to solve most of their problems through their internal forces, without taking into account forces in the external environments” (p. 1). In my experience, these educational institutions have professed that they can accomplish their student performance goals through the development of their own culture that focuses on accountability, high expectations, and performance. The external factors of families and environments have been treated as distractors to making significant educational gains. This predominant school view has conflicted with my personal orientation, which acknowledges that families and communities have a presence and influence on their children’s learning.

While I worked on programs that focused on family outreach and involvement to influence early language and literacy acquisition, I found myself questioning colleagues and families about how these two groups of adults could work in congruence. In these schools, there was a prevalence of prescriptive literacy programs that communicated the mechanics of developing language and literacy skills with limited consideration to how relationships
influenced this acquisition. My desire to have more clarity about what occurred in the homes of culturally and linguistically diverse families has stemmed from my personal connection to this topic; the uncertainty families have expressed to me as they have attempted to navigate the expectations, rules, and recommendations by schools; my conversations with colleagues about the creation of equitable partnerships; and my Ph.D. coursework, which has illuminated the social component of literacy acquisition. My interest in this research study emerged from my personal background and my professional and scholarly interests that made me attentive to interactions between families and schools, and my curiosity was further heightened as I became acquainted with families of West African heritage and their interactions with ECCE programs in New York City.

**Statement of the Problem**

**School Readiness and Family and Intergenerational Literacy Programs**

Over the past 30 years, early childhood education and care (ECCE) settings have created family and intergenerational literacy programs aimed at influencing the knowledge and practice of immigrant and refugee populations. These programs have been utilized to “improve skills, attitudes, values, and behaviors linked to reading” (Nickse, 1990, p. 5). The United States has embarked upon several education reform efforts that have promoted family engagement (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 is the latest iteration of these reform efforts that intentionally prioritizes home and school partnerships. Public schools that have a high percentage of families who are low income receive Title I funding from the U.S. Department of Education. Each state is required to allocate 1% of their Title I funds to parent engagement efforts that include “home-based reading programs that promote alignment between home and school activities” (Capotosto et al., 2017, p. 1).
Family and intergenerational literacy programs operate under the shared understanding that family members are vital in stimulating the environments and experiences that are conducive to early language and literacy acquisition. A significant body of research from the early childhood development and brain development fields demonstrates that family members are instrumental in nurturing socio-emotional and cognitive growth (Lyons, 2003; Perry, 2002; Posner & Rothbart, 2007). The foundation for learning is created during a young child’s life, ages zero to eight, through the daily interactions where they are making meaning. Much research evidence has supported the positive acquisition of enduring literacy practices when parents facilitate early literacy experiences (Fan & Chen, 2001; Mullis, Mullis, Cornielle, Ritchson, & Sullender, 2004; Weigel, Martin, & Bennett, 2005). Examples of these early literacy interventions have been discovered in robust preschool early literacy experiences: intellectually challenging conversations, the use of “rare words,” extensions of conversations through questioning, hearing books, and analysis of books (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). The intentional role in language and literacy development taken by parents has been shown to supersede other influences—socioeconomic status, level of parental education, and family size (Flouri & Buchanan, 2004). Furthermore, family members are their children’s first teachers and provide the initial exposure to language and literacy expectations, values, and use (Strickland & Taylor, 1989).

Parents have a vital role in the development and growth of their children, especially during the early years (Britto, Brooks-Gunn, & Griffin, 2006; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; McCoy & Cole, 2011; Weigel, Martin, & Bennett, 2005). A synthesis of parental involvement research concluded that “the evidence is consistent, positive, and convincing: families have a major influence on their children’s achievement in school and through life. When schools,
families, and community groups work together to support learning, children tend to do better in school, stay in school longer, and like school more” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 7). Adults who share a “sphere of influence” on children create a milieu that stimulates the intellectual, mental, physical, and socioemotional competencies of children (Epstein, 2001, 2010). There is consensus among researchers, policymakers, and educators that the role of the family is undeniable in early language and literacy growth. These stakeholders, however, continue to debate the manner in which familial relationships affect the enactment of readiness and literacy in young children.

**Readiness defined.** The concept of readiness in early care and education is plagued with a lack of consensus on its definition, an absence of an agreed-upon standard, and discord on how to measure it (Ackerman & Barnett, 2005; Saluja, Scott-Little, & Clifford, 2000). Kagan (1990) highlighted the complexity of the different interpretations of readiness by stating, “the idea of ‘readiness’ poses very real challenges, both conceptually and practically. Conceptually, readiness remains poorly defined and variously interpreted. Practically, it is mired in confusion, with practitioners and policy makers advancing widely differing positions regarding it” (p. 272).

The ambiguity that has entrenched the term and the nature of readiness has hindered a cohesive understanding and universal operation of it. School readiness encompasses two pivotal ideas that have divergent components: readiness for school and readiness for learning (Kagan, 1990). Readiness for school is a fixed construct. It is orientated with the traditional Western notion emulated by capitalist societies that accept a narrow conception of literacy, which exclusively attributes literacy to schooling and pedagogy (Auerbach, 1995; Clancy & Simpson, 2002; Graff, 1987; Street & Street, 1995). Ogbu (1990) underscored this limited perspective of literacy by conveying that it “has become synonymous with academic performance . . . the
ability to read and write and compute in the form taught and expected in formal education” (p. 116). Therefore, literacy defined by these strict parameters concentrates on the training of a technical skill set that can be applied to various educational disciplines. Early reading research substantiated the prevailing belief that literacy was “‘cognitive’ or ‘mental’ . . . residing primarily inside people’s heads, not society” (Gee, 2015, p. 2). There is an emphasis on skill acquisition, with minimal regard to how contextually contingent aptitudes, knowledge, and understanding influence the use and definition of literacy (Street & Street, 1984).

Readiness in young children can be linked to their later academic success, their completion of higher levels of education, and their ability to secure employment (Ackerman & Barnett, 2005; Duncan, Dowsett, & Claessens, 2007; Hair, Halle, Terry-Humen, Lavelle, & Calkins, 2006). Feinstein and Symons (1999) underscored this idea through their study that identified that the single greatest predictor of achievement for children at the age of 16 was parental interest in their child’s education. Moreover, Duncan et al. (2007) posited that even after taking into consideration diverse family backgrounds, children with higher levels of school readiness at the age of five were successful during the primary school years, were less likely to drop out of high school, and earned more as adults.

Maxwell and Clifford (2004) emphasized the importance of families with the following statement: “children are not innately ‘ready’ or ‘not ready’ for school. Their skills and development are strongly influenced by their families and through their interactions with other people and environments before coming to school” (p. 42). Research has demonstrated that the disparities in school performance originate before children enter formal schooling (Alexander, Entwisle, & Bedinger, 1994). School readiness is positively correlated with school success and has life-long consequences (Kagan, Moore, & Bredekamp, 1995; Snow, 2006). Family and
intergenerational literacy programs have sought to ameliorate what have been viewed as insufficiencies in school readiness for those who are racially, linguistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse. Researchers, policymakers, and educators have debated how to remedy the disproportionate educational outcomes during the early lives of immigrant children, with early language and literacy development viewed as a major area of contention.

**Readiness for school defined.** Historically, readiness for school has been strongly associated with reading readiness (Gray, 1927). Moss (2012) indicated that a prevailing notion of school readiness is that early childhood education and care is a preparatory phase for formal education; the objective of this time is to equip children with the skills and behaviors to perform well in compulsory schooling. A thorough knowledge of the alphabetic system, phonemic awareness, print concepts, and comprehension are noted as essential foundational aptitudes (Learning First Alliance, 1998; National Early Literacy Panel Report, 2008; Okwilagwe, 1988). Kagan (1990) revealed that readiness for school can be attributed to children’s ability to distinguish, identify, and copy shapes, colors, letters, and numbers. Children acquire “pre-primary” skills with an emphasis on early literacy and numeracy skills through the initiation of adults (Britto, 2012). Children’s competency levels are measured by their alignment to the elementary school curriculum (Kagan, 1990; Okon & Wilgocka-Okon, 1973).

The origins of the reading readiness approach emanate from a fixed conceptual child development framework. Downing and Thackray (1971) stated that reading readiness is a period of time when a child can be presented with instruction that they can comprehend and utilize in their growing understanding of written text. There is an argument in reading readiness that development of language occurs naturally, while the development of literacy requires explicit teaching of pre-skills by schools. A specific time in the mental, physical, and social-emotional
development of children is designated as the optimal time to cultivate the ability to decipher written language (Neuman, Copple, & Bredekamp, 1998).

Family and intergenerational literacy programs are typically shaped by several assumptions made about language and literacy development that reinforce the fixed construct that reading readiness operates under (Jarrett & Coba-Rodriguez, 2017; Pratt, McClelland, Swanson, & Lipscomb, 2016). There is a defined scope and sequence of skills that children are expected to master before they can progress forward. The skills are arranged in a particular order, become increasingly complex, and are assessed by early childhood. The components—alphabet awareness, phonemic awareness, print concepts, and comprehension—are thought to be pivotal to early language and literacy development of children (Child Trends Databank, 2015).

Family and intergenerational literacy programs that are strictly oriented to skill development associated with the reading readiness construct can create disconcerting repercussions on culturally and linguistically diverse families (Heath, 1983, 2004; Lightfoot, 2004; Street, 1995). These family literacy programs can potentially marginalize and discredit the literacy of families who are racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse (Auerbach, 1989). There is a focus in these family and intergenerational literacy programs on what the families are not doing at home and how the schools can inform their choices (Auerbach, 1989; Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis, 2012). Early childhood educators and care providers who embrace reading readiness in their practice tend to communicate to families that their role is to reiterate school-established routines and expectations at home in order for their children to progress forward (Learning First Alliance, 1998; Armbruster, Osborn, Lehr, RMC Research Corporation, National Institute for Literacy, 2003).
Readiness for learning defined. The other component of readiness, readiness for learning, is defined as the “level of development at which an individual (of any age) is ready to undertake the learning of specific materials” (Kagan, 1990, p. 273). Readiness for learning reflects the understandings that have developed from ethnographic research that posits that the home milieu stimulates early language and literacy acquisition (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Heath, 1983). The beneficial impact of family members’ engagement in their children’s learning extends beyond their early language and literacy development throughout their academic trajectory. The range of differences in children’s health, social development, and engagement are acknowledged. There is an assumption that growth can be cultivated in each of these areas. In addition, the age and capability of peers is considered in order to gauge what a child may be ready for in schooling experiences.

Emergent literacy defined. Emergent literacy is aligned to readiness for learning. It designates an importance in the social interactions between children and adults (Fitzgerald, Schuele, & Roberts, 1992). The environment that children are immersed in is applicable to their conceptual and procedural knowledge of language and literacy development (Sénéchal, LeFevre, Smith-Chant, & Colton, 2001; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). The conceptual knowledge is the comprehension of the text through specific strategies that include background knowledge, awareness of semantics, and awareness of situational context (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). The procedural knowledge is the ability to understand print first by recognizing sounds and letters, then moving on to recognizing increasingly complex words and combinations of words (Sénéchal et al., 2001). Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998) proposed that conceptual knowledge and procedural knowledge must be present in order for children to develop conventional reading abilities. Adult caregivers can intentionally provoke and support the early language and literacy
acquisition of children by immersing them in different opportunities, experiences, resources, and contexts.

A premise of the emergent literacy theory is that children are in the process of becoming literate from birth. The literacy and language foundation is constructed and nurtured along a “developmental continuum with its origins early in the life of a child” (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 2001, p. 596). In emergent literacy theory, early language and literacy acquisition is recognized as non-linear development that is nurtured through purposeful and authentic interactions with the real world. Early language and literacy acquisition is a dynamic and active experience where children grow in their competence and capability as observers, listeners, speakers, readers, and writers through a range of experiences. Teale and Sulzby (1986) posited that these behaviors and knowledge are not pre-anything. . . It is not reasonable to point to a time in a child’s life when literacy begins. Rather, at whatever point we look, we see children in the process of becoming literate, as the term emergent indicates. (p. xix)

Teale and Sulzby contend that children do not obtain their language and literacy competency through isolated interactions or during one specified time in their lives. The emergent literacy perspective recommends that educators value a range of experiences that children have, accept that each child will develop at a different pace, and acknowledge that each person interacting with children plays a seminal role to their growth. Rohde (2015) and Zygouris-Coe (2001) agree that early childhood educators and caregivers who operate with an understanding of emergent literacy and an understanding of developmentally appropriate pedagogy are more inclined to facilitate experiences that will enrich these concepts. Moreover, early childhood practitioners operating with an understanding of emergent literacy would express that there is connection, growth, and individualized displays of the concepts of print awareness,
language, and phonological awareness. The emergent literacy perspective acknowledges that variations in demographics, culture, and community change the environment where children acquire their early language and literacy knowledge and skills.

**Literacy in diverse households.** A substantial body of research has indicated that educational institutions do not always recognize non-mainstream literacy practices, which in turn can have an adverse effect on students academically (Brown, 2011; Fayden, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2005). Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines (1988) conducted a research study where they assessed the literacy environment of children who were living below the poverty line. Historically, in the United States, children under the age of 18 who are “Black, American Indian, and Hispanic are disproportionately low income and poor” (Koball & Jiang, 2018, p. 4). Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines (1988) posited that “families use literacy for a wide variety of purposes (social, technical, and aesthetic purposes), for a wide variety of audiences and in a wide variety of situations” (p. 202). This previously-mentioned study highlighted that there was a robust use of language and literacy through everyday interactions in the homes of these culturally, linguistically, and socio-economically diverse children who faced challenging economic circumstances. There are various ways in which culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse families utilize language and literacy that influence their children’s literacy skills, motivations, and habits (Auerbach, 1989; Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Dudley-Marling, 2009; Heath, 1983; Janes & Kermani, 2001; Jarrett, Hamilton, & Coba-Rodriguez, 2015; Purcell-Gates, 1996; Reese, 2012).

Family and intergenerational literacy programs that are responsive to the cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic context of different families have developed bilingual programming and are considering varying approaches to sustain the home languages of the
families while also developing English (Anderson, Friedrich, & Kim, 2011; Hirst, Hannon, & Nutbrown, 2010; Quadros & Sarroub, 2016; Rodriguez-Brown, 2011; Zhang, Pelletier, & Doyle, 2010). There is evidence that these programs have made progress in the attainment of English language and literacy in children when they foster the learning that is already occurring in the homes of these children (Dudley-Marling, 2009; Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001; Janes & Kermani, 2001). These socio-culturally responsive family and intergenerational literacy programs have features of readiness for learning that aligns with literacy as a social practice.

Literacy as a social practice operates under a guiding principle that acknowledges the presence of multiple literacies. Gee (1991) enumerated the importance of who you are and what you are communicating as vital considerations in numerous contexts. A cognizance of the social practice of literacy debunks the notion that literacy can operate in a vacuum. Literacy is no longer defined by prescriptive skill attainment; instead, the complexity that is created by variance in positionalities, dispositions, and lived experiences are acknowledged. Consider the perspectives, backgrounds, and experiences of diverse groups of families (Gee, 1991). Socio-culturally responsive family and intergenerational literacy programs operate with the ethos that literacy and language activities are occurring in the homes of diverse groups of families.

Policymakers, educators, families, and communities may appear to have a harmonious stance on the importance of school readiness, but these stakeholders disagree about the meanings and objectives of readiness. Questions have arisen about which group of stakeholders’ needs to be ready in order to ensure that children will succeed when they begin compulsory schooling (Vinovskis, 2009). The three considerations that have been made are children’s readiness for school, schools’ readiness for children, and contributions of family and community supports and services to children’s readiness for school success. The National Goals Panel, School Readiness
Initiative, and the National Head Start have communicated that the readiness of all groups of stakeholders is pivotal to ensuring a comprehensive approach that benefits children, especially during the early years (Vinovskis, 2009). The definition of readiness has to be clarified by families, early childhood practitioners, and community partners who are present in the lives of young children. This definition dictates how these stakeholders align their efforts to provide developmental experiences and environments that prepare children to successfully transition to compulsory schooling. In addition, a clear and shared understanding of the term “school readiness” affects its application to improve the early development and learning of children, the quality of schools, and the participation of families (Britto, 2012). School readiness has the potential to create a long lasting influence on the learning growth of children, not only throughout their elementary school years but throughout their lives (Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2001; Weikart & Schweinhart, 1993; Vitaro, Brendgen, Larose, & Trembaly, 2005; Webster-Stratton & Taylor, 2001).

The two conflicting components of school readiness—readiness for learning and readiness for school—generate opposing communication and behavior from theorists, policy makers, educators, and families involved in early education and care. While there is flexibility in the ideology and application of child development in readiness for learning, there are restrictive conventions applied to the construct of readiness for school. There is a preeminence of reading readiness approaches that emulate the stringent principles of readiness for school in many family and intergenerational programs that seek to work with immigrant and refugee families, which have presented a number of challenges as these families encounter family and intergenerational literacy programs that do not acknowledge their experiences, their ways of knowing, and their
literacy traditions and activities (Auerbach, 1989; Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009; Gregory & Williams, 2000; Tett & Crowther, 1998).

**Contemporary Migration Trends**

The contours of the argument that support the use of family and intergenerational literacy programs in ECCE settings must be understood with a substantive knowledge of the current population changes in the United States. Contemporary migration trends have contributed to a myriad of ethnicities, languages, and racial identities present in the adult and student population. There are approximately 44.5 million people living in the United States who are foreign-born, which equates to 13.7% of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The current foreign-born population is at its highest numbers in a century. The population of children who have at least one parent who is foreign-born outpaces the growth of all other student populations (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011). The Science of Early Childhood Development (2007) noted that after decades of increased immigration, one in four children under the age of eight years old has at least one immigrant parent. In a mere 20 years, the population of 4.3 million young children of immigrants increased to a population of 8.7 million young children of immigrants in 2010 (Fortuny, Hernandez, & Chaudry, 2010). This approximate doubling of the young child population with a foreign-born parent accounts for the entire increase of the United States’ young child population between 1990 and 2010 (Fortuny et al., 2010).

One-third of children of immigrants are considered “linguistically isolated” because they are living in environments where a person who is 14 years old or older and is proficient in English is not present (Fortuny et al., 2010). Consequently, by the age of five, approximately 35% of these children of immigrants speak both English and their home languages fluently, while approximately 37% of these children of immigrants were considered English Language
Learners by the age of five. The data from the 2016 American Community Survey substantiated that the poverty rate for immigrant children is approximately 51%, while it is 38% for native-born children (Koball & Jiang, 2018). The statistical evidence that this population is growing compels us not to ignore the children with foreign-born parents. The range of English language and literacy abilities within this specific population is significant.

**African-born Immigrants in the United States**

African-born immigrants are a rapidly growing ethnic group in the United States. According to the American Community Survey, this particular population has doubled from 881,300 people in 2000 to 1.6 million people in 2010; this correlates to 4% of the foreign-born population (Grieco, Trevelyan, Larsen, Acosta, Gambino, De la Cruz, & Walters, 2012). Amicable immigration policy in the form of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 and the Refugee Act of 1980 provided entry into the United States for those who were African-born and met one of the following criteria: had a family member sponsoring his or her transition to the United States, had earned high degrees of educational attainment and skill development, or required asylum from residence in an unstable country (Grieco et al., 2012). The legislative parameters that granted African-born immigrants entry into the country have influenced the demographics of the population that now has residence. The clear majority of these foreign-born Africans come from the eastern and western coasts of the continent. According to the 2010 American Community Survey and a historical review of the 1960 to 2000 decennial census, three-quarters of African-born immigrants are identified as “Black” (Grieco et al., 2012). This specific racial identifier, Black, encapsulates “Blacks born in the U.S., Black Africans (immigrants from Africa), and Afro-Caribbeans” (Fournillier, McLean, & George, 2013, p. 258).
Zhou (2003) cautioned that the term Black, used as nomenclature, presents numerous challenges that stem from a lack of recognition of the intragroup diversity.

African immigrants have higher levels of education, higher levels of English level proficiency, and lower unemployment rates compared to other immigrant groups (Carrington & Detragiache, 1999; Maurseth, 2019). Many are a part of a population of people contributing to what is known as the “brain drain of Africa,” which is an enormous international migration of trained and educated workers from less-resourced countries to postindustrial societies (Nyang, 2018; Thomas, 2011). Approximately 40% of African immigrants have a college education (New American Economy, 2018). Arthur (2013) noted that “the majority of the African immigrants have experienced urban life and transnational migration prior to coming to the United States” (p. 2).

African immigrants are more linguistically diverse than other immigrant groups (Thomas, 2009). There are approximately 2000 non-official languages spoken on the continent of Africa in varying degrees (Sands, 2009). The ability of this recent immigrant group to develop competency and efficiency in English is crucial, as it correlates to their ability to establish economic and social stability for their families and integrate into the United States (Thomas, 2009).

New York State, home to 158,878 African-born immigrants, saw this immigrant group’s population increase by 35.9% between the years 2000 and 2010 (Grieco et al., 2012). Over the past 30 years, in an area of New York City known colloquially as “Le Petit Senegal,” or Little Senegal, the population of African-born immigrants has surged (Duthiers & Chen, 2013). The Little Senegal community is composed of a substantial Francophone African-born immigrant population predominately from Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Guinea, and Senegal. The majority
identify as Muslims (Lee & Lee, 2007). Francophone African-born immigrants in New York City exist as a minority within a minority group. Kasinitz (1992) described this phenomenon as “double marginality.” The racial identifier Black is often attributed to Blacks born in the United States and not to Blacks who are African-born or Afro-Caribbean. Francophone African-born immigrants epitomize intragroup diversity with their variance in language, religion, and country of origin. French, Wolof, Arabic, and English are all languages that can be heard and seen in the varied correspondence and advertisements in the enclave. Islam and Animism both have a presence in this community. The people of this community are also predominately working class, involved in the transportation, service, production, construction, and maintenance industries (Duthiers & Chen, 2013). This community has a presence in the commerce, cuisine, and culture of this section of Harlem. This group of foreign-born Africans live, work, and attend schools in an area that historically has been home to Blacks born in the United States.

Considering the evidence that the demographic landscape of the United States has experienced a monumental increase in the African immigrant population and that the parental role in early language and literacy acquisition is significant, research is needed to investigate the observations and encounters that families with such backgrounds have regarding the early language and literacy development of their children. While this group has a substantial presence in commerce, cuisine, residence, and school attendance, there is little evidence that they are deeply understood by researchers, policymakers, and educators. Conspicuously limited in extant research are the sociocultural practices, ideologies, values, and positionalities of Black immigrants residing in the United States, even though their population has grown at notable rates (Fournillier et al., 2013). The perspectives of Francophone African-born immigrant families who are raising their children in Little Senegal in New York City are missing from current research,
and this particular study aims to address this absence. There is a need to consider the perspective of a larger array of families and their perspectives (Compton-Lilly et al., 2012).

As the demographic landscape in Little Senegal has changed, a rapid expansion of ECCE programs has occurred in recent years in New York City. In 2018, 70,000 pre-kindergarten children in the city attended a five-day-a-week ECCE program (Shapiro, 2019). There are 1,850 ECCE programs that exist and are a compilation of district schools, charter schools, pre-kindergarten centers, and New York City Early Education Centers. An English language intervention program that informs teaching instruction for second language learners has been implemented in over 100 ECCE programs. Francophone African-born families in Little Senegal with pre-kindergarten-eligible children find that they are now a part of the initiative to ensure that their children are prepared for compulsory schooling.

Culturally and linguistically diverse families are inundated with challenges as they seek to meaningfully engage in their children’s early education (Park & McHugh, 2014). The barriers for these foreign-born family members include a limited proficiency in English language and literacy, minimal understanding of how to navigate the educational system in the United States, and restricted understanding of the cultural norms and values in the United States (Auerbach, 1989). The home environment is critically important to the development of early language and literacy and has been shown to enhance or diminish school readiness, performance, and engagement (Compton-Lilly et al., 2012; Gonzalez, Borders, Hines, Villalba, & Henderson, 2013; Heath, 1983). Concerns and questions have emerged from considering scholarship about school readiness and family and intergenerational literacy programming alongside literature explaining contemporary migration trends of African immigrants. These concerns and questions
underscore the need for greater understanding about how the immigrant families that are the focus of this study regard their children’s early education and care.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand how Francophone African-born immigrant family members narrated their personal experiences of early language and literacy acquisition and their understandings of their children’s early English literacy and language acquisition. This study revealed the “plots of narratives (the *whats*) [while] attempting to understand the ways in which stories about experience are presented, structured, and made to cohere (the *hows*)” (Gubrium & Holstein, 1997, p. 147). The content and context of narrative are integral components of this meaning-making device that operates with the stance that life is “storied” (Chase, Josselson & Lieblich, 1995). There is a fundamental notion in narrative that the meaning given to life is acquired through the construction and internalization of self-defining stories. The content of the narratives, “the *whats*,” were revealed as Francophone African-born immigrant family members expressed their myriad of ideas, thoughts, and experiences that their children had as they develop their early English language and literacy skills and awareness. In addition, “the *whats*” were presented through the family members’ communication of their interactions with their children’s teachers and the ways in which they assign significance to these interactions.

“The *hows*,” the process of telling the story, were presented as family members expressed their ideas in a particular fashion in order to elicit a specific meaning. De Oliveira (2010) suggests that “we alter our stories, shifting their emphasis, altering our choices of words or the significance of the experience we relate depending on our audience” (p. 1017). Through this interpersonal communication, prominence is placed on “how people construct, make sense of,
and negotiate identity, relationships, and meaning” (Kellas, 2015, p. 1). Furthermore, this social interaction “embodies the relation between narrator and culture” (Chase et al., 1995, p. 2). Narrative, in the form of oral storytelling, communicates connected events with a specified implication within a greater society. It influences the ways in which people express themselves, the formation of their cultural history, and the construction of communal identity and values (Hodge, Pasqua, Marquez, & Geishirt-Cantrell, 2002). The action of the telling of the story, “the whats,” and the circumstances surrounding the telling, “the hows,” are closely related and create a complexity that I, as a researcher, had to consider as I discerned and described the social reality that was articulated by the Francophone African-born immigrant family members.

This research study did not generalize the understandings of a specific immigrant population. Instead, the nuanced perspectives of individual family members were communicated as they affirmed their own belief system, thoughts, and experiences through their narration of their children’s early English language and literacy development and their contact with their children’s schools.

The following questions guided this study:

- What do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members report about their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school?
- How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members explain their roles in their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?
- How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members describe their encounters in early childhood care and education settings that center on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?
Definition of Terms

**Immigrant**

The Immigration and Nationality Act 101 broadly defines the term “immigrant” with the following: “any alien or person not a citizen or national of the United States” (Section 101.8 U.S.C. 1101). For the purposes of this study the term “immigrant” is used interchangeably with “foreign-born.”

**Black Immigrants**

The U.S. Census Bureau surveys and decennial census utilizes the term “Black immigrants” to refer to people who are racially identified as Black and who are foreign-born. Since the year 2000, people can designate more than one racial identifier to encapsulate who they are on the surveys (Pratt, Hixson, & Jones, 2015).

**Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE)**

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) indicates that early childhood care and education (ECCE) “includes ‘care’ (health, hygiene and nutrition and child care in a nurturing environment) and ‘education’ (play, socialization, guidance and developmental activities), ideally provided in an integrated manner” for children from birth to the age of eight years old (UNESCO, 2013).

**Francophone African-born Families**

“Francophone African-born families” is used to refer to people who emigrated to the United States from different African countries and who share a common written and spoken language with various dialects. For the purpose of the study, a defining characteristic is that they have emigrated within the last ten years from French-speaking West African countries seeking safety, economic stability, and/or a better education for their children.
Literacy Practices

For the purposes of this study, literacy and language are being considered socially constructed through the interactions, observations, and participation in culturally contingent situations with those who are more competent in the literacy skill set and behavior (Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978). People hold varying understandings about their role during literacy events, and they hold different beliefs about the nature of literacy that are dependent upon their own experiences (Heath, 1983; Purcell-Gates, 1996; Street & Street, 1984).

Significance of the Study

There are numerous stakeholders who could potentially benefit from the insights arising from this study. This study contributed to the research in the field on family engagement in schooling and sociocultural views of early language and literacy acquisition (Heath, 1983; Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988). Early childhood educators, administrators, education researchers, school leaders, education training agencies, and education schools have been provided with an additional example of the value of learning about the families of their students to inform their pedagogy (Auerbach, 1989; Ramirez, 2003). The personal perspectives and viewpoints of family members offered an understanding of how their knowledge, competence, skills, and social relationships influence the experiences and environment their children are immersed in and therefore influences their children’s early language and literacy development.

The diversity within racial groups is an important factor that this study illuminated to educators, policymakers, and researchers. In this study, the Black African-born immigrant experience was explored in order to provide an understanding of how literacy practices are constructed within the complexity of a social, cultural, and positional identity that is not reflected in the mainstream values and practices of schools.
This study provided insight into considerations that family and intergenerational literacy programs can make in order to create a more robust, inclusive, and informed program for students and families of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. A substantial body of research has noted how schools may not recognize non-mainstream literacy practices, which, in turn, can have an adverse effect on students academically (Auerbach, 1989, 1995; Moll et al., 2005; Rodriguez-Brown, 2011). Educators can integrate an understanding of the home culture of students to develop informed instructional practices. In this study, knowledge about the families' context and identity were expressed and demystified by the family members themselves. This research intentionally ensured that a space was created for culturally and linguistically diverse families to communicate their varied perspectives, experiences, practices, and values.

**Design of the Study**

**Orientation**

A narrative analysis method framed this study (Polkinghorne, 1988; Riessman, 1993; Wortham, 2001). This is a form of qualitative research that requires a methodical examination of language and behavior in circumstances that are considered typical. The tools to organize and interpret life experiences and thoughts are provided using a system of principles. Stake (1995) expounded on this topic, writing, “it [qualitative research] is holistic in that it is contextualized and case oriented. For example, it considers the wide sweep of context such as temporal, special, historic, cultural, personal, and social factors” (p. 43). The intangible components of life that include social norms, culturally specific values, behaviors, and thoughts can be analyzed and understood. The complexity of the intersections of identity and context can be expressed through the descriptive nature of the in-depth studies.
The narrative form relays connected events that a speaker uses to explain an experience and explain what he/she ascertained from an experience. Bamberg (2012) elaborated on the role of the speaker by stating that the speaker “position[s] characters in space and time . . . give order to and make sense of what happened—or what is imagined to have happened. Thus, it can be argued, that narratives attempt to explain or normalize what has occurred” (p. 77). Narrative method operates with the understanding that the story that people tell about themselves and their lives portray their understanding of these experiences and social reality (Chase, 2003). People choose how to portray themselves and their sense of agency through the narration. The external conditions that include the operating norms in a social environment that influence behaviors, experiences, actions, and thinking are acknowledged in narrative as people modify and negotiate their expression of themselves. The content of the narrative and the ways in which the narrative is constructed are subjective components of this spoken or written account. This form of expression is used to both understand what has occurred and to be understood by others.

In this study, the narratives of six Francophone African-born family members were explored. Semi-structured interviews were employed to understand the lived experiences and perceptions of these families to illuminate their lives, negotiations, and relationships in relation to their own early language and literacy acquisition and their children’s early English language and literacy development.

**Setting and Selection of Participants**

Le Petit Senegal, or Little Senegal, is a densely populated section of the Harlem neighborhood in New York City. The boundaries of this neighborhood are fluid but are recognized as existing in Central Harlem along West 116th Street between Lenox Avenue/Malcom X Boulevard on the east and Frederick Douglass Boulevard on the west (Attah,
2007). Historic demographic changes occurred in a five-year period ending in 2005 in Little Senegal, when the number of African-born immigrants increased by two-thirds to nearly 6,500 people (Kankam, 2007). Approximately one-sixth of these African-born immigrants are French-speaking people from Senegal (Kankam, 2007). West African-born immigrants from Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Guinea, Senegal, and various other countries can also be found in this section of Harlem. There are numerous apartment complexes that cater to families who qualify for low-income housing accommodations. Attah (2007) illustrated Little Senegal vividly by stating that “…it abounds in aromas of stewing mafe and yassa wafting out of restaurants, sidewalks turned into mosques and businesses stocked with merchandise right out of Dakar” (p. 10). The economic and social presence of this African-born immigrant community is reflected in the bakeries, delis, tailors, hair salons, and dialects in this area.

The participants were chosen through convenience sampling from the Little Senegal portion of Harlem and consisted of six Francophone African-born family members. In addition, two Francophone African-born family members participated in my pilot interview. Five out of six of the participants in the study attended the same early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting in Little Senegal. The one participant whose child attended a different ECCE setting agreed to be a part of the study because of a mutual acquaintance that we both had and trusted. After several unsuccessful telephone and email attempts to gain permission to connect with families through the administrators and directors of various ECCE settings in Little Senegal, I gained permission to connect with families in-person at a school that I had connected with earlier in my career as an educator. The administrators and staff at the ECCE setting directed me to speak with families who met the criteria I had informed them of (see Appendix A). All of the participants and the school administrator were informed of the risks and benefits of participating
in the study. They were informed that they could refuse to be a part of the study at any time.

Each of the participants was given the option to have a French interpreter, whom I had trained on the nature of a narrative inquiry study, to participate in the interview. One out of six of the participants requested the French interpreter.

**Role of the Researcher**

I was aware that my own contextualized personal experiences as a Black female raised by immigrant parents offered a sensitivity to this topic and preconceptions that have been established through my own lived experience. An assumption that I have held in my personal life and professional life is that linguistically and culturally diverse family members feel that their literacy home practices do not connect with literacy school practices. This supposition was reinforced by the tension that I experienced while immersed in disjointed home and school literacy practices as a child and while I worked in school environments that conceptualized and implemented literacy programs through assimilationist efforts. It was through exposure to varied perspectives introduced through Ph.D. coursework and in-depth conversations with colleagues and families that I become cognizant of the need to recognize and address misconceptions that I have. Takacs (2003) posited that individuals cannot be entirely objective because they are filtering experiences and knowledge through their own epistemology. I understood the importance of creating a space where participants could express their own thoughts and insight. My ability to acknowledge the possibility of harmony between home and school literacy practices demonstrated a shift in my thinking and approach to learning more about this topic. It also epitomized an exercise in self-authorship (Pizzolato, Magolda, Creamer, & Olson, 2016). The development of this skill set to challenge the thoughts and meaning-making that I have established through socialization was difficult, was done intentionally, and continues to be a skill
In order to respond to personal bias and to engage in the meaning-making process, I incorporated an interpretive and reflexive qualitative methodology in the data collection. Mason (2002) stated that “if you wished to derive data in an interpretive manner, then you would be wanting to ‘read’ the interviews for what you think they mean, or possibly for what you think you can infer about something outside of the interview interaction itself” (p. 78). Reflexivity was an activity that provided me with an opportunity to consistently expose and reexamine my personal thoughts, feelings, and perceptions that I held throughout the research process. This practice provided me with the open-mindedness needed to acknowledge the new information that was generated.

I wanted to ensure that I alleviated any barriers that could be caused by my lack of fluency in French, so I hired an interpreter who was fluent in both French and English. Riessman (2000) explained that “storytelling is a relational activity that gathers others to listen and empathize” (p. 169). I was cognizant that the social dynamics of the researcher, interpreter, and research participants would have an influence on developing a level of trust that was needed to make the exchange conducive. Given this circumstance, participants were made aware that they could have an interpreter present during interviews. I employed special care in choosing someone who was familiar with the population of families and who would be competent at interpretation (see Appendix F). The interpreter shared the same racial identity of the participants, which was Black. She was college-educated, born in Martinique, had lived in France, and had resided in Little Senegal for a number of years before moving elsewhere in New York City. She was not an acquaintance of any of the participants in the study. I trained her on the nuances of the study and, in particular, the descriptive nature of the study and emphasized
that it was not predictive. With this in mind, I instructed the interpreter to strive to represent the intended meanings of the participants and researcher instead of her personal thoughts. I utilized her interpretation skills during one of the pilot interviews and during one of the interviews for the study. All of the other participants chose to speak with me in English.

Data Collection

I collected data through semi-structured interviews and interpretive and reflexive practices that I utilized throughout the research phase. I planned to have one initial interview and then have a follow-up interview with each of the participants. There was a change of circumstance for two of the participants, which was their acquisition of employment with demanding hours. These two research participants were only available for the initial interview. Four out of six of the participants were interviewed twice. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed by me. I took notes before interviews, during interviews, and after interviews to elicit possible meanings of situations and thoughts that percolated in my position as a researcher engrossed in the narrative journey of the participants.

I utilized the examples and templates proved by Creswell (2013) to generate the initial interview protocol. I formulated questions for the initial and follow-up semi-structured interview protocol that was open-ended and encouraged participants to candidly express their thoughts (Foddy & Foddy, 1994; see Appendix F). I piloted the interview protocol with two individuals whose backgrounds were similar to the study’s participants. The pilot interview experience helped me refine the interview questions and helped me determine ways to maintain a relaxed atmosphere and query in a more concise format. I developed a script to ensure that I clearly communicated with the participants the parameters of the research and their rights as participants.
and that I clearly relayed the questions that I had determined were relevant to the study (see Appendices E, F, and G).

**Data Management**

I made every effort to ensure that specific ideas and thoughts were not attributed to actual participants by keeping data files in secure locations and changing the names on responses. As part of my training of the French interpreter, I ensured that she was aware that a strict adherence to confidentiality was needed. She signed an agreement that detailed this and was not given access to the transcripts without my presence (see Appendix F). She and I worked through listening to transcriptions after interviews to ensure that I had a clear understanding of what was interpreted for the one pilot interview that required her assistance and the one interview during the research study that required her assistance. The names of the participants and schools were changed. All paper copies of interpretive and reflexive notes were kept in locked file storage. Upon completion of the dissertation, all transcripts and interpretive and reflexive notes will be destroyed.

**Data Analysis**

Creswell (2013) recommends a methodological approach that involves preparing and organizing the data, classifying the data in order to develop themes, and representing the data. I reviewed the transcripts and interpretive and reflexive notes numerous times. I identified emergent and salient themes, along with visceral words and patterns, by utilizing open coding and provisional coding during the initial rounds of data analysis. After the initial round of coding, I recognized preliminary categories, noting how the data informed the guiding research questions. Sub-themes were identified, and larger patterns were identified to create a cross analysis of the perspectives and insights of each of the six immigrant family members. I organized the information conveyed through the “narrative form” (Bamberg, 2012).
This particular research study was conceptually informed by Gee’s (1996, 2001a, 2001b, 2014) sociolinguistic theory. I framed the six family members’ narration of their understandings in regard to literacy and language as a social concept with prescribed notions of literacy (Gee, 1996, 2001a, 2001b, 2014). Discourse is described by the ways in which socially and historically defined groups of people integrate and recognize their ways of talking, listening, writing, reading, acting, interacting, believing, valuing, and feeling (Gee, 1996, 1999, 2001a). Language is a crucial component to this social identity, as Gee (1990) defined discourse with a lower case d as

any stretch of language (spoken, written, signed) which “hangs together” to
make sense to some community of people who use that language . . . making sense is
always a social and variable matter: what makes sense to one community of people
may not make sense to another. (p. 103)

I have provided a full explanation of aspects of design and method in Chapter three. Additional details about data analysis procedures also appear in Chapters Four and Five.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The study was delimitated in the following ways. By design, the participants were Francophone African-born parents or guardians who live in Little Senegal and have a pre-school-aged child. The length of time that the families have lived in the United States was noted. Family members who had resided in the United States for less than 10 years were incorporated into this study. The role of the family member, which included parent or guardian, was incorporated in the study. Auerbach (2002) cautioned that the daily childcare responsibilities of immigrant families are not always reflective of the mainstream configuration of a two-parent household. Immigrant families can have other extended family members who take an active role in raising
their children. I was cognizant of this potential family makeup and wanted to ensure that I created the ability for my study to account for this at the onset. I had the participants list their specific role to the pre-kindergarten child. In this particular study, four biological mothers and two biological fathers participated in this study. This research study focused on the perceptions and the accounts of a small group of family members, and it was not meant to represent the positionalities and perspectives of an entire ethnic and linguistic population. Therefore, the accuracy of the storytelling was not researched in further detail. This study consisted of face-to-face interviews that were audio-taped. One of the pilot interviews and one of the research interviews involved a French interpreter at the request of the parent.

Chapter Outline

Chapter One: Introduction

Chapter one is divided into the following sections: (a) Introduction, (b) Statement of the Problem, (c) Purpose of the Study and Guiding Questions, (d) Definition of Terms, (e) Significance of the Study, (f) Method, (g) Delimitations of the Study, and (h) Chapter Outline.

Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

Chapter two situates the reader in understanding the concept of family involvement in schooling with historical and theoretical insight. Pervasive perspectives that informed the creation of family and intergenerational literacy programs are presented. The understandings of the role of linguistically and culturally diverse families in family and intergenerational literacy programs are explored. This overview of the research provides the social, cultural, political, and historical details needed to understand the study in greater depth. Sectioned headings are (a) Framing Family Involvement, (b) Family Literacy Programs, (c) Immigrant Families and Family Literacy, and (d) Summary.
Chapter Three: Design and Method

Chapter three describes in further detail the rationale for the design of the study and how the study was conducted to address the purpose and guiding questions. The sectioned headings are (a) Description, Rationale, and Theoretical Framework, (b) Methods, (c) Sampling: “Beginning the Story,” (d) Data Collection: “Living the Story,” (e) Data Analysis: “Writing the Narrative,” and (f) Summary.

Chapter Four: Presentation of Narratives

Chapter four presents in the participants’ own words their personal backgrounds, their upbringing, their thoughts in regard to their children’s early childhood literacy and language development, and their accounts of their encounters with educators in ECCE settings. Sectioned headings are (a) Overview of Analysis, (b) Introduction to Participants, and (c) Analysis of Individual Narratives.

Chapter Five: Presentation of Findings

Chapter five presents the thematic understandings that emerged when I investigated the meanings within and across each of the six narratives provided by the Francophone African-born family members. Sectioned headings include (a) Inclusive Analysis of Narratives and Findings, (b) Immigrant Family Members’ Own Early Language and Literacy, (c) Immigrant Family Members’ Home Practices and Experiences, (d) Immigrant Family Members’ Encounters with the Early Childhood Education and Care (ECCE) Settings, and (e) Concluding Remarks.

Chapter Six: Discussion, Implications, and Future Research

Chapter six reintroduces the essential research that informs the study, details areas for further research, and provides final reflections. Sectioned headings include (a) Background, Relevant Scholarship, Purpose of the Study, and Design, (b) Discussion of Findings, (c)
Implications for Policy, Practice, and Scholarship, and (d) Limitations for Study/Considerations for Further Study.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the theoretical writings, research, and other extant scholarship that are integral to understanding knowledge relevant to this study. This specific research study aims to provide insight into the ways in which African-born immigrants narrate their own early language and literacy experiences, their perspectives on their children’s early language and literacy acquisition, and reports on how they are experiencing the efforts of schools in Little Senegal, New York City. I will begin this chapter by discussing the fundamental differences evident in the literature regarding how family involvement is conceived depending on its alignment with “Worlds Apart frameworks or Worlds Together frameworks” (Doucet, 2011, p. 2707). “Worlds Apart frameworks” encompass scholarship in family engagement that operates with the ethos that the spheres of home and school are “distinctly separate and culturally mismatched” (Doucet, 2011, p. 2707). Consequently, the “Worlds Apart frameworks” are marred by a deficit approach where the educational institutions determine the learning plan for children and families with little to no insight from these families’ themselves. “Worlds Together frameworks” encompass scholarship in family engagement that has “challenged the binary constructions suggested by cultural mismatch theories, insisting that boundaries between apparently separate spheres are permeable and never fixed” (Doucet, 2011, p. 2707). Therefore, in the “Worlds Together framework,” family involvement lends itself to a much more flexible conception where the family member’s role and influence is acknowledged and considered in various facets of a child’s life. Each of the aforementioned frameworks for family involvement and family engagement has its limitations. They each require modification in order to appropriately meet the contextually contingent needs of the schools, families, and students.
I will then examine the implementation of family literacy programs whose creation was informed by the frameworks that were explored earlier in the chapter. I will provide a historical, social, and political overview of the relevant facts regarding the definition, creation, and application of family literacy programs. I will address how family literacy programs have aimed to address challenges that immigrant families experience when working with their children to help them perform in school. I will examine how immigrant family members’ thoughts, perspectives, and realities have been shown to be vastly absent in the creation of family literacy programs, even though the programs presumably intend to serve the families’ needs. There are a number of assumptions that educational institutions can make about immigrant families whom they may label as apathetic and/or whose input into the learning experience of their children they may dismiss. The literature reviewed includes sources that offer guidance about how family literacy programs should understand and honor the ways that immigrant family members engage their children in learning. I will highlight a concern about the lack of substantial empirical research on African-born immigrants and the importance of studies like this one to inject their particular voices and perspectives into the scholarly research.

Finally, this literature review will provide context regarding oral traditions and multilingual environments of West Africa. This is the milieu that each of the six family members came from and spoke about during their interviews. It is crucial to have an understanding of how these specific literacy traditions have informed the perspectives, thinking, and decisions that the research participants make as they now reside in New York City. Each of the bodies of research provide a multifaceted view of family literacy programs.

**Framing Family Involvement**

“*Worlds Apart Frameworks*”
Scholarly research and policy efforts that span decades have acknowledged that parents have the ability to influence their children’s academic prowess and abilities to navigate schooling in a positive manner (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton, & Luppescu, 2010; Epstein, 1995; Fan & Chen, 2001; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2010). Historically, family involvement has been framed in a structuralist framework, which draws attention to the presence of cultural disjunctures between home and school beliefs, values, norms, and practices of primarily immigrant students and students of color (Cook-Cottone, 2004; Henderson & Berla, 1994; Phelan, Davidson, & Yu, 1993; Pransky & Bailey, 2005; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Yamauchi & Tharp, 1995). According to Doucet (2011), “Worlds Apart frameworks identify different norms, goals, values, practices, and so on, for the various worlds inhabited by youth and their families” (p. 2708). Parents are depicted as opposing caricatures, with those who display upper-class and middle-class values being considered “overflowing containers,” while those who do not display the accepted values and norms are considered “empty vessels” (Lightfoot, 2004, p. 95). The group of parents in the latter group of “empty vessels” are often parents of color, immigrants/refugees, working class, or poor (Lightfoot, 2004, p. 95; see also Doucet, 2011). Furthermore, this aforementioned group can be considered by schools to have very little value to add to the educational experience of their children without remediation and assistance from the schools (Doucet, 2011; Lightfoot, 2004;).

Critical engagement literature suggests that immigrant/refugee, bicultural, communities of color, working class, or poor families can find that their input, perspective, and lived experiences are not acknowledged in the schools (Canagarajah, 1999; Lewis & Diamond, 2015; Olivos, 2006; Valenzuela, 1999). This can create tension, as the operating norms, values, and pedagogical theory of the schools do not coalesce with the learning traditions and values of
culturally and linguistically diverse families (Fu, 1995; Heath, 1983; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 2000; Scollon & Scollon, 1981). Extant research that encompasses the “Worlds Apart frameworks” reveals that a deficit model of family engagement can exist in schools as they view the immigrant/refugee, bicultural, working class, or poor families as subjects with limited power or position in the school and who require direction on how to interact with the school and their children (Doucet, 2011, p. 2708; see also Delgado-Gaitan, 2004; Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2004). Ishimaru and Bang (2016) underscored this concept by noticing that there could be “the existence of schools that are ‘subtractive’ spaces-for bicultural students and their families-that dismiss and often mischaracterize the social and cultural resources of such families by using a deficit lens” (p. 852).

Jeynes (2010) highlighted that schools tend to request the more overt displays of parental involvement, including school visits, meetings, and fundraising. Random and compliance-driven strategies can be utilized in family involvement, which upholds the deficit approach to this sort of correspondence and relationship building between schools and families (Paredes, 2011). These efforts are typically fragmented strategies that are organized around social activities and events that may include open houses and school parties. Families are provided with broad educational information and time to meet school staff (Paredes, 2011). Typically, the agenda for these disconnected events, meetings, and activities is determined or approved by the schools. There is an operating assumption that the school is the keeper of the knowledge about how children successfully learn. Accordingly, the parameters of conduct and interaction are determined by funding sources and/or state or local educational agencies. Mattingly, Prislin, McKenzie, Rodriguez, and Kayzar (2002) indicated that a number of family and community organizations create family engagement efforts that often do not acknowledge the complexity of
context and relationships in regard to their influence on student progress. Constrained parameters are created through activities like parent-teacher conferences and school events, where parents interact with the school in limited capacities as passive listeners, fundraisers, and clients (Baquedano-López, Alexander, & Hernández, 2013).

Through a meta-analysis of parental involvement in 41 quantitative studies that included data from over 40,000 participants, Jeynes (2010) identified positive outcomes of subtle aspects in parenting. These subtle aspects of parenting were identified as the opposite of deliberate acts, which included parents assisting children with acquiring self-control, learning how to make choices, using language to navigate through various interactions, recognizing environmental print, communicating needs, and nurturing healthy relationships. These non-academic and culturally-situated ways that parents support children’s educational growth may not be visible to the school, but they are important to the development of children (Ramos & Alegría, 2014). When the variances in parental involvement are not affirmed for culturally and linguistically diverse families, they can “often feel unwelcome, powerless, and marginalized in their children’s schools” (Ishimaru et al. 2016, p. 852).

The “Worlds Apart frameworks” can come across as standards for parents that focus on specific behaviors instead of appreciating the intricacies of those behaviors and the cultural subtext (Doucet, 2011, p. 2708; see also Delpit, 1995). There are certain expectations of parents that, when they are unfulfilled, can be viewed by the school as the parents not satisfying their obligation. Dyrness (2007) posited that families can detach themselves from the schooling process as they encounter challenges that are expedited by differences in expectations that are informed by race, culture, values, and traditions. Concurrently, many empirical studies reveal that linguistically and culturally diverse families feel more comfortable entering and engaging in
their children’s schools when the differences in expectations between themselves and the school are addressed (Crozier, 1999; Crozier & Davies, 2007; Graue, Kroeger, & Prager, 2001; Lareau & Horvat, 1999).

“Worlds Together Frameworks”

The “Worlds Together frameworks” draw attention to the poststructuralist view of family involvement, which suggests that the boundaries between the spheres of influence of home and school are not fixed and stringent; instead, there is movement from one context to another (Doucet, 2011, p. 2708). The body of scholarly research about literacy, second language learners, and family engagement acknowledges the complexity of lived experiences and perspectives of immigrant/refugee, bicultural, low-income, or poor families who are engaged in the schooling experiences with their children (Gutierrez, 2008; Gutierrez & Orellana, 2006; Hall, 2008; Hull & Schultz, 2001, 2002; Orellana & Gutierrez, 2006). This research focuses on understanding how the various facets of home and school values, beliefs, and experiences manifest and can be comprehended.

Research abounds about the importance of the development of meaningful partnerships between schools and families as an essential component to children’s learning (Boutte & Johnson, 2014; Delpit, 1995, 2006; Epstein, 2001, 2010; Gill, Purru, & Lin, 2012; Reardon & Owens, 2014; Willems & Gonzalez-DeHass, 2012). Henderson and Mapp (2002) found that children with engaged families attend school regularly, are more likely to attend post-secondary schools, earn higher grades and test scores, and improve their behavior and attitudes about school. The families themselves also reap the benefits of family engagement in ways such as increased confidence about guiding children through school, appreciation for teachers’ work and skills, and a stronger sense of support from the school and families (Epstein, 2013). Educators
have also benefited from family engagement because it has been shown to increase their respect for families’ strengths and efforts, understanding of families’ goals, and satisfaction with teaching (Epstein, 2013).

The “Worlds Together frameworks” uphold the tenets of the concept of family engagement prescribed by Weiss, Lopez, and Rosenberg (2010), who stated that it is a shared responsibility of families, schools, and communities for student learning and achievement; it is continuous from birth to young adulthood; and it occurs across multiple settings where children learn. As a reform strategy, family engagement should be systemic, integrated, and sustained. (p. 3)

The researchers emphasized the importance of incorporating an operating norm of family engagement that is focused on the various connections between home and school. Epstein (2010) underscored this idea with the following: “partners recognize their shared interests in and responsibilities for children, and they work together to create better programs and opportunities for students” (p. 1). Collaboration and an exchange of knowledge is emphasized in the development of reciprocal relationships between home and school (Epstein, 2001, 2010; Henderson & Berla, 1994; Weiss, Caspe, & Lopez, 2006).

The literature review of the “Worlds Together frameworks” suggests an expansion of considerations that must be made into the commonly held norms of understanding in regard to the stakeholders both in the home and in the school, the nature of relationships between these spheres of influence in children’s lives, and the ways in which relationships in the different contexts of children’s lives are established (Doucet, 2011; Gutierrez, 2008; Lightfoot, 2004; Nasir & Saxe, 2003). Doucet (2011) posited that the “World Together frameworks” recognize that there are potential ways that dynamic relationships among different contexts of children’s
lives can be established without being regimented to the fixed notions of what constitutes as learning in the home because of “false binaries, such as in-school/out-of-school, good parent/bad parent, in-group/out group, or ethnic culture/American culture” (p. 2709). The binary categories presented above limit the conception and application of family literacy programs, underscore a deficit orientation, reinforce the inequitable status quo, and advance assimilation. The complexity of identity and behaviors of individual people are explained with cursory nomenclature and preconceived notions instead of an understanding of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1990) and subtractive schooling (Valenzuela, 1999). Intersectionality is a framework that considers the various ways in which different parts of people’s identity—including race, class, gender, and language use—are interdependent, influenced by power, and are used to discriminate those who are considered different from the mainstream. Intersectionality theory acknowledges that identity markers do not operate in isolation; furthermore, it recognizes that culturally and linguistically diverse people operate in societies where inequities are a systemic part of society (Doucet & Adair, 2018). Valenzuela (1999) posited that schools fail to recognize the resources that culturally and linguistically diverse families and children have and that schools create a power dynamic that requires these marginalized groups to compromise their cultures, languages, and community-based identities.

“Worlds Together frameworks” acknowledge and challenge the disadvantages that culturally and linguistically diverse people face by creating structural changes to family involvement. The approach to family involvement is a strengths-based approach with a consideration for community and children capabilities, while also fostering collaboration between home and school that develops meaningful learning experiences for children. The liberatory power of education to change systems that recognize, address, and foster the agency
and power of culturally and linguistically diverse people is present (Freire, 1968/1998/2005; hooks, 1994). Moreover, “Worlds Together frameworks” do not pressure culturally and linguistically diverse families and children to make drastic changes to the ways they operate, communicate, and live.

The “Worlds Apart frameworks” and “Worlds Together frameworks” of family involvement both recommend the development of a relationship between the stakeholders in both spheres of influence in a child’s life—home and school (Doucet, 2011). A debate continues regarding the nature of the relationship and the best ways in which the relationships can be established.

**Family Literacy Programs**

The concern from researchers, policymakers, educators, and communities about children’s school readiness and the glaring disparities in educational achievement of marginalized communities have contributed to the growth of family literacy programs (Auerbach, 1989, 1995; Gadsden, 1992, 1994). Policymakers and educators have emphasized leveraging the knowledge and abilities of parents and communities with the intention of enhancing family learning experiences and children’s academic achievement. While this overarching goal for family literacy has been clear, the explicit and implicit definitions of family literacy vary. The variation of the meaning stems from its roots to numerous theories that include multiculturalism, emergent literacy, adult literacy, and social justice, just to name a few. The differences in family literacy programs are vast and are often very dependent on the population of families and students being served and the definition under which it is operating. Anderson and Henry (1994) noted that family literacy is a belief in the parents’ ability to influence the developmental capacity of their children and that the literacy competency of the parent is an
essential component to fostering literacy skills and knowledge in children. Nickse (1990) underscored this idea by stating, “family and intergenerational literacy programs provide an opportunity to combine agendas of mutual importance: the improvement of adults’ basic skills and children’s literacy development” (p. 1). The role of the family in literacy development is brought to the forefront of this programing as an area that must be addressed in order to stimulate and support growth in children.

Morrow, Paratore, Gaber, Harrison, and Tracey (1993) proposed the definition below for family literacy that was incorporated by the International Reading Association’s Family Literacy Commission:

Family literacy encompasses the ways parents, children, and extended family members use literacy at home and in their community. Sometimes, family literacy occurs naturally during routines of daily living and helps adults and children get things done…family literacy may be initiated purposefully by a parent or may occur spontaneously as parents and children go about the business of their daily lives. Family literacy activities may also reflect the ethnic, racial, or cultural heritage of the families involved. (p. 7-8)

The definition above provides a comprehensive acknowledgement that family literacy is a process of integrating verbal and written communication into meaningful activities within the family and community. In addition, family literacy can be thought of as “the set of oral, symbolic and graphic ways by which family members exchange and retain information and meaning” (Padak, Sapin, & Baycich, 2002, p. 3). Auerbach (1989) supports this definition of family literacy as an “inclusive” one, which allows the activities and practices of families to be appreciated. This broad definition of family literacy lacks a specific theoretical framework,
which leaves the goals, implementation, and assessment of the programs up to interpretation by outside entities, including organizations and schools that utilize this approach.

Nickse (1990) depicted the variations in the implementation of family literacy through a typology that noted distinctions between two essential components: type of program intervention (direct or indirect) and type of participation (adult alone; children alone; adults and children together). The parameters of each program type appear below.

Table 1

Typology for Family and Intergenerational Literacy Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>direct adult – direct children</td>
<td>This is an intensive model that often requires a great deal of time from the adults. Adults and children attend highly structured and sequenced activities to enhance their literacy skill sets. Adults are taught how to extend the literacy-learning occurring in school at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>indirect adult – indirect children</td>
<td>Adults (who may or may not be a parent) and children (unrelated children are welcome) attend family literacy activities. A key feature is that literacy is viewed as enjoyable. It is presented through informal formats with flexible expectations on attendance. Examples are book talks, read alouds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>direct adult – indirect children</td>
<td>The focus is on improving the literacy skill set of the adults with the hopes that this will generate positive changes in children’s literacy acquisition. Children participate rarely, if at all. Workshop formats are utilized with adults coaching each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>indirect adult – direct children</td>
<td>The focus is on improving the literacy development of children with adult participation as optional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The content of the table was adapted from Nickse (1990).
The ways that families are engaged in the literacy-learning processes of their children in family and intergenerational literacy programs vary. Nickse’s classification system of family and intergenerational literacy programs does not capture the intricacies that exist; instead, it provides an overarching understanding of the essential characteristics of each type. The nuances of the target population that receives the programming, its objectives, the duration and frequency of interactions, the nature of the relationships, and the potential benefits to the participants are not depicted by this typology but are underscoring ideas that those who create and implement family and intergenerational literacy programs must consider. For Type 1 programming, the adults and children are engaged in a formal and highly structured literacy intervention. Type 1 programs require the parents and children to commit for a longer period of time and to meet frequently in order to obtain the new skills and knowledge. Type 2 programs are less-structured, short-duration, and enjoyable activities that aim to develop the literacy skills of adults and children over an extended period indirectly. Type 3 programs tend to be short-term initiatives that directly aim to influence the literacy knowledge and use of adults through workshops and peer instruction. Type 4 programs also tend to be short-term initiatives for children whose “goal is supplementary school related school improvement” (Nickse, 1990, p. 36) that is teacher-directed, has take-home assignments, and does not have direct instruction for adults. There is no literacy instruction for the parents themselves. Nickse (1990) posited that while each of the forms of family and intergenerational literacy programs have a primary group that has been identified as benefiting from the services provided, there is also a secondary group that can find that their literacy knowledge and experience also benefit because of one group’s participation. This is the case with Type 3 programs, where children are influenced by their parents’ experiences, and Type 4 programs, where parents are influenced by their children’s experiences (Allen, 2016;
Kesoglou, 2016; Scott, 2015). Nickse (1990) asserted that “no single model or type is necessarily better than another, assuming a needs assessment has preceded the design of the program and influences the practice” (p. 35).

The variances of family and intergenerational literacy programming are viewed as having equal value, as long as it meets the goals of the program and the beliefs about the nature of the relationships (Nickse, 1990). The family and intergenerational literacy programs that require direct contact with families and children tend to be aligned with “Worlds Apart frameworks” when the differences in the families’ approach, belief, and values regarding language and literacy are viewed as regimented boundaries between home and school. Furthermore, the underlying premise of these particular family and intergenerational programs is that the families and children operate in a deficit that can be remedied through prescribed notions and presentations that support and instill school literacy beliefs, knowledge, and values. There are family and intergenerational programs more closely aligned to a poststructuralist view that is encapsulated by “Worlds Together frameworks,” which claim that there is the potential for exchange and acceptance of a fluid conception of literacy and language that integrates the notions that are held in the home environment with the school environment. These family and intergenerational literacy programs operate with a premise that families have strengths, can communicate with families and children both indirectly and directly, and are intentional about creating an environment where there is reciprocal communication and valuing of the different presentations of literacy and language.

A complexity exists that may not always be recognized in schools regarding how language functions and how literacy events unfold for diverse groups of children. Heath’s (1983) seminal ethnographic study of public school educators in the 1970s, during early racial
integration of schools in Piedmont, North Carolina, posited a glaring misalignment between the solidified belief system, practices, and expectations among educators regarding early language and literacy acquisition and the non-dominant community members. Heath (1983) identified and described the patterns and supportive conditions that were upheld by specific customs in learning and language use in the homes of white and Black working class children that were not recognized by the educators. The public school educators found that they had internalized a dominant accepted set of beliefs regarding early literacy and language development through a cross section of experience, professional guidance, knowledge base, and environment.

Delpit (1995) purported that the learning needs of African American children and other culturally and linguistically diverse children were disproportionately not met in their classrooms, through highly regarded and accepted progressive pedagogies that included process writing, whole language, and open classrooms. Delpit noted a correlation between the accepted pedagogies and the dominant cultural norms, which were understood as being able to meet the literacy needs of all children. Delpit challenged this perception of creating educational programs for children without accounting for the differences in literacy experiences, behaviors, and expectations of children who were a part of non-dominant groups.

Reyes and Torres (2007) proclaimed that many family literacy programs adhere to a “deficit model” where the objective is on “how to ‘fix’ the child’s family and communities, [and that they] naively work to ‘help’ them become literate as if the families had no literacy practices and were living in a vacuum” (p. 74). These family literacy programs that operate in a “deficit model” are created with the intention to stimulate the literacy behavior and skills of children without acknowledging that learning is a cultural process that is embedded in a specific context (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1986). Major criticism exists in the field of family and
intergenerational literacy, as linguistically and culturally diverse families find that their values, norms, expectations, and beliefs regarding learning are not matched by the perspectives and expectations of the dominant culture that is reflected in the educational institutions their children attend (Auerbach, 2002; Cooper, 2009).

Morrow (1995) cautioned that the “deficit model” to family literacy programming that historically prevailed is not an ideal approach. In the 1990s, the United States saw an influx of family literacy programming that was considered “the key to reaching U.S. educational goals” (McKee & Rhett, 1995, p. 166). Wave after wave of initiatives were incorporated into formal schooling environments to convey to families the literacy skill set desired by the school (Auerbach, 1989, 1995). Reyes and Torres (2007) emphasized the ways in which literacy programs have been informed by an “efficiency paradigm,” where assessments and parameters created by literacy experts are considered the optimal objective of literacy programs (p. 75). The literacy expectations and beliefs of families are not considered a measurable or desirable outcome of literacy programs operating in an “efficiency paradigm” (p. 75). Families were given information that presumed literacy shortfalls were present in their homes because their literacy events were divergent from the literacy events and expectations of the school. Darling (1992) underscored the idea of addressing the children’s literacy problems by teaching the parents with the following statement: “the seeds of school failure are planted in the home, and we cannot hope to uproot the problem by working only within the schools. We must approach it through the families” (p. 5). Auerbach (1995) characterized this form of family literacy as “the intervention prevention approach” (p. 644). The dilemma in literacy acquisition was equated with the families’ beliefs and techniques that they utilized with their children; therefore, the families were expected to inculcate the ideas and methods that were taught by those who were deemed experts
to optimally create literacy growth. The practitioner provided prescriptive lessons on isolated literacy concepts to raise the awareness and knowledge base of families. The educator divulged the knowledge to families about the best literacy approaches and strongly encouraged families to utilize these approaches in their instruction with their children in order to see growth in their children’s literacy skills. The communication was mainly one-sided from those who were the creators of the family literacy programs.

Auerbach (1995) highlighted an increase in family literacy programs that professed to implement an anti-deficit perspective. The “strengths-” or “wealth-” based approaches to family literacy programs reframed the role of families so that their contributions were now seen as integral to literacy development; there is an assumption in this approach that families have “intact literacy patterns” (Morrow, 1995). This perspective does not operate by first defining a problem or inadequacies with the literacy of families. The resources, attributes, knowledge, and cultural values of families and communities are considered assets. Auerbach (1995) characterized one form of this strengths-based approach as “multiple literacies perspectives” (p. 651). There is an assumption that the literacy of families and the literacy of schools can converge in various ways. Families are placed in the role of experts as they are now asked to share their own beliefs and methods in literacy development. There is a focus on inquiry. Families and educators learn about perspectives on literacy in relation to their own cultural beliefs, values, and context. The educators are placed in the role of learners, which promotes an environment of sharing knowledge among the adults who are promoting literacy development in children (Street & Street, 1995). In the multiple-literacies perspective, educators intentionally incorporate culturally relevant and familiar literacy practices into their pedagogical approach.
Parecki, Paris, and Seidenberg (1996) illuminated that family literacy programs that met their goals shared the following assets:

- Sensitivity to families, cultures and communities
- Meaningful curriculum
- Focus on self-sufficiency through learning experiences
- Instruction that features interactivity and modeling
- Stable, well-trained staff with practical knowledge
- Age-appropriate activities
- Attention to barriers that prevent attendance

This research substantiates that productive partnerships between families and educators are essential to meeting the goals of family literacy programs. Educators can determine which activities to incorporate into their practice as they meet the needs and characteristics of the family and children (Cochran-Smith, 1986). This approach provides parents with the knowledge they need to make positive changes in their children’s language and literacy development to meet the expectations made by the schools.

**Immigrant Families and Family Literacy**

Education is a crucial factor in raising children for immigrant families (Audet, Evans, Williamson, & Reynolds, 2008; Delgado-Gaitan, 1991; Trumbull & Rothstein-Fisch, 2011; Valdés, 1996). Moreover, the existence of the potential educational opportunities for their children has been reported as a major factor in the decision-making process as families considered migrating. These parents tend to have high expectations for how their children should perform in the educational institution (Carréon, Drake, & Barton, 2005; Mo & Singh, 2008; Orozco, 2008). The ability for these families to navigate the host country and the schooling
experience for their children is dependent upon a myriad of factors. Research has supported that immigrant family members who find that their values and practices are supported in the day-to-day discourse of the educational institution tend to be much more visible in school life (Crozier, 1999, 2001; Crozier & Davies, 2007; Crozier & Reay, 2005; Graue et al., 2001; Lareau & Horvat, 1999). Family members who have secured employment that is supportive of the school hours may find that they can be available for meetings and other events in the educational setting. There are immigrant family members whose practices align with the mainstream discourse of family involvement. They are visible in the school as chaperones for field trips, are in attendance at school meetings, volunteer, and participate in the educational institution’s activities in numerous capacities that are deemed acceptable.

Auerbach (1995) revealed the existence of a disconnect between research and implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programs that employ practices that support family contributions in children’s development. This researcher has highlighted that language minority families’ perspectives and insight are nearly absent in the creation of these family literacy programs (Auerbach, 1995). Concern from researchers and educators on immigrant children’s linguistic outcomes has been primarily galvanized by debates on how bilingualism benefits or hinders these children’s English proficiency levels (Oller & Eilers, 2002; Portes & Hao, 2002). Lambert (1975) provided a framework to consider the arguments for and against bilingualism with the terms “subtractive bilingualism” and “additive bilingualism.” Subtractive bilingualism encompasses a belief that the acquisition of a second language hinders the competence and growth of the first language, while additive bilingualism purports that there are benefits to the growth of competence and linguistic repertoire when another language is learned.
Family members can find themselves at a disadvantage in the development of a partnership with the educational institution as they encounter the “culture of power,” which refers to the upper-class and middle-class rules and codes that are implicitly upheld in schools to ensure success (Delpit, 1995). In these intercultural relationships developed between home and school, power dynamics are more likely apparent to those who do not have power (Delpit, 1995). In addition, there is a potential loss or gain of power for both parties in the home-school relations (Doucet, 2011). Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, and Wiseman (1991) illuminated the challenges that are revealed, writing that “intercultural competence can be learned only through intercultural relationships in risk-taking, anxiety-provoking, confusing, and sometimes embarrassing intercultural encounters” (as cited in Sturm, 1991, p. 38). Doucet (2011) explained that “traditionally the burden of risk-taking has fallen on marginalized groups” who are left to resolve the conflict and challenges inherent in the construction of these relationships (p. 2728).

Du Bois’ (1903/1994) notion of “double consciousness” highlighted how culturally and linguistically diverse groups can be faced with a multi-faceted conception of themselves and their heritage while they attempt to reconcile with a dominant culture that does not support or acknowledge who they are. The family-school relations do not guarantee equitable benefits simply because it has been established (de Carvalho, 2001; Doucet, 2008; Doucet & Tudge, 2007; Graue, 1993; Lawson, 2003; Mapp, 2003; Russell, 1991).

In the mainstream discourse of family involvement, family members are inculcated to adopt a methodical notion and utilization of literacy in their interactions with their children. The educational institutions can impose a partnership that requires immigrant family members to adopt values and practices that do not honor and/or reinforce their personal beliefs and experiences (Bulcroft, Carmody, & Bulcroft, 1996; Driscoll, Russell, & Crockett, 2008). The
competence, experiences, and abilities of diverse groups of people is ignored or viewed as requiring the addition of values and practices that align with mainstream literacy. A tension can occur between home and school because of differences in perspective and values. For example, in U.S. culture, there is a prominence of independence and autonomy, which exists in stark contrast to other cultures of origin where there is a prominence of family connections, support, and obligation (Driscoll et al., 2008). Misunderstandings can arise concerning how immigrant parents choose to raise their children, which can cause these family members to make themselves less available to the educational institutions (Costigan & Su, 2004). Beauregard, Petrakos, and Dupont (2014) stated the following:

In addition to learning a new language and getting to know a new culture, it appears that immigrant parents experience more culture shock as they have to navigate two school systems (the one they experienced and the one in which the child develops), and they are confronted with changes in roles (i.e., the role they used to play, and the one expected in the host society . . . ). Consequently, some immigrant parents seem to withdraw or participate less in school activities. (p. 179)

Immigrant family members can be apprehensive about the terms and conditions that schools create around partnership and therefore develop ways to safeguard their heritage and perspective in the raising of their children. These families can be faced with a number of both implicit and explicit stereotypes and beliefs from the educational setting that hinder their ability to develop reciprocal partnerships with school personnel (Benoît, Rousseau, Ngirumpaste, & Lacroix, (2008); Carreón et al., 2005; García Coll, Akiba, Palacios, Bailey, Silver, DiMartino, & Chin, 2002; Moosq, Karabenick, & Adams, 2001; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Hernandez, 2003; Wong & Hughes, 2006). Researchers have shown that educators can have
misunderstandings about the parental role in the literacy process (Brown, 2011; Rimm-Kaufman, La Paro, Downer, & Pianta, 2005; Tabors, Roach & Snow, 2001). These assumptions that teachers may hold can have an adverse effect on the relationship that they establish with families and with children. A disconnect can exist between home and school, where the values, expectations, and approach to learning can be in conflict. Immigrant family members who are less visible in the educational institution may have challenges in employment that make them unavailable for school meetings, cultural and language differences, and barriers and/or opportunities created by how they migrated to the United States and how they were received by the host country (Garcia Coll et al., 2002; Kanouté & Saintfort, 2003).

Immigrant family members can create distance between their homes and the school as they determine how to sculpt their children’s educational experience while considering how to honor their worldview and culture. These choices have been viewed as acts of resistance in empirical research (de Certeau, 1984/2002; Doucet, 2011). Trueba (1998) illuminated that, among Mexican families, the creation of social networks that transcended distance and borders was essential to ensuring that children could be returned to their parent’s home of origin to assist them with the recovery from the “trauma of American schooling” (p. 260). Doucet (2011) provided an understanding of how Haitian families attempted to protect their children by communicating that they would return them to Haiti if their behavior alarmed their families, that they must protect their privacy, and that parents had to advocate for their children in educational institutions. Furthermore, Doucet noted that all of the aforementioned choices were made by Haitian families because of their “fear of losing their children to Americanization” (p. 276). While concerns have been raised in empirical studies about immigrant families’ attempt to preserve the use of their native heritage languages, a study of African immigrants who speak
indigenous languages to their children found that this exposure to multiple languages did not impede their children’s ability to acquire the language of their host country (Thomas, 2010). Pendakur and Pendakur (2002) maintained that language use among immigrants can serve multiple purposes and affect the extent to which immigrants can identify themselves as members of a cultural community.

The established extant research into the language acquisition experiences of immigrant families provides a foundation to consider the dynamics between home and school, but these understandings have their limitations. Immigrant groups from locations that, in recent years, have not been the typical origins of immigrants to the United States—such as Africa, China, and India—have limited research studies on their dynamics and experiences in English language acquisition. Knowledge, experience, and values differ within various subgroups in immigrant populations (Thomas, 2010). The need to establish empirical evidence of the experiences of various underrepresented groups is clear. This particular study intends to provide insight into the knowledge, thoughts, and perspectives of Francophone African-born immigrants in New York City.

**West African Language and Literacy Traditions**

**Oral Traditions**

For a number of centuries in West Africa, Arabic was the written form of communication that dominated this region. This form of communication was not accessible to the vast majority of the people who could not speak or write in Arabic (Finnegan, 2007). Historically, the human voice—oral presentation—has been vital in conveying history and experience and providing accessible communication to the vast majority of the people of West Africa. Oral traditions have been an essential component to the lifestyle of many West African societies. There is an
integration of music, dancing, and singing in this form of oral and visual expression. There can be a combination of soloists and chorus who are sharing the experience. Oral traditions are a method in which history, stories, folktales, and religious beliefs are communicated. It is viewed as a primary means of transmitting cultural knowledge.

The use of oral traditions can span in its ability to be a form of entertainment to commentary on serious matters in society that include social structures and relations between culture and state and display a dynamic use of language. Furniss and Gunner (2008) emphasize that “it [oral traditions] can also be a significant agent of change capable of directing, provoking, preventing, overturning and recasting social reality” (p. i). Oral traditions can have profound implications on how history and knowledge within a society is presented and understood.

There are distinct differences between oral traditions and written texts that include the manifestation of performance, the role of the individual enacting the art, and the direct influence of the audience (Furniss & Gunner, 2008). Performance is a major component to oral traditions. The specific words chosen are not solely significant, but instead the ways in which these words are used to convey the aesthetics of an experience are significant. The presence or omission of tone, gestures, facial expressions, dramatic pause, and rhythm and the use of passion and humor also convey the stylistic and structural characteristics of the expression. In oral traditions, each of these artistic conventions of expression are seen as an essential component that can be used in a flexible manner to convey meaning, while in written texts the artistic conventions are used to exaggerate meaning.

The speaker in oral traditions makes a number of decisions about how the message is presented verbally and visually and which specific aspects of the message are relayed. This expanded understanding of the speakers’ role debunks a misnomer that oral traditions directly
emulate written text, which can be meticulously memorized pieces communicated from one
generation to another. Oral presentation can range along a spectrum of memorized reproduction
and original creation. These verbal variations can include differences in words, phrases, and
expressions that make oral traditions unique compared to written texts. The authenticity and
original authorship are versatile features of oral traditions, while they are static features of
written texts.

Oral traditions are situated within specific occasions that elicit feelings and expressions
from the audience. The styles of performance are specific to the culture and are recognizable to
those who are a part of the occasion. The speaker’s words, gestures, tone, dress, and demeanor
create an atmosphere. The visual aspect of the oral tradition can be extended through music and
dance that can include chants and specific songs that require the participation of the audience.
The speaker can use each of the aforementioned visual aspects to enhance relevant components
of the performance and extend the understanding of the audience. The audience is in direct
contact with the speaker, often face to face, and has the ability to influence the presentation
dependent upon who they are and why they are gathered. In written text, the reader does not have
the ability in real time to participate, change, and/or challenge what is presented, while in oral
presentations the audience is a direct participant and influencer of the presentation.

All six of the research participants expressed how oral traditions were a recurring part of
their experiences as young children. They communicated that they heard histories and narrations,
proverbs or sayings, and songs from the older generation, which primarily included their parents.
These oral performances presented specific messages about how the world worked and exhibited
specific lessons and values through this form of expression about who they were.
Complex Multilingual Contexts

Multilingualism and cultural diversity are a reality on the continent of Africa that are complex, distinctive, and changing (Gadelii, 2004). There are an estimated 1,000 to 2,500 languages spoken, with the number varying dependent upon how the language is defined (Ouane & Glanz, 2010). As a result of the colonial history of the past, 24 countries of Francophone Africa have an estimated 120 million people who speak French as their first or second language (Gadelii, 2004). Variations in vocabulary and intonation from standard French exist among the different countries. There are differences in the function and status of languages as the objectives, history, politics, and social environment can impair or stimulate communication, recognition, and acceptance in various contexts.

In post-colonial Francophone West Africa, international languages, like French, are prioritized through forums of power that include finance, politics, and education. The official language is defined as one or more languages that a country utilizes as a sanctioned form of communication in education, government, or commerce (UNESCO, 2013). There are times when the official language is distinct from the national language. The national language is recognized as being utilized by a large portion of the population of people within a country but may not have the designation of an international language (UNESCO, 2013).

A preference for international languages exists in the African educational sphere, where only 176 African languages are utilized in the school systems, while there are upwards of 2,500 African languages spoken on the continent of Africa (Ouane & Glanz, 2010). In the pedagogical practices of the schools, perceptions exist that the mother-tongue, the first language a child learns, is a distraction and can be counterproductive to the acquisition of the international language. African educational systems continue to require students to assimilate to a formal
version of the international language when they enter school around the age of six years old. This approach to teaching the international language has been flawed, illustrated by the current estimate that only between 10 to 15 percent of the population of most African countries is fluent in the international language (Ouane & Glanz, 2010).

There is evidence that a disconnect is present in Francophone West Africa between the formal communication in educational, political, economic, and media spheres and that of the social and linguistic landscape of the everyday experiences of the people who use a vernacular—an informal language that is not imposed but is acquired as a first language. A vernacular holds value in a particular region and/or among a group of people as it is used to navigate particular social networks. The positive aspects of the local languages and in multilingual diversity are not honored with the same regard as the use of formal international languages in contexts that influence economics, education, and politics in West Africa (Ouane & Glanz, 2010).

All six of the research participants reported different ways in which various language expectations were placed on them when they were children. The different language and literacy interactions and events that they had as children were dependent upon where they were and who they were interacting with. Their experiences as children themselves left an impression on each of the family members in their raising of their own young children. The participants shared their choices and desire to continue to sustain their native heritage languages with their young children.

**Value of bi/multilingualism.** Extant empirical research and theory on language acquisition and bi/multilingual learning substantiates the numerous benefits of sustaining young children’s heritage languages in early childhood instruction before introducing a second language as the primary medium of instruction (Ball, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Schwartz, 2014). Furthermore, these
studies have posited that the use of heritage languages in early childhood instruction that young children are exposed to from birth provides a language and literacy resource that can be used to scaffold experiences, knowledge, and understanding in other languages. These benefits of continued use of heritage languages in early childhood instruction include improved readiness that stimulates reading skills, awareness, behavior, and use (Burchinal, Field, López, Howes, & Pianta, 2012). English reading comprehension is enhanced as young children expand their vocabulary in their heritage languages (Lindholm-Leary, 2014). Furthermore, young children’s oral language skills in heritage languages is directly correlated to their kindergarten early English reading skills (Hammer, Davison, Lawrence, & Miccio, 2009).

There are households throughout the world where children are entering compulsory schooling without exposure to the dominant language since their own knowledge of language and literacy has taken place primarily in their heritage language (Ball, 2010). Since 1953, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has supported and advocated for “language-in-education” policies, which view a child’s ability to engage in their heritage language as a right as their linguistic and cultural diversity is sustained (UNESCO, 1953, 2003).

The increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood classrooms throughout the United States has corresponded with a shift in terminology and approach to immigrant families and their children in the United States. The term Limited English Proficient (LEP) was used widely by legislatures and underscored a deficit orientation by claiming that those with this title, LEP, were learning and did not acknowledge the other languages that the children knew (García, 2009). Terms like English Language Learner (ELL), Multilingual Learner (MLL), and Emergent Multilingual Learner (EMLL) are now more widely used, including by the New York
State Department of Education. These are more inclusive terms that acknowledge the existence in the child’s life of another language that is not English and communicate the need to sustain it. Emergent Multilingual Learner (EMLL) is a term that distinguishes the pre-school-age population of children who enter compulsory schooling able to communicate in a home language that is not English (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). There is an acknowledgement that the languages that children are exposed to at birth are tied to their identity, experiences, culture, history, and knowledge and have value in the schooling experience (García, 2009). With the use of these terms and the policies and procedures that come with them, it is crucial for educators to understand that there is a variance in developmental milestones of monolingual and bi/multilingual children (New York Education Department, 2017). Without this recognition of the nuances in the experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse families and their children, educators can place these families at a disadvantage and underscore inequities that exist in the system by not clarifying and creating systems that better support and are relevant to these families and their children with the knowledge of who they are.

Translanguaging. Translanguaging was originally a pedagogical practice that was introduced in Welsh bilingual classrooms where the input language, which included reading and listening, intentionally occurred in a different language from the output language, which included speaking and writing (Williams, 2002). García (2009) extended the conception of translanguaging as a social practice where bi/multilingual speakers utilize their knowledge and resources of various languages features to create an integrated communication system. Furthermore, García (2009) refers to translanguaging as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (p. 45). There is a focus on ensuring that the interconnected nature of language, identity, culture, and expression is supported
by the recognition of the flexible use of language by bi/multilingual speakers and through pedagogical practices in the classroom that create the space for this sort of language exchange.

**Funds of knowledge.** Funds of knowledge is a concept operating with the premise that families have a knowledge base that is fostered through their experiences, social practice, and social history (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2006). Funds of knowledge debunks stereotypes of deficit about culturally and linguistically diverse groups of people. The resources and strengths that exist within families are recognized by educators as they engage in meaningful exchanges with families as learners and researchers. Gonzalez et al. asserted, “this work should not be confused with parent participation programs . . . [T]his is also not an attempt to teach parents ‘how to do school’” (p. x). While educators can discover through this approach that there is increased parental involvement and requests from parents to learn how to navigate the academic environment, this is not the original focus. Instead, the objective of the funds of knowledge approach by educators is to learn more about the cultural milieu, lived daily experiences, local histories, and community contexts, networks, and relationships of the families that they work with. This has implications for practice as educators consider not only what they are teaching but also why and how they are teaching as they engage with culturally and linguistically diverse families and their children. The conversation about family and intergenerational literacy continues, and it is evolving.

**Summary**

This chapter examined existing literature and theoretical research that is relevant to immigrant families and family literacy programs. It explored how the concepts of the “Worlds Apart frameworks” and “Worlds Together frameworks” that influence how family literacy programs are organized, perceived, and communicated. The limited perspective that is given to
immigrant families as family literacy programs are created to meet their needs was also explored. The need to incorporate the insight of immigrant groups, like West African immigrants, was considered, given that their presence in the scholarly narrative is widely absent. Literature particularly addressing oral traditions and multilingual contexts was explored in order to gain more perspective on the experiences of the research participants who participated in this study.

In Chapter Three, I describe and discuss the research methodology that I chose to explore African-born family members’ accounts of their own early language and literacy experiences and their children’s English language and literacy experiences. I utilized a thematic narrative analysis in order to capture and explore the lived experiences reported by the six immigrant family members.
CHAPTER THREE: DESIGN AND METHOD

In this chapter, I present the research design, including the theoretical framework, description and rationale, the process of recruiting and selecting participants, data collection, and analysis.

The following three questions guided the study:

- What do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members report about their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school?
- How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members explain their roles in their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?
- How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members describe their encounters in early childhood care and education settings that center on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?

Description, Rationale, and Theoretical Framework

My decision to conduct a narrative inquiry stems from my 10-year career in public education when I worked with culturally and linguistically diverse populations. During that time, there were countless occasions that I recall being a listener as families engaged me with their stories. Through narration, families have the opportunity to display an authority about what is conveyed and how to express it (Riessman, 1993). The inquiry-oriented aspect of this mode of communication made it possible for the research participants to contribute in a way that allowed space and time for them to express themselves naturally, while I strove to acknowledge and value their subjective viewpoints. Webster and Mertova (2007) asserted that storytelling is the most common form of human communication and that it is used to communicate the elements of
experience that have affected an individual or a larger group. Tamboukou, Andrews, and Squire (2008) also argued that the narrative form is the universal way in which people make sense of their experiences. People communicate and reinterpret their life experiences through stories (Riessman, 2002a, 2002b).

Auerbach’s (2002) statement that “many scholars turn to narrative to study the instantiation of power relations and oppositional voice” resonates with me (p. 1371). Moreover, the construction of narrative analysis has the potential to address social justice by “honoring context, including multiple and fluid voices, maintaining a commitment to constructive transformative learning, challenging hegemony and the status quo of traditional research, doing research with adults rather than on adults, and challenging the traditional interviewer-interviewee relationship” (Warrington-Broxton, 2014, p. 91). Narrative inquiry takes as its object of investigation the story itself and can be used in many ways to understand people’s accounts of their experiences (Riessman, 2002a). To better garner the meaning of the stories that were shared with me by the research participants and to organize the lived experiences that were presented by the research participants, I utilized Gee’s (1992, 1996, 2014) theory of discourse analysis to influence my researcher stance. Gee’s theory states that “language-in-use is about saying-doing-being and gains its meaning from the game or practice it is part of and enacts” (2014, p. 11). I conducted a thematic narrative analysis that focused on the “saying” (2014, p. 11). The focus was on what content and themes the narratives communicated. I oriented the study on what the research participants were communicating about their own literacy and language experiences as children, how language was being used to create a parental identity as participants expressed what they understood and observed, the ways in which they participated in their children’s English literacy and language growth, and how language was being used to express the
interactions that family members had with their children’s ECCE settings. I undertook an analysis of the narratives that was methodical, focused, and detailed while still retaining a sense of the “whole” story (Riessman, 2008).

This particular study was conceptually informed by Gee to organize the findings and various perspectives (Rogers, 2004; Gee, 2004). Gee’s theoretical tools of inquiry were instrumental to understanding language-in-use: intertextuality, conversations, Discourses, social languages, figured worlds, and situated meaning (Gee, 2004).

Intertextuality refers to the ways in which people’s talk incorporates the “words other people have said or written” (Gee, 2014, p 28). It is the when a person speaks to an idea that was generated by someone else and is common knowledge and/or is written. These words are used to influence how people identify themselves and are presented in society. In this particular study, the six research participants reported that the presence of oral traditions was instrumental in providing insight into their identity and their history when they were children themselves. These oral traditions were presented in the form of wise sayings, songs, and stories that revealed past histories and common understandings of importance to the family members. This form of expression from the childhood and native lands of the research participants revealed itself in the ways in which they expressed themselves in their current lived experiences.

Conversations are the myriad of ideas, some of which are contentious, that take place in social groups and/or in society. Narrative is influenced by familial and cultural contingencies as identities are established (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Rossiter & Clark, 2007). The dominant culture also influences how these narratives are displayed, constructed, and represented, which is exhibited by the ways in which hegemonic conversations unfold to form sexism, racism, ableism, patriarchy, and classism (Rossiter & Clark, 2007). It can be difficult to recognize the prejudice
that is situated in the everyday contexts and realities of people. Domineering viewpoints can be challenged through the inclusion of those whose voices and perspectives are not typically included in mainstream conversations. In this particular study, the six research participants shared the ways in which the English language was presented as a priority within the ECCE settings that their children attended and became a much more noticed presence in their multilingual homes.

Gee’s theory of D/discourse posits that language is situated, not static nor clearly defined (1991, 2001a, 2014). There can be overlap in language use, and it is complex, as it conveys identity and perspective. “Little ‘d’ discourse” refers to “connected stretches of language that make sense, like conversations, stories, reports, arguments, essays; discourse is part of Discourse--Discourse is always more than just language” (Gee, 1991, p. 149). “Big ‘D’ Discourse” refers to the ways in which people are implicitly recognized as sharing cultural and historical knowledge through their interactions, communication, thinking, and presence in different contexts (Gee, 2000). Gee (2000) illuminates this further, writing, “The kind of person one is recognized as ‘being,’ at a given time and place, can change from moment to moment in the interaction, can change from context to context, and of course, can be ambiguous or unstable” (p. 2). In this particular study, the six research participants reported the ways in which language was important in distinguishing who they were and navigating multilingual environments as children themselves.

Primary Discourse is acquired from socialization early in life from a person’s family and community. This primary Discourse is not defined the same for all people; instead, it is assigned a variance in expression, as modifications and negotiations in identity are made by people as they interact with the larger community. Secondary Discourses are learned through interactions in
public domains, including schools, religious institutions, community organizations, and businesses. These secondary Discourses can become dominant Discourses, which allow for the possession of wealth and/or social status. Non-dominant Discourses allow for communication within a given social network but no increase in social status. Gee (2001a) described the use of one Discourse to better understand another as “meta-knowledge.” Meta-knowledge is the ability to conceptualize the similarities and differences of the Discourses that people have and that people are attempting to acquire. In this particular study, participants revealed their primary Discourse and Secondary Discourses through their responses to the queries included in the first guiding research question, which aimed to learn more about the social environment that participants were a part of that influenced their literacy and language experiences as children. The six research participants revealed that their primary Discourses included the prevalence of oral traditions in their lives and an exposure to multilingual environments as young children, which expanded their abilities to communicate in various contexts.

Gee (2014) purported that any language has multiple sublanguages, which he has been termed as social languages. People become versed in specific variations of social languages through the communicative exchanges that they have with those who are much more competent than them. Gee (2001b) posited that “human language is not one general thing (like English) but composed of a great variety of different styles, registers, or social languages” (p. 718). The variance in language is attributed to social interactions that have requirements of affiliation to specific groups and cultural norms. These social languages can be presented in the vernacular, which is everyday language that is spoken in a specific country, region, and/or social group. There is also a specialist language that one is conditioned to learn through social institutions, like schools. In each of these social languages, “a figured world which is a picture of a simplified
world that captures what is taken to be typical or normal” (Gee, 2014, p. 175) is created. There is an assumption that is made by the listener and speaker about what is being spoken about and referred to when there is a common social and/or contextual identity (p. 175). In this particular study, the respondents expressed how they were raised speaking different variations of language that allowed for them to both engage and be recognized by their families, friends, and community members. This way of being and interacting in the world for the research participants informed their development of their primary Discourse.

The choice to embody the dominant Discourse has a “price,” as “newcomers” develop a socially-situated identity that may conflict with or differ from their own values and ways of being (Gee, 2001b). Situated meaning refers to the range of possible definitions that the word or structure can take on in different contexts of use. There are a number of decisions regarding their communication that “newcomers” would need to make in order to have effective exchanges with socially-situated and historically-situated groups. The “newcomers” can be faced with reconciling their display of their primary and secondary Discourses in order to conform to the expectations of the established group that they are interacting with. Fluency in the dominant Discourse can be potentially hindered as “newcomers” because of the differences between their Discourses and those of the established group. In this particular study, each of the six research participants expressed their desire to use their native heritage languages with their children in order to establish their children’s’ abilities to navigate their home and extended family members who were abroad. Concurrently, each of the family members in the study expressed the importance of their children learning English in order to navigate their lives in the United States. The families valued both their native heritage languages and English in their homes but did not
report that their native heritage languages were acknowledged or viewed as valuable in the school setting.

Gee’s theory of discourse analysis was employed to organize the understandings that individual family members expressed as they narrated their interactions with their children and their children’s teachers on early English language and literacy. A narration from the family members about the values, attitudes, motivations, ways of interacting, and perspectives was revealed. In order to capture the complexity of the cultural and social phenomena, I was cautious to avoid a cursory interpretation that was not “written according to a model of cause and effect but according to the explanations gleaned from the overall narrative” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 7). Throughout the narrative inquiry, the participants and I collaborated in the creation of the narrative explanation.

Methods

Connelly and Clandinin (1990) advised that the specific procedure employed when utilizing narrative inquiry should incorporate the elements “beginning the story, living the story, and writing the narrative” (p. 3). These researchers have developed a methodology to aid in the discovery of the ways in which people explain and account for the various experiences and events that they characterize through narratives. The first stage, “beginning the narrative,” was crucial to me as a researcher as I engaged in learning more about myself, about the extant research that pertained to the topics of immigrant families and literacy development of young children, and about the people and context that I would interact with through my study. The second stage, “living the story,” encompasses the procedures that I undertook in order to collect data, which included developing interview protocols, making contact and receiving commitment from the research participants to be a part of the study, conducting pilot interviews, changing the
interview protocol and my approach, and interviewing the research participants. The third stage, “writing the narrative,” provides details about the steps that I took in order to understand, organize, and present the narratives that were shared with me during the in-depth interviews.

“Beginning the Story”

In the stage of “beginning the story,” the researcher is cautioned to carefully consider the “negotiation of entry into the field situation . . . a negotiation of shared narrative unity” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 3). This initial stage begins with the knowledge that the researcher internalizes about the topic, the context, and the participants. The researcher is a part of the process of sharing and communicating with the interviewee. As a researcher, I reminded myself of the importance of creating the space and time to listen to each of the family members deeply. I created the logistical space in my schedule to be available to speak with the participants for more than an hour if they needed that time to express themselves. I made sure that I did not interrupt them with my suppositions and instead left my own interjections to clarifying questions.

Setting. The enclave of central Harlem known as Little Senegal has a large contingent of West African-born people who are predominately from Senegal. Other West African countries represented by people in this section of Harlem include Ghana, Ivory Coast, Mali, and many others. There is a wealth of experience and background knowledge that this immigrant group brought to the United States.

Francophone African-born people began to transition to the Little Senegal section of the New York City during the 1980s and “played a major role in Harlem’s renewal, in its latest Renaissance” (Cohen, 2017). Takougang (1995) explained that African immigrants tend to choose their place of residence based on the availability of jobs. New York City, as a substantial metropolis, offers an opportunity of gainful employment to newcomers. In Little Senegal, the
Francophone African-born immigrants have become a vital component of local industry as entrepreneurs who opened taxi stands, a local market, and restaurants. This pattern is evident in various cities throughout the United States where African immigrants have established community centers, businesses, religious institutions, and restaurants in order to support their ability to maintain their ethnic identities (Eissa, 2005).

Despite African immigrants’ high status of education and employment, they find themselves affected by the high poverty rates in this enclave. This is especially true for recently arrived immigrants, particularly refugees (Arthur, 2013). According to Community Health Profiles, as of 2015, 13% of residents were unemployed; additionally, 29% of all people living in Central Harlem were below the poverty line, and 49% faced many challenges in an attempt to pay their rent (Dragon, King, Hinterland, & Gwynn, 2015). Each of these factors contributes to Central Harlem being the second poorest neighborhood in Manhattan. Concurrently, major corporations are rapidly obtaining and replacing locally owned and operated industries, and higher income earners are moving in, which contributes to the exorbitant rents (Cohen, 2017).

Presently, Little Senegal’s population is shrinking, as the West Africans who typically have called this enclave their home are moving to other parts of New York City because of the many challenges that they face (Cohen, 2017). Despite these changes, Little Senegal sustains an identity in Harlem that displays the presence of the Francophone African-born residents who live, work, and raise families in the area. The Malcolm Shabazz Market continues to be a community center, and the Senegalese Association of America continues to assist people in their transition to New York. Numerous Early Childhood Education Centers of Harlem enroll young children and their families in the Little Senegal area.
Selection of participants. I prepared for the “negotiation of entry” by engaging in an extensive literature review to develop an in-depth understanding of early language and literacy development as a social process and of the immigrant family experience. In addition, I have for many years worked closely with families who were Francophone African-born immigrants in New York City in the capacity of a school staff member tasked to develop outreach and involvement efforts with families and communities. Parents have a vital role in the development and growth of their children, especially during the early years (Britto et al., 2006; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; McCoy & Cole, 2011; Weigel, Martin, & Bennett, 2005). Much research evidence has supported the positive development of enduring literacy practices when parents facilitate early literacy interventions (Fan & Chen, 2001; Mullis et al., 2004; Weigel et al., 2005). There is evidence that parent and home environment variance has direct implications for the language and literacy environment that is fostered for children (Byrne et al., 2009). The intentional role in language and literacy development taken by parents has been shown to supersede other influences like socioeconomic status, level of parental education, and family size (Flouri & Buchanan, 2004). Early literacy and language acquisition are part of a comprehensive set of “domains that include—physical, social-emotional, and cognitive—that are interrelated and interdependent” (Strickland & Riley-Ayers, 2006, p. 1). This development influences the “whole child” (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009; Grace & Brandt, 2006; Noddings, 2005; Strickland et al., 2006). Developmental stages, people, and experiences that a child is immersed in play an active role in the construction of his/her literacy and language makeup; congruently, there is an appeal from researchers to consider the child in the larger context of his/her social and cultural world (Delpit, 1995, 2006; Grace et al., 2006; Heath, Bishop, Bloor, Boyle, Fletcher, Hogben, & Yeong, 2014; Heath & Street, 2008; National Research Council, 1998, 2000). Auerbach (1989)
noted that family literacy programs developed for socially, economically, linguistically, and
culturally diverse families, including immigrants and refugees, tended to assume a deficit
perspective that either ignored or discouraged the vernacular literacies and home languages of
families. The “negotiation of entry” entailed convenience sampling to identify six participants
for the study who lived in the Little Senegal section of Harlem in New York City. I was
interested in the “partial, local, and historical knowledge” (Richardson, 2004, p. 476) that could
be obtained from individual participants who were a part of the narrative inquiry, as opposed to
inferring a universal truth about a group of people. After I received approval from the Lesley
University Institutional Review Board, I sought participants whose children attended early
childhood education and care (ECCE) settings in the Harlem section of New York City. In
November of 2016, I identified fifteen ECCE settings located in or within close proximity to the
Little Senegal section of Harlem. The New York City Department of Education website includes
a detailed list of each of these providers. I then contacted the directors and/or administrative staff
initially by telephone and by email correspondence to introduce myself and the research study
and request assistance with identifying family members to participate in the study based on the
following criteria (see Appendix A):

- African-born adult immigrant
- French-speaking
- Parent or guardian of a pre-school-aged child, four years old or five years old

The additional demographic information was presented on a parent letter in an attempt to
further narrow the participants by their ability to meet the following criteria:

- Lived in the United States for less than ten years
- Resided in Little Senegal
• Parent or guardian of pre-school-aged child

• Willingness to participate in two interviews that are 60-90 minutes each

In an attempt to bolster my outreach efforts, I contacted a community resource, the Senegalese Association of America. This institution provides information and referrals regarding immigration, health care, general support, community events, and recreation to those who have migrated from Senegal. I spoke with one of the main representatives of the association in January of 2017 in-person and was advised that “this research was needed” and that there was a Family and Women’s division that they planned to open in the next few weeks. After several failed attempts to make contact with the previous representative both in-person and on the telephone, I was unable to make the arrangements needed to utilize the Association space to recruit parents. My attempts to make contact with families occurred during a precarious time of uncertainty for the immigrant community in New York City. This was a period of time when there was an enforcement of accountability of immigration status that fostered a sense of possible deportation, which was intensified by a change in the presidential administration and overall political climate. These tense times, I surmised, were presenting challenges to my ability to obtain the trust and approval needed from directors and/or administrators to speak with immigrant families.

The outreach attempt was not as successful as I had hoped, but I did receive two responses from two of the early childhood sites. One of the directors was interested in my study but did not receive approval from his Board of Trustees in order to allow me to proceed. I received approval to proceed with my study from one of these ECCE settings. I also successfully connected with a participant for my study through a connection with a mutual friend.

The parent coordinator and the assistant principal of the school were given 30 French/English parent letters and consent forms that introduced me as the researcher and the
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study, requested permission to contact adults, had preliminary demographic information, and had a self-addressed envelope that parents and guardians could use to return their contact form (see Appendix B). I placed a photo of me in my living room, which had a couch in the background. In the picture, I wore a modest blouse that was not business-like and could be considered casual and in which I was smiling slightly. I made these intentional decisions about the chosen photo to affirm to families that I was a doctoral student and not a representative of an organization that was seeking to penalize families. I anticipated that I would not know these new families with children attending pre-school, even though I had worked in the neighborhood in the past. I also made sure that I did not use the word investigator in any of my correspondence with the family members in an attempt to alleviate any alarm families may experience about being asked to participate in a study. The parent coordinator identified fifteen people who fit my criteria for the study, distributed the letters, and had the children take them home. Nevertheless, I did not receive any written responses from the parents indicating that they were interested in participating in the study.

It became evident through this experience that the form of communication that I was primarily employing to connect with families was not the most effective. After speaking with the parent coordinator, she illuminated the importance of in-person connections. I requested the opportunity to visit the school once a week for two months to speak with families during breakfast. I found that there were family members present during this time who were willing to speak and who were not in a rush. I distributed in-person the flyers that described the study to parents and guardians, addressed their questions and concerns, and collected contact information for those interested in participating. I informed each potential participant that the interview could be conducted in French and that I had an interpreter who would assist. One of my former
colleagues, who frequently interacted with the families during transition times because she rode
the school bus with students during arrival and dismissal, introduced me to a few parents who,
she felt, fit my criteria. I then met two parents who introduced me to two other parents, who
became a part of the study. I realized then, as I did throughout this experience, how crucial it was
to have even a minor prior acquaintance with the participant or a relationship with someone
whom the participant trusted.

Once the research was under way, I interviewed members of six families for this study. I
selected the family members to contact by reviewing the demographic information that was
included with the consent form and parent letter that I distributed to the potential participants.
After I spoke with parents about the study during breakfast at the educational institution, I then
scheduled a time to speak with them over the phone in order to confirm a convenient meeting
place and time. For those family members who indicated that they spoke French, I had the
French interpreter speak with them over the phone to secure a convenient time and place for the
interview. I ensured that the interviews were planned with enough time for me to visit the school
during breakfast and have an additional informal interaction with the family members who
confirmed that they were interested in participating. While at the school during breakfast, I made
sure to greet the potential participants, greet their child, inquire casually about how they were
doing, and confirm again that I was looking forward to speaking with them during our scheduled
interview time. I also ensured that I spoke with the participant whom I was connected with
through a mutual acquaintance by speaking with him on the telephone to confirm our meeting
date and time.

**Selection of French interpreter.** I decided at the “beginning of the story” phase to identify
a French interpreter to work closely with me. I wanted to ensure that there would be someone
available to bridge language barriers that I anticipated could exist during the study. I requested recommendations from parents and former colleagues whom I worked with in the past to identify a French interpreter. I selected an interpreter based on my ability to establish a rapport with her. I wanted to ensure that we could candidly exchange ideas and thoughts. She was a college-educated woman from Martinique who had lived in both France and in the Little Senegal section of Harlem. She had no previous relationships with any of the participants. The trust that was built between us was important and was established when we each were candid about who we were and our lived experiences (Lencioni, 2002). The development of our relationship was an area that I gave substantial attention to because I was aware that it had the potential to undermine or enhance the level of comfort and authenticity that the participants sensed and believed existed as they interacted with us. I engaged the interpreter’s services only on two occasions at the request of parents—once during the pilot of the interview instrument and once during an interview that was a part of the study.

I trained the French interpreter during the “beginning of the story” phase of the study (see Appendix F). The training entailed attentive listening exercises with me to ensure that she was aware that this approach was an essential component of the semi-structured interviews. I also clarified who I was, the objective of the study, the role of the French interpreter, and compensation. The interpreter translated the parent letter, conducted phone conversations to secure direct contact with families in a location of their choosing, translated between the participants and me during two of the interviews, and translated the recordings of the interviews immediately afterwards. I emphasized the importance of the interpreter conveying the responses exactly as they were spoken by the participants and me. I established from the onset that my own voice and the voice of the families should not be compromised because of the interpreter’s desire...
to include her own viewpoints. Great care was taken in order to ensure that the interpreter knew that there was a strict adherence to confidentiality and that the specificity of comments would be attributed to pseudonyms. The operating norms of the study were made explicit from the first written correspondence and throughout each interview session.

**Data Collection: “Living the Story”**

Connelly and Clandinin (1990) advised researchers that in the stage of “living the story,” the accounts that were shared by a speaker are multifaceted, nuanced, and present. There are narratives that remain poignant in the lives of those who continue to tell them. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) expounded on this notion further:

For the researcher, this is a portion of the complexity of narrative, because a life is also a matter of growth toward an imagined future and, therefore, involves retelling stories and attempts at reliving stories. A person is, at once, engaged in living, telling, retelling, and reliving stories. (p. 4)

There is an acknowledgement in the aforementioned statement that narratives involve plots and characters that are presented by the speaker and are interpreted by the listener. These stories are not seen as only residing in the past of the speaker; on the contrary, it is a part of the lived experiences and the narrations that the speaker shares. I created a space for the family members to express details about themselves and about various parts of their experiences through semi-structured interviews, which I describe in detail below.

**Design of interview protocols.** I designed protocols for two semi-structured interviews that were informed by the overarching research questions in this study (see Appendices F and G). The primary narrative research data collection method is the conversational interview (Mishler, 1986). The format of these interviews provided me with the flexibility to adjust questions during
the interview, clarify and extend ideas, and create a much more natural exchange between the participants and me (Creswell, Hanson, Plano, & Morales, 2007). The goal of narrative interviewing is to generate a detailed account of events or experiences (Riessman, 2008). In an attempt to invite the perspectives and experiences of the participants, I utilized open-ended questions in both interview protocols (Foddy et al., 1994). Open-ended questions have several benefits that include providing the space for unanticipated feelings to be discovered as participants respond to the queries posed.

I piloted the protocol that was created for the initial interview with two families. This piloting was part of my process for developing the instruments. I modified the instruments based on the experiences that I had in regard to securing an interview time, conducting the interview, and using the instruments. For the first piloting of the protocol, I interviewed a father from Burkina Faso, Charles (pseudonym), whose wife I have known for many years. I interviewed him in his home. He was very candid in his stories about his life, his relationship with his young son, and his and his son’s early language and literacy experiences. It appeared that he trusted me from the onset because of the relationship that he knew I had with his wife.

I also conducted a pilot interview with a mother from the Ivory Coast, Karen (pseudonym), whom I was introduced to by a former colleague. I interviewed Karen at a local coffee shop that was within walking distance of her child’s school but was not frequented by other family members from the school. I wanted to limit distractions during our interview time and protect Karen’s privacy so that she would not be noticed by other family and/or community members. While she was willing to share a little bit about herself when we were speaking informally, she restricted herself to one- and two-word answers when we began interviewing. I realized after this interaction that the formality of the interview may have been disconcerting. At
that moment, I decided to be explicit with participants about the format of the interview process and inquire again about their willingness to be a part of the study. The stark difference between the informal and formal exchange between this interviewee and me also made me intentional about creating additional, in-person, informal contact between the time of establishing an interview date and time and the time of the actual interview.

I found that the participants with whom I piloted the initial protocol instrument did not always want to utilize the French interpreter. Charles requested the interpreter, while Karen did not. Throughout the pilot interview, Charles spoke in both French and English and requested to do so because expressing himself through both languages felt more natural. This interaction made me cognizant of the importance of ensuring that the use of the French interpreter was presented as a choice to each of the participants who had varying degrees of command over their spoken English and varying degrees of comfort with having an additional person present during our interviews.

There were several questions in my interview protocol that I needed to simplify to ensure that I was being as clear as possible. Table 2 displays the changes to the protocol that were informed by the pilot interview.
Table 2

Revised Questions 1.1 and 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Interview Protocol Question</th>
<th>Revised Interview Protocol Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Please tell me about your language experiences in childhood when you were growing up. (Note: If</td>
<td>1.1 What are the places you lived before living here in Little Senegal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family member is not narrating ask this) Can you give me a detailed description (examples from) of</td>
<td>1.1a What were you like as a child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your childhood?</td>
<td>1.1b What sort of things did you do with your family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What are examples of stories, lessons, or books that adults shared with you when you were a child?</td>
<td>1.3 What are examples of stories, lessons, or books that adults shared with you when you were a child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3a And what did that teach you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wanted questions that would allow for me to generate more details that might provide a more specific description of the family member’s context. There are so many countries of origin represented in the Little Senegal area in Harlem that I wanted to ensure that I captured that information. I also believed that these questions would provide the details about a participant’s background that would capture the ways in which they each differed. I found that this question was a good way to ease into questions that asked for more depth. I noticed through my pilot interview and through informal conversations with families in Little Senegal that people were usually willing to share about where they had lived. I also realized that I needed to simplify the phrasing of some of the questions in order to ensure that comprehension was easier. Below are questions that I revised for that purpose.

Questions 1.3a. “And what did that teach you?” invited the participants to articulate the meaning that they attributed to the knowledge that was passed onto them by the adults that they were surrounded by. I wanted to know what the participants were told they should be, what their culture was, and what their defined accepted values and norms were.
I also revised questions that pertained to the language and literacy experiences and events of the research participants’ young children (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Revision to Questions 2.1 and 2.1a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Interview Protocol Question</th>
<th>Revised Interview Protocol Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What do you notice about your child learning English?</td>
<td>2.1 Please tell me about your child’s experiences learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1a What have you noticed about how your child participates/responds?</td>
<td>2.1a What have you noticed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1b Is he/she interested?</td>
<td>2.1b Is he/she interested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1c Does he/she enjoy the process?</td>
<td>2.1c Does he/she enjoy the process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I structured these questions that appear in Table B in order to encourage participants’ expressions about the ways in which their children were learning English. I wanted to learn more about the sense of effort and/or enthusiasm that the family noticed, not only from the explicit verbal feedback that children provided but also through their children’s choice to use English or not, their expression of satisfaction or discontent, and the ways in which they exhibited their pleasure when speaking English.

The initial and subsequent interview protocols. The revised interview protocol appears in Appendix G. It was used as the initial interview protocol with the research participants in the study. This initial interview protocol concentrated on eliciting from participants the ways in which they understood the expectations and the environment that influenced their own and their children’s early language and literacy development. I began each interview with a statement explaining that I wanted their stories of their experiences and perspectives of their own early language and literacy events and those of their young pre-school-aged children. The questions were purposely crafted to prompt the descriptions and explanations of ideas and actions from the participants. At appropriate junctures, I would ask questions to elicit elaboration on key points.
During this first occasion, I explored storytelling and the sharing of experience by inviting the participants to share memories and recollections of themselves and of their children. These interview questions in the initial protocol were created in order to ease family members into the interview situation with queries about their upbringing and daily interactions to introduce more detailed accounts of their experiences (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). I made notes during the interviews, which I utilized as prompts to remind me of a point that they made to which I wanted to return. I made a conscious decision to not interrupt or interject comments that would disrupt the flow of their stories. Instead, I followed up at a later point in the interview. At the end of the interview, I informed the research participants that I would be in touch with them again in order to learn more about what they had shared. The interview protocol for the second session was created after I analyzed the data from the initial interview (see Appendix H). The subsequent questions that I formulated for the second occasion allowed me to expand and deepen my understanding of the perspectives and experiences of the participants with respect to what was revealed during the first occasion. Spradley (1979) recommends that ethnographic interview questions take three forms: descriptive, structural, and contrast. I formulated descriptive questions that delved deeply into the behaviors, values, and feelings that were narrated in the initial interview. I developed structural questions that sought to understand the knowledge that family members created regarding the attributes and relations of various experiences. I constructed contrast questions that illuminated and clarified the tensions that the family members identified during their first narration.

In the subsequent interview protocol, I developed questions where I repeated the information that the participants shared with me in order to prompt many more details about specific occasions that the participants had raised. With the four family members who were
available for the follow-up interviews, I conducted a member check to clarify his/her perspective from the first interview. Unfortunately, I was unable to conduct the same member check with the two other participants through a subsequent in-depth interview because they were both unavailable to commit to another time. I did, however, during the first interview with each of the participants, ensure that I had a thorough understanding of what they said by restating information they shared and asking clarifying questions in order to ensure my accuracy of interpretation.

I made iterations to the subsequent interview protocol based on the specific lived experiences and insight that each of the six research participants expressed. The questions that were formulated in this subsequent interview protocol were an extension of the questions that were formulated in the initial interview protocol, which were ultimately informed by my guiding research questions. I delved more deeply into the ideas expressed by the participants with additional questions that I created for the follow-up interview in order to obtain in-depth knowledge. I was intentional about eliciting further information, and I was cautious about not interrupting the flow of the story. I refrained from asking certain questions if it seemed as if it would steer the participants away from expressing their stories the way that they wanted to.

Procedures for data collection. The first and subsequent interviews lasted between 45 minutes to 70 minutes. This prolonged time with the family members allowed me to develop a rapport with them, which created an environment where they were open to sharing intimate details about themselves. These interviews took place in participants’ homes, a local coffee shop, and/or private meeting spaces in an apartment building where the participant resides. I made it a high priority to hold interview meetings in locations that participants could reach conveniently and where they felt comfortable. Each of these interviews was recorded with the permission of
the participants, and I also took notes. After the first interview, I confirmed that the participants would be willing and available to participate in a follow-up interview of approximately the same length. Four of the six participants were available for a follow-up interview.

Data Analysis: “Writing the Narrative”

In the “writing the narrative” stage, the researcher is called to balance between delving into the details that were shared while sustaining the general understandings that have been communicated by the participant. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) purported,

Narrative explanation derives from the whole…narrative inquiry [is] driven by a sense of the whole and it is this sense which needs to drive the writing (and reading) of narrative. Narratives are not adequately written according to a model of cause and effect but according to the explanations gleaned from the overall narrative. (p. 7)

To stimulate the writing of the narratives that addressed both the details and the whole, I followed a specific procedure to both organize the data and conduct a thematic analysis.

Preparation and organization. Early in the data collection process, I began to familiarize myself with the data by transcribing the audio-recordings verbatim. Narrative analysis involves immersion in the transcripts, and I believed that the process of transcription would aid in my intimate understanding of the data. Although this was a lengthy process, it enabled me to begin to get a sense of the stories that each of the family members shared. During the transcription process, I made sure to remove possible identifying information that included the participants’, children’s, and ECCE settings’ names. A revised transcript was then created with the content remaining unchanged, but the format of the stories changed. Gee (2005) recommended the use of stanzas in order to present what has been communicated in a clear fashion. Gee posited that speech is composed of small spurts and that each spurt contains a piece of new information,
which in turn can constitute a larger chunk of information (2005). A block of information about events, themes, and topics consisting of several lines are referred to as stanzas. Gee’s (2010) theoretical understandings informed the organization of the stanzas, as I labeled them with the various components that he identified as essential components of a story: setting, catalyst, crisis, evaluation, resolution, and coda. This organization into stanzas provided me with the ability to review the stories as parts and as a whole.

**Classification of data.** I engaged in a process of individual narrative analysis and then inclusive narrative analysis. The Qualitative Data Analysis software program Dedoose was used to organize the data. Each transcript was imported into the program. I read through the narratives several times, and I identified sections of the narratives that related to the ways in which participants conveyed their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school; how they used descriptive words and phrases to explain their roles in their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition; and how they described their encounters in early childhood care and education settings. I utilized inductive analysis, which required me to immerse myself in the details and specifics of the data to discover the important categories, dimensions, and interrelationships (Patton, 2002). Strauss and Corbin (1998) described inductive analysis with the following: “The researcher begins with an area of study and allows the theory to emerge from the data” (p. 12). I engaged in an exercise of open coding by highlighting concepts and categories to distinguish ones that were related to one another as I reviewed each line of the transcribed interviews (van Manen, 1984). I sorted the stanzas according to their relevance to my guiding research questions.

Through a process of descriptive coding, I was able to further refine the information that emerged from the transcripts. I noted in the data when a participant returned to a theme within a
story and at different points in the transcription. I categorized expressions and analyzed how meaning was constructed, how interpretations were made through what was relayed about the explicit meanings, and the ways in which things were conveyed through frameworks used to make sense of the world from observed commonalities in the empirical data (Braun & Clarke, 2012). I refined the codes into themes that were coherent and distinctive by continuously reviewing the excerpts. I utilized Ryan and Bernard’s (2003) “cutting and sorting” technique. I gave each of the color-coded excerpts a theme and then determined if they were meta-themes or needed to be collapsed into overarching ideas.

For the inclusive narrative analysis, I reviewed the data that I identified as relevant to my guiding research questions through the specific phrases and general ideas that I had identified through the narratives that were shared. I reviewed the short phrases or codes that I had assigned to portions of the narrative that indicated the salience of particular portions. I reviewed the collapsed meaning units that developed from the coalescing and refining of the codes. I constructed an analytical display to have a clearer understanding of how the themes and sub-themes that had emerged converged and diverged across the narratives of each of the research participants. In this way, as Denzin (1997) noted, the “text allows the reader to re-experience the events in question, coming to see the truth of the narratives that contain them” (p. 266). I made notes in the margins of this chart in order to keep track of nuances, similarities, and differences that were expressed across the various narratives.

**Representing the data.** In order to ascertain the meaning of the stories told by the participants, I created narrative sketches or critical events with the elements of scene, plot, and character that elicited an understanding of individual perspective (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Gubrium and Holstein (1997) posited that in order to create the cohesion and comprehension of
the narrative, there has to be the use of “narrative linkage [which] assembles individual objects, actions, and events into a comprehensible pattern; telling a story turns available parts into a meaningful whole” (p. 147).

The ideas that follow are those that guided me as I wrote. The stories told by the research participants were examined methodically with an attention to the micro and macro social, cultural, and political contexts of the experience. Chase (2003) recognized that “narrative research is embedded and shaped broad social and history currents” (p. 669). Andrews (2007) underscored the importance of the greater social and cultural considerations with the following rhetorical question and response:

How does this individual with whom I am speaking reflect wider social and historical changes that form the context of his or her life? I am convinced that if I can listen carefully enough, there is much to learn from every story that one might gather. For society really is comprised of human lives, and if we can begin to understand the framework that lends meaning to these lives, then we have taken the important first step to being able to access the wider framework of meaning that is the binding agent of a culture. (p. 491)

The focus on relationships and the creation of a comprehensive presentation were important factors when employing narrative analysis of family storytelling when “beginning the story, living the story, and writing the narrative” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 3).

Summary

In this chapter, I have described the narrative inquiry methodology employed for this study. Beginning with an overview of the approach, I then shared the training of the French interpreter, and I described the protocols developed to guide the dialogue with participants who
met the study criteria. The process of ensuring confidentiality was reviewed, as well as data collection and analysis. A description of the pilot study, its participants, and the resulting changes to securing participants for the study was given, and the use of the French interpreter’s skill set was explained. I described the resulting changes to the initial semi-structured interview protocol. I described at length the ways in which this research was conceptually informed by Gee’s (2014) framework for language-in-use. I described the steps that I took to analyze the data thematically. In Chapter four, I report on the analysis and present the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF NARRATIVES

This chapter presents the ways in which Francophone African-born family members expressed their personal accounts of their own early language and literacy development, their perspectives on their role and on the household factors that mediated processes through which their child acquired English language and literacy growth, and their descriptions of their interactions with the educational setting in regard to their child’s early English language and literacy growth. This study explored the following questions: What do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members report about their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school? How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members explain their roles in their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition? How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members describe their encounters in early childhood care and education settings that center on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition? Participant interviews provided data for this study. The chapter is divided into three sections: (a) Overview of the Analysis, (b) Introduction to Participants, and (c) Analysis of Individual Narratives. This chapter begins with a description of how the analysis was conducted.

Overview of Analysis

This is the first of two chapters to report on what the data revealed. Data analysis in qualitative research typically consists of preparing and organizing data for analysis, reducing data into themes through coding, condensing the codes, and representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion (Creswell, 2013). I employed a process that utilized the data of the immigrant family members’ direct quotes, personal experiences, opinions, feelings, and knowledge collected from the semi-structured interviews. These family members revealed their
history and lived experiences in regard to early childhood language and literacy occurrences.

**Preparation and Organization**

I began the preparation and organization of the data by listening to the audio-recordings of each of the interviews. After listening to each of the recordings numerous times, I then transcribed them. I placed each of the transcripts into a folder that was labeled by the participants’ pseudonym. In order to prepare myself for the process of investigating the data, I organized the transcripts into stanzas. Gee (2010) posited that features of a story include the following: setting, catalyst, crisis, evaluation, resolution, and coda. The setting encompasses the scene in terms of time, space, and characters. The catalyst displays the problem. The crisis builds the problem to the point of requiring a resolution. The evaluation makes the purpose of the telling of the story clear. The resolution solves the problem set by the story. The coda provides the closing of the story. Gee (2010) stated, “in some ways this is the structure of all stories, regardless of what culture or age group is telling them” (p. 83). The emphasis on different features during the telling of a story can vary dependent upon the teller. I made a note of the various parts of the stories near the margins of the stanzas to assist with understanding its organization. This process of listening to the audio-recordings, transcribing them, and then creating stanzas was utilized after each interview and made it possible for me to become closely acquainted with how these features appeared in the stories of each of participant.

**Classification of Data**

For Chapter four, “Analysis of Individual Narratives,” I presented the narratives of each respondent with a consideration to data that was pertinent to my guiding research questions. I was intentional about presenting the narratives in the voice of the research participants. I wanted
to provide a forum for the research participants to clearly state in their own insight on early language and literacy development and how they were experiencing the efforts of schools.

For Chapter five, “Inclusive Analysis of Narratives and Findings,” I discovered the themes and categories of themes by drawing upon what was reported by the research participants through a review of their narratives as a coherent whole. I read through the narratives several times and created labels for segments of data that were “summative, salient, essence-capturing, and or evocative” (Saldana, 2003, p. 3). This labeling of all of the data that was presented through the interviews occurred through a process of open coding. I considered the guiding research questions in order to take the narratives apart and narrow the segments to those that reflected answers to the guiding research questions. I utilized a process of descriptive coding, which entailed summarizing the basic topic that was apparent through the narrative in a few words. I created categories from the similar codes, which merged to create a broader sense of the data. The themes developed from the broader concepts that included the various categories.

Representing the Data

I integrated data from the themes, sub-themes, semi-structured interviews, memos, and my theoretical and conceptual framework to generate a comprehensive written account. I wrote the section entitled “Participants’ Narratives” after I had a sense of the whole story of each of the participants. This section provides an overview of the specific milieu that situates each of the six African-born immigrant families in the Little Senegal section of New York City and an overview of who each of the research participants states that they are.

With an understanding of the participants’ backgrounds and experiences that were shared with me, I then wrote the section entitled “Analysis of Individual Narratives.” This particular section presents how the participants, in their own words, expressed their personal backgrounds,
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upbringing, and their thoughts and perspectives regarding early childhood literacy and language. In this particular research study, narrative provided the ability to capture and describe the participants’ holistic account of their lived experiences when they were children themselves, as their own language and literacy repertoire was growing. In addition, narrative provided the space for the research participants to express their views on their own children’s early development in New York City.

I wrote Chapter five, “Inclusive Analysis of Individual Narratives and Findings,” after having told the narratives. I looked at the data as a collection of narratives. I coded the larger data set, collapsed the meaning units, and derived themes. I reviewed the themes that were reoccurring across the narratives and decided how they related to the guiding research questions. I created charts with all of the information from each of the participants that entailed the statements that they each made and the codes that I attached to the segments. I created an analytical display that presented the major themes and subsequent sub-themes, along with supporting correlating statements from the participants. These visual aids provided me with a way to review the narratives as a coherent whole across the six research participants and within each individual participant. I could see the whole story of each of the participants and how they related to each other. The assertions that I make are findings that consider the ways in which the family members communicated across and throughout the narratives their perspectives, while considering the guiding research questions and the themes and sub-themes.

Introduction to Participants

Introduction to the Setting and Participants

The Little Senegal section of Harlem is known as an enclave for Francophone West African immigrants. It is located in the major metropolis of New York City, which is commonly
celebrated for its diversity of culture, people, and perspectives. It is also located in a city that has faced problems of pollution, crime, and stress for families as its population continues to grow. In Little Senegal, the African-born population has created a network of businesses, associations, and religious institutions that reflect the cultural values and perspectives of the immigrant population. Participants for this study resided in Little Senegal and had a child who was four or five years old and who attended an early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting in the area. I recruited participants through friends and former colleagues. The participants included four females and two males from various countries in Francophone West Africa. They were each the biological mother or father of the child that attended the ECCE setting.

Each profile is a brief overview that introduces the individual people as well as general details about their lives. This information serves as background for the circumstances and experiences that they each shared as they narrated accounts of their own and their children’s early language and literacy development.

James. James was born in Mali and grew up with his parents who had both obtained academic degrees. He was raised in the Muslim religion. James’ father was an educator. As a young child, he spoke both Bambara and French in his home. At approximately nine years old, he moved from the capital city in Mali to smaller municipalities in Mali. He went on to obtain several academic degrees and currently works as a substitute teacher and assists people like him through the court process. He has a son who attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal, and he has an older child. He speaks with his children in English, while he continues to speak Bambara and French with his wife. He considers himself a very involved parent because of his consistent presence at school meetings and his participation in both dropping off and picking up his
children to and from school. He is the parent who the teachers contact. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent.

**Patricia.** Patricia was born in the Ivory Coast and grew up with parents who attended Arabic schools, while her parents placed her in French schools. She was raised in the Muslim religion. As a young child, she spoke both Bambara and French. While she spent her childhood in the Ivory Coast, she spent some of her adult years living in Italy before transitioning to the United States. She obtained academic degrees abroad and is currently working in the service industry in a position with an uncertain and frequently-changing schedule. She has one child who attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal. She speaks with her daughter and husband in French in their household and is learning English. She receives updates from the teachers about her daughter’s progress during parent-teacher conferences, and she has reached out to a family member for guidance on how to assist her child. She was unable to commit to a follow-up interview because of the time constraints she experiences. This interview was conducted with a French translator by the request of the parent.

**Jennifer.** Jennifer was born in Mali and grew up with parents who both lived apart from her and her siblings for several months out of the year. She was raised in the Muslim religion. Her mother lived with a family on a farm, and her father worked in a village as teacher. She recalled spending substantial amounts of time with her ten siblings. Jennifer did not complete high school and is currently employed by the service industry and has a challenging work schedule. She has four children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal and is the second to last child. She speaks with her children mainly in Bambara at home. She reports that she primarily receives updates about her daughter’s progress during parent-teacher conferences. She was unable to commit to a follow-up interview because of the challenges she
experiences with working in the service industry and balancing the schedules and needs of her four children. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent.

**Elizabeth.** Elizabeth was born in Mali and grew up in Senegal and France. Both of her parents are from Mali and did not complete high school. She was raised in the Muslim religion. She describes her father as a savvy businessman who traveled throughout Europe and Africa. Elizabeth accompanied her father on several of these trips and describes learning a great deal about languages and people through these experiences. She grew up surrounded by people who were not originally from Senegal, but who had their own businesses in that country or worked for the government. She spent the majority of her childhood in Senegal and in France. Elizabeth did not complete high school and is an entrepreneur. She has three children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal and is the last child. She speaks with her children predominately in Soninke and English. She also speaks French and Wolof to her husband and her extended community. Elizabeth creates work hours that are flexible and provide her with opportunities to volunteer in her children’s school, attend meetings, and receive updates about her children’s progress during both formal and informal meetings with the teachers. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent.

**Michael.** Michael was born in the Congo and grew up in Senegal and France. Both of his parents had obtained academic degrees, and his father was a doctor. He was raised in the Catholic religion. He grew up in an enclave in Senegal of families who were not originally from the country, and they worked in the medical industry, business industry, and government. Michael obtained several academic degrees and currently works in the computer science field. He has two children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal and is the youngest child. He speaks to his children in French and English at home. Michael expresses that
he has a demanding work schedule and only sees his child’s teacher briefly as he drops his daughter off to school each day. He looks for progress in his child’s language and reading ability through his interactions with her and through updates that his wife shares with him, since she picks their daughter up from school daily. Both interviews were conducted in English at the request of the parent.

**Linda.** Linda was born in Senegal to parents who did not complete high school and who raised her in the Muslim religion. Her family was involved in the running of several businesses. Linda shares that she decided during her junior high school years that she no longer wanted to attend school after finding it challenging and disempowering. She was employed at her family’s businesses and assisted with the everyday running of the household. She now works in the service industry in a position that can be periodically demanding of her time. She has three children, and her youngest child attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal. She speaks to her children in Wolof. She receives updates about her daughter’s progress by attending the scheduled parent-teacher conferences. Both interviews were conducted in English at the request of the parent.

The general characteristics of the six participants are summarized in Table 4.
Table 4

Summary of Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Early Childhood Spent In</th>
<th>Language (currently spoken in home primarily by parent)</th>
<th>Interview in English or Other language</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Years living in the United States</th>
<th>Age of Child in ECCE Setting</th>
<th>Gender of Child in ECCE Setting</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Bambara, French, English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>5 years-old</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years-old</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Bambara</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>5 years-old</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Soninke, Wolof</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>5 years-old</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>4 years-old</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Wolof</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>4 years-old</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to attend to the nuances of each of the respondents’ lived experiences and honor each person’s individuality, I have presented each of their individual narratives in the next section.
Analysis of Individual Narratives

I present each of the participants’ narrative perspectives for the areas of inquiry that drove my research study. These narratives are written as the participant’s whole story to provide insight into their complexity and authenticity into who they are. I utilize Gee’s (1996, 2001, 2014) formatting of narratives into lines and stanzas. The narratives as stanzas made the unconventional syntax easier to read and analyze, as the meaning was displayed clearly. By reading each line within the stanza, the insight of the participants was evident. I note when an interview took place in a language other than in English. The interpreter assisted my communication with Patricia, who was a research participant who spoke during the interview in both French and English. The “Analysis of Individual Narratives” section is divided into the following parts that are informed by my guiding research questions: (a) James’s/Patricia’s/Jennifer’s/Elizabeth’s/Michael’s/Linda’s narrative, (b) Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences, (c) Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting, and (d) Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting. The guiding research question are addressed through the participants’ own accounts. This section begins with the research participant James.

James’s Narrative

James is the father of two children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in the Little Senegal section of Harlem. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent. Below is James’s narration of who he is and his experiences:

*Interviewer: What places did you live?*

1a. I was in Mali
1b. Bamako
1c. the capital of Mali
1d. West Africa.

2a. Because my dad was a teacher
2b. one thing he didn’t like to stay in the capital of Bamako
2c. because he say the influence was too much.

3a. So what triggered the moving
3b. was when I was ahhh
3c. I think I was in first grade
3d. I went to the afternoon movie
3e. with his permission
3f. then I stayed there to watch the overnight movie Sunday
3g. and then Monday I was supposed to go to school.

4a. So he was not happy about that
4b. so he literally disciplined me seriously
4c. and then he said
4d. "I’m not going to stay in the city."

5a. So then
5b. we start to go from different small cities within Mali.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James was born in Mali. He grew up in the large city capital of Bamako, which is regarded as one of the fastest growing cities on the continent of Africa. His father was a professional, which he confirmed with, “…my dad was a teacher” [2a]. James revealed that a
major change of residence occurred in his young life because of his father’s preference: “… one thing he didn’t like to stay in the capital of Bamako” [2b]. James continued to expound upon his father’s decision to relocate his family from the metropolises, saying, “because he say the influence was too much” [2c]. James clarified “the influence” [2c] to which he was referencing in his statement with the following:

So what triggered the moving, was when I was ahhhh, I think I was in first grade, I went to the afternoon movie with his permission, then I stayed there to watch the overnight movie Sunday, and then Monday I was supposed to go to school. [3a-3g]

James made a decision to extend his entertainment without considering the consequences it could create on his performance in school. He shared that his father was concerned with the fact that his son had such options of continued entertainment readily available to him in the city capital, which was “the influence” [2c]. He described his father’s reaction with, “so he was not happy about that, so he literally disciplined me seriously, and he said, ‘I’m not going to stay in the city’” [4a-4d]. James continues to explain: “so then, we start to go from different small cities within Mali” [5a-5b]. At a young age, James was aware of the reasons that prompted his father to move their family to other municipalities with environments quite different from that of his birthplace. James described the differences in further detail below.

*Interviewer: What was your new home like?*

10a. It was very quiet

10b. and we go to school.

11a. After that

11b. you don’t have time to go wandering around
11c. or something like.

12a. That’s how he tried to keep us

12b. in those kind of cities

12c. to be a part of custom.

13a. So I like it because

13b. after school

13c. unless you go to the bushes

13d. and then do some kind of hunting

13e. or do some kind of fishing

13f. those kind of activities

13g. outside activities

13h. you just have to do your studying.

14. You don’t have time to waste.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James illustrated in the excerpt above the ways in which his life in the smaller municipalities in Mali contrasted his life in the bustling metropolises of Bamako. He said, “It was very quiet and we go to school. After that you don’t have time to go wandering around or something like” [10a-11c]. The forms of entertainment were now different and contained to a less densely populated area. James referred to his father’s decision making when he stated, “that’s how he tried to keep us, in those kind of cities, to be part of custom” [12a-12c]. In those small communities, James was immersed in “custom” [12c], which included occurrences that both displayed and reinforced his heritage and history through his current way of living in the smaller municipalities. James provided various examples of activities that were now a part of his
reertoire as a young child: “So I like it, because after school, unless you go to the bushes and then do some kind of hunting, or do some kind of fishing, those kind of activities, outside activities, you just have to do your studying” [13a-13h]. James attributed these newfound activities and interests as positive and productive, as he ended this correspondence with, “you don’t have time to waste” [14].

**Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences.** James provided insight into the ways in which listening to various stories from his family members at a young age stimulated his early language and literacy development.

*Interviewer: What are examples of stories, lessons, or books that adults shared with you when you were a child?*

7a. We would talk a lot about our family history
7b. because my father used to tell me
7c. about my grandfather who I was named after.
8. He used to buy some kola nut from the Ivory Coast.
9. It’s a neighboring country all the way to Senegal.
10a. So he used to tell me
10b. many things about our family.

(James, personal communication, March 4, 2017)

James discussed how oral tradition was an established part of his upbringing. At the opening of this excerpt, he used his words to display the ways in which a rendering of past history and experiences of his family members was delivered with frequency when he shared, “We would talk a lot about our family history” [7a]. James explained that the stories that he was told were not cursory. He said, “my father used to tell me about my grandfather who I was
named after” [7c]. James learned about his namesake, who was connected to him through the shared history and knowledge that was conveyed to him as a child. James alluded to an extension of his role beyond that of a listener when he was a child at the beginning of this excerpt of the transcript when he said, “We would talk a lot about our family history” [7a]. James included himself in the pronoun “we,” which suggests that he was part of these talks. James mentioned throughout the excerpt how his father was the person who spoke with him about his family’s past and experiences, particularly when he said, “because my father used to tell me” [7b].

James described how both the languages of French and Bambara were important in his life as a child. His narration is below:

*Interviewer: If I were there with you and your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?*

49a. Most of the time

49b. in the city they have the

49c. my uncle and my aunts would be there.

50. It was a large family.

51. It was more people to interact with French.

52a. But when I was in the small city or countryside

52b. in French it was only my mom or my dad.

53. Most of all the teachers.

54a. Apart from that

54b. we speak Bambara.

55a. So I was like practicing my dad

55b. he was a teacher
55c. like I told you
55d. so he used to like to correct all the time
55e. then to discipline the proper way of saying things.
56a. For my mom
56b. she didn’t care that much
56c. about making mistakes in Bambara
56d. so I used to learn some few words.
57a. So growing up in the city
57b. we had the tendency of mixing some French words
57c. in the Bambara language
57d. even nowadays.
58a. That’s why
58b. some people who grow up in the city
58c. that’s what happen to us
58d. so when we go to the countryside
58e. and you speak to those old people they say
58f. "Oh you don’t speak Bambara."
59. Because we mix up the French words.
60. That’s why we different.

(James, personal communication, March 4, 2017)

James expressed through the excerpt above how he used language in the different places that he lived in with the different people that he interacted in several fashions. He explained that, while residing in the capital city, “it was a large family. It was more people to interact with
French” [50-51]. James had numerous family members to stimulate his use and knowledge of French through their daily interactions with him because this language dominated their discussions while in the capital city. There was a clear contrast to his experience with the French language when he resided in the smaller municipality. James explained, “but when I was in the small city or countryside, in French it was only my mom or my dad. Most of all the teachers” [52a-53]. When James resided in the smaller municipality, he discovered that the expectation to use solely French was delivered by his parents and by his teachers at school. In what follows, James expressed how his use of French was critiqued: “so I was like practicing my dad, he was a teacher . . . so he used to like to correct all the time, then to discipline the proper way of saying things” [55a-55e]. James’ father held him to a stringent standard regarding “the proper way of saying things” [55e] in his display of the French language, and he reinforced his expectations with James as a child by creating occurrences that James described were “like practicing” and “correct all the time” [55d-55e].

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** James discussed in the interview how he attempts to sustain his native heritage language while also reinforcing the English language that his children encounter in their education programs. James expounded below on his experiences:

*Interviewer: What language do you speak at home?*

42a. When Lesley was born
42b. my daughter here
42c. we set up some rules
42d. that my wife was speak with her in French and Bambara
42e. and I would speak with her in English.
43a. Then but she didn’t do her part
43b. and Lesley is OK.
44a. She speak French and she write and read.
45. But Timothy is not that good.
46a. So that was the mistake we made
46b. but we trying to work on that.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James discussed the establishment of a meticulous routine in his home with his wife in order to expose his children to the languages that were important to them. He explained, “when Lesley was born, my daughter here, we set up some rules, that my wife was speak with her in French and Bambara, and I would speak with her in English” [42a-42e]. James and his wife discussed holding onto the languages of their home—Mali, French, and Bambara—and complementing the language of their new home, English. He said, “we set up some rules” [42c], which indicates that each parent was responsible for continuing to communicate with their children in specific languages. James expressed that while in theory this plan was devised, it was not implemented the way that they had planned. He illuminated: “then but she didn’t do her part, and Lesley is OK. She speak French and she write and read. But Timothy is not that good” [43a-45]. Their children did not obtain the language exposure that they had aspired for. James referenced both of his children’s French abilities and their limited fluency, with his oldest child’s French abilities being stronger than his young child.

James lamented the missed opportunity to strengthen their children’s French abilities when he stated, “so that was the mistake we made” [46a]. James explained that, despite their intentions, his spouse did not immerse their children in French enough, which resulted in their
limited abilities in both comprehension and use of the language. James explained that, as parents, they recognized that this is a “mistake” [46a] and that they blamed themselves for not helping their children hold onto the languages of their home. James ended this segment of this transcript hopeful about developing his children’s French abilities with “but we trying to work on that” [46b]. There are particular choices that James and his wife have made in order to strengthen their children’s French abilities, illustrated by their decision to have their children live in Mali for a year. He provided details about his children’s experiences in Mali in the excerpt below:

154a. At home they were trying to speak in French not in Bambara
154b. because they were kind of behind.
155a. Lesley was in second grade
155b. Timothy was OK
155c. he was only three.
156a. All their aunts and uncles
156b. everybody they want them to learn.
157a. They say
157b. "For English. They gonna know English."
158. Lesley didn’t even have a problem.
159a. When she come back
159b. her English was good.
160. It was still on the same level.
161. For Timothy he had to start learning again.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)
James explained in this particular excerpt how he and his wife sent their children “home” [154a]. James chose to have his children be in Mali for a year, and while his children were there, his extended family worked on building his children’s language skills in French. James said, “At home they were trying to speak in French not in Bambara, because they were kind of behind” [154a-154b]. James’ family members reported that they attempted to strengthen his children’s French speaking abilities, as “they were kind of behind” [154b]. James’ extended family devised a way to assist by creating an environment where their children would have full exposure to French. James continued to describe his children’s experience in Mali with, “all their aunts and uncles, everybody they want them to learn” [156a-156b]. There was a shared desire and commitment among his family members in Mali to provide the children with what they needed to be able to speak and comprehend French. The reasoning of this group of people, James explained, was expressed to him as, “They say, ‘For English. They gonna know English’” [157a-157b]. There was recognition from his extended family members that English would be strengthened in the environment that the children lived in, the United States, but French would not. The opportunity to live in Mali was taken advantage of for its offering of a full immersion experience in French that was complemented by various family members.

James made the point to ensure that both of his children would have the English language complemented in the home like it was at school. This was James’ own experience, as he learned French formally from his father in his home and had it reinforced at school. James stated that when his older daughter was born, he established with his wife an environment for their home that included the condition that “I would speak with her in English” [42e]. He created the space for his daughter and later his son to speak English with him in their home. James also acknowledged that his older daughter’s trip to Mali for the year did not diminish her English
language fluency when he stated, “Lesley didn’t even have a problem. When she come back, her English was good. It was still on the same level” [158-160]. James clearly expressed that his daughter maintained her abilities in English.

James acknowledged that the relationship that his children have as siblings directly influences the development of his younger child’s English communication. He provided additional details in the following excerpt:

*Interviewer: What are some examples of what your child has learned at home or with family/community members in her use of English?*

232a. When he started reading things
232b. like the scholastic material that I had.
233. And sometimes I let Lesley to advise him.
234a. Sometimes my conversation
234b. with a French background
234c. sometimes they even laugh at me
234d. and I say
234e. “We grew up speaking with the British accent so even I used with the Peace Corps volunteers.”
235a. So I would let Lesley be around
235b. so when he’s reading
235c. or saying words
235d. or watching the news
235e. so that’s how I learned that he was learning things fast.
236. He was learning things quickly.
237a. When he tried to speak to Lesley
237b. sometimes
237c. most of the time in English
237d. and when he try to read everything
237e. that he tries to show me that
237f. by reading aloud.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James’ words at the beginning of the excerpt acknowledge that his son experienced growth in his English language abilities “when he started reading things, like the scholastic material that I had” [232a-232b]. His young son was now able to decipher the text that he made available at home. James had his older daughter Lesley become an advisor and teacher of the English language to his young son. He emphasized this several times in this excerpt when he says, “and sometimes I let Lesley to advise him” [233] and “so I would let Lesley be around” [235a]. James had Lesley “advise him” [233], which indicates that as an older sibling she was making recommendations to improve her younger brother’s English skill. His daughter provided stewardship because she was born in the United States, is attending school, and is fluent in speaking American English.

James shared that he faced his own limitations in his English-language-speaking abilities when he said, “Sometimes my conversation, with a French background, sometimes they even laugh at me and I say, ‘We grew up speaking with the British accent, so even I used with the Peace Corps volunteers’”’ [234a-234e]. James explained that “speaking with the British accent” [234e] presented a challenge to teaching his young child American English. He mentioned of his children that “sometimes they even laugh at me” [234c], which was their reaction to the
differences that they were noting between how their father spoke English and how they heard it in their school. James appears to mention that there was a difference in the way he spoke in order to further clarify why he was dependent upon his older daughter, who was attending school, to provide insight into how English is spoken in their community.

English became a dominant feature in his home, as James revealed through the exchanges that the siblings were having. James stated, “when he tried to speak to Lesley, sometimes, most of the time in English” [237a-237c]. James described his son’s ability with English, saying, “he tried to speak to Lesley” [237a], which gives the impression that his English was still not fluid but he was using it and taking language risks to extend his ability to speak it. James at first described these conversations as happening “sometimes” [237b] but then corrected himself with “most of the time in English” [237c]. James’ use of the phrase “most of the time” [237c] indicates that this is a condition that exists in his home. Earlier in the interview, James reflected on what he would have done differently now that he better understands how prominently English shows up in the lives of his children. His excerpt below provides his insight:

140a. I would have put the focus on French and Bambara at home

140b. because I

140c. I know at any course

140d. they are going to learn English.

141. They are here.

142. Their environment is here.

143. They go to the school.

144. They are surrounded by people who only speak English.

145a. It’s not like me
James’ words provide a vivid image of what he understands about how the English language and literacy is a part of his children’s lives in numerous ways. He stated, “I would have put the focus on French and Bambara at home, because I, I know at any course, they are going to learn English” [140a-140d]. James presented his children’s acquisition of the English language and exposure to it as inevitable with his words that emphasized, “I know at any course” [140c]. His choice of words provides an image for the listener of events unfolding that were predetermined.

James, in the excerpt above, continued to explain the current milieu that his children are immersed in. He said, “They are here. Their environment is here” [141-142]. James explained that both of his children are “here” [141] in “their environment” [142], which is an area in New York City where the language most commonly spoken is English. He then mentioned how integral the educational institution has become to the lives of both his children when he said,
“They go to the school. They are surrounded by people who only speak English” [143-144]. His children are encountering their peers and adults who are not only communicating in English but also expecting that they do so as well.

As James reflected upon his children’s upbringing, he then remarked on how different his own upbringing was to that of his children as he reminisced, “Once I leave the school, the linguistic environment is French. It’s totally different here” [146a-147]. James did not have English language and literacy reinforcement in his home and community, while his children do. He ended this segment of the transcript with, “I would have changed it. Both of us, my wife and myself, should speak to her in English and Bambara, no I mean French and Bambara” [148b-149d]. James highlighted how he would have changed the choices he made early on with his first child and which would have influenced how he raised his son, who is currently in an ECCE program, if he had a much more robust understanding of how the English language and literacy environment would dominate so many parts of his children’s lives in the United States.

**Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting.** While James has developed and articulated numerous perspectives on language-learning for his young child, he has interactions with his child’s ECCE teacher where his specific perspective is not illuminated. James narrated how interactions with the ECCE setting unfold for him:

*Interviewer: Has your child’s teacher shared a plan for your child in school?*

199a. I think the both of them said

199b. that the way I was involved

199c. in the education of my kid.

200a. Because their school was divided
so I used to go between two buildings

so I would go to meetings

or something for the parents.

Sometimes you have to attend the one meeting

and then go to the other building.

They really appreciated that I went there all the time.

All the time they had to do something

if they wanted to talk to a parent

then they knew I would be there.

She even told me

"you are so involved in the education of your kid. He’s not a bad kid. It’s just that they make fun of him."

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James described the different ways in which he encountered his young child’s teachers. He said, “so I used to go between two buildings, so I would go to meetings, or something for the parents” [200b-200d]. James displayed with his words that he was determined about being a constant physical presence in his son’s ECCE program. He did not allow for geographical challenges, timing, or regularity of the demands on his time to pose a challenge. He attended both “meetings or something for the parents” [200c-200d]. He made himself available to the school and was noticed by his child’s teachers for his efforts. James emphasized this point twice in this excerpt. At one point, he recounted the teacher’s praise: “‘You are so involved in the education of your kid. He’s not a bad kid. It’s just that they make fun of him’” [204b; see also 199a-199c].
James shared a specific occurrence where the school directed how he should interact with his young son in his home. He delved into the details in the excerpt below:

*Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teacher about his/her language-learning.*

50a. When he came back to Prep World ahhh
50b. when they came back
50c. so he lose his English totally.
51a. It was even a big problem
51b. because when we talk
51c. they say it better to read and speak in English.
52. I was getting call every single day.
53. The principal was comment on it.

(James, personal communication, March 4, 2017)

James shared how the teachers at the school received his son after his son spent a year abroad in Mali: “When he came back to Prep World ahhh, when they came back, so he lose his English totally. It was even a big problem” [50a-51a]. James expressed how his young son’s inability to express himself and understand English was framed as a “big problem” [51a]. This particular language choice gave James’s son’s language status at that time a negative connotation. James spoke about two consequences that he was dealing with as a parent, given that his son could not meet the standards set for his English-language-learning. He said, “I was getting call every single day. The principal was comment on it” [52-53]. James’ words suggest a disapproving and perhaps insistent nature of these phone calls from the ECCE educators. He continued to elaborate about the direction that he was given by the school: “because when we
talk, they say it better to read and speak in English” [51b-51c]. James was referencing his conversations with the school, and he stated that the counsel that he received was that he should communicate and have literacy events solely in English because “they say it better” [51c] to do so. This placed a priority on the language of the school community over that of any of the native heritage languages that were being spoken at home.

The advice that James received from the ECCE setting to speak and read English only had direct implications on how James supports his child’s language development. James shared the ways in which he guides his young language-learning son to complete homework assignments from the school. James continued to expound upon his own actions in the excerpt below:

Interviewer: How are you interacting when you use English? And when you use your home language?

211a. So as soon as they come from school
211b. they would go and do their homework
211c. before doing anything else.
212a. If they are having trouble
212b. they would come and say
212c. "Daddy I don’t understand that part."
213a. And I would try to tell them
213b. without giving the answer.
214a. Sometimes I see
214b. sometimes I see
214c. people outside on the train
214d. trying to literally do the homework for the kid.
215. I don’t do that.
216a. I let them do it
216b. struggle and find out.
217a. Then I say
217b. “OK you did everything almost perfect 90 or 80% perfect, but there are some mistakes.”
218. So they can find the mistakes in that area.
219. So they can figure it out.
220a. If they can not
220b. then I know that they have done the most hardest part
220c. and then I would let the teacher do the next day in the school.
221a. So I would just follow every single homework
221b. and try to put my initial on it
221c. that I tried to helped them look at the homework.
222a. That way I tell everything in English
222b. because I don’t want to mix it up ahhh
222c. so that in Timothy head
222d. or both of them
222e. that by explaining in French
222f. I’m not going to help them develop their English.

(James, personal communication, May 13, 2017)

James explained that he was having encounters with the school and the learning that is occurring in the institution through the homework that his children bring home. He said, “so as
soon as they come from school, they would go and do their homework, before doing anything else” [211a-211c]. James described how the completion of the assignments from school took precedence in his home as it was done “before doing anything else” [211c]. He then employed a specific strategy to assist his children with their homework completion: “And I would try to tell them, without giving the answer” [213a-213b]. The guidance that James provides his children directly contrasts to the parenting that he becomes privy to when he observes families on public transportation. He stated, “sometimes I see, sometimes I see, people outside on the train, trying to literally do the homework for the kid. I don’t do that” [214a-215]. He provided more details about how he works with his children when they have homework, saying, “then I know that they have done the most hardest part, and then I would let the teacher do the next day in the school” [220b-220c]. James revealed that when there are aspects of the homework that his children have difficulty completing, he “would let the teacher do the next day in the school” [220c]. He shows that he has a certain level of trust in the teacher’s ability to guide his young son and his older daughter through academic challenges that they face. He makes a point to not be the person to deliver all of the answers to his children and has their teachers remain in a role of authority for their children.

James explained his process of homework support: “so I would just follow every single homework, and try to put my initial on it, that I tried to helped them look at the homework” [221a-221c]. James used his initial as a way to communicate with the teacher. James is intentional about his language choice when he is completing homework with his young son; as he stated, “That way I tell everything in English” [222a]. He used the superlative “everything” [222a] to clearly state that all of his interactions with his children about assignments are in English. James disclosed his reasoning for using English when he said, “because I don’t want to
mix it up ahhh, so that in Timothy head, or both of them, that by explaining in French, I’m not going to help them develop their English” [222b-222f]. He is hesitant about having his son “mix . . . up” [222b] which languages are French and English “in Timothy head” [222c].

The next narrative that I present is that of Patricia.

**Patricia’s Narrative**

Patricia has one child who attends an ECCE program in the Little Senegal section of Harlem. This interview was conducted in both French and English at the request of the parent. I have indicated in parentheses at the beginning of each new line in the stanza when Patricia spoke in English or when she spoke in French. In the following interview segment, Patricia reported the range of locations where she has lived.

*Interviewer: What are the places you lived before living here?*

1a. Michigan (English)

1b. Italy

1c. and before Italy

1d. Ivory Coast.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia currently resides in New York City, but prior to making this her place of residence, she has lived in two other countries and one location elsewhere in the United States. She provided the following list of places that she has resided, once queried: “Michigan, Italy, and before Italy, Ivory Coast” [1a-1d]. The differences in geographical location that span three continents suggests that there were varying languages, people, and cultures that Patricia encountered in each of these locations. Patricia elaborated on her upbringing as a child in the Ivory Coast:
*Interviewer: What sort of things did you do with your family?*

5a. When I was a child  
5b. my grandpa used to do  
5c. a lot of things for me.

6a. Grandpa spoiled me  
6b. because I was the first grandchild  
6c. of my grandfather  
6d. so they spoiled me a lot.

7a. You would see me  
7b. happy

7c. Yeah.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia spoke of her childhood in the Ivory Coast as one that was “happy” [7b], as she spent time with her grandparents. She explained, “when I was a child, my grandpa used to do a lot of things for me” [5a-5c]. She continued to narrate, “Grandpa spoiled me, because I was the first grandchild of my grandfather, so they spoiled me a lot” [6a-6d]. Patricia reinforced that she held a special position in her family as “the first grandchild” [6b]. While she did not elaborate on how she was “spoiled” [6a & 6b], she did repeat this word twice in this short excerpt, emphasizing her impression that she was indulged as a child.

**Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences.** Below is Patricia’s explanation of how instrumental the narratives from her parents were in her formation of images on how to live:

*Interviewer: If I were there with your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear*
you talking about?

10a. My parents (French)
10b. they used to talk to me
10c. about when they were little.

11a. They used to talk the old stories (French)
11b. to me
11c. many stories.

12a. My daddy used to tell (French)
12b. when he was a child
12c. he was so smart in the class.

13a. He used to go the school and study (French)
13b. and he was very smart in the class.

14. He used to tell that a lot.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia began this excerpt explaining how she learned about incidences of the past when she stated, “my parents, they used to talk to me, about when they were little” [10a-10c]. Patricia expressed that there were various times when she was told specific details from both of her parents. She spoke specifically about how her father relayed an aspect of his own identity as a child, that of a student. Patricia’s parents displayed the value and importance of these stories by making it a persistent part of their interactions. She revealed how her father spoke about how “he used to go the school and study, and he was very smart in the class. He used to tell that a lot” [13a-14]. Patricia’s father presented a specific portrayal of his role as a student. He shared that he displayed a strong acumen at school and emphasized to his daughter how important it was in his
childhood to receive positive recognition for this aspect of his identity. He was rewarded with the acknowledgement of being “very smart in the class” [13b]. Patricia knew what the features of a good student entailed based on how her father spoke about his own experiences. The frequency of the telling of this particular story suggests that these personal accounts from the past were not mere entertainment; instead, it held different socializing functions, including an affirmation on how to live.

As an adult, Patricia is able to recall the details of the stories that her father told her because they were repeated often, which indicates that her father had her rapt attention. She was placed in the role of being a listener who was expected to be attentive to what her parents were saying.

As Patricia recalled her childhood, she stated, “My parents they used to talk to me” [10a-10b], “they used to talk the old stories” [11a], and “he used to tell that a lot” [14]. She mentioned numerous times that her parents were the speakers and were relaying the information that they believed was important for her to hold onto as a child.

Patricia’s parents were knowledgeable in Arabic, had attended Arabic schools, and had books in this language in the home, but Patricia could not understand this language. She spoke candidly about the discontinuity of languages that she felt between herself and her parents because of her lack of exposure and knowledge of Arabic. Patricia elaborated:

*Interviewer*: If I were there with you and your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?

16a. My parents did Arabic school (English)

16b. but I studied in French.

17a. They just put me in a French school (French)
17b. and they didn’t teach me Arabic.

18. But they just put me in French school. (French)

19a. So I used to go to school. (French)

20a. But they didn’t teach me (English)

20b. how to learn in the book

20c. that they had in Arabic.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

While Patricia resided in the Ivory Coast as a child, she had encounters with two languages—Arabic and French. She began this excerpt by addressing how there was a communication discontinuity between herself as a child and her key conversational partners, her parents, when she stated, “my parents did Arabic school, but I studied in French” [16a-16b]. She continued to elaborate that there was not any bridging of communication of the two languages that was facilitated by her parents; instead, she stated, “they didn’t teach me” [17a, 20b] twice in this excerpt while referring to Arabic. Patricia acknowledges that her parents had a choice and that they made the decision to not introduce her to a language that Patricia knew existed in her home. This she revealed when she stated, “But they didn’t teach me how to learn in the book that they had in Arabic” [20a-20c].

Patricia acknowledged that she had an identity that was established by her attendance in the French school when she stated, “but I studied French” [16b], which distinguished her experience from that of her parents. She continued, explaining, “but they didn’t teach me how to learn in the book that they had in Arabic” [20a-20c]. Patricia described her lack of agency as a child when she stated twice in this excerpt “they just put me in a French school” [17a, 18] to show that she was a passive part of the experience that was being determined by her parents.
Patricia’s use of the adverb “just” [18] suggests a perception on her part that she was being denied entrance to a part of their lives. Furthermore, Patricia’s use of the adverb “just” [18] suggests that she viewed that she was lacking in her experience of language and literacy without a knowledge of Arabic that her parents had. Her parents held the agency and power to create the literacy events and experiences that they valued for Patricia as a child. Patricia learned that her knowledge and use of Arabic was not a part of the priority that was placed on her own upbringing, while it was placed as one for her parents.

This excerpt of the transcript begins with Patricia stating, “my parents did Arabic school but I studied in French” [16a-16b], which shows that there was an expectation of an international language, French, that was placed on her as she navigated her own schooling experience. While she was expected to develop fluency in this language while she was in school, she also found that she faced a challenge when she arrived home and her proficiency in Bambara and French did not enable her to understand Arabic.

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** Patricia narrated below her own experiences presently as a mother of a young child who is attending an ECCE program in Little Senegal and who is growing in her English language and literacy abilities:

*Interviewer: What language do you speak at home?*

37a. I speak French (French)

37b. but my daughter doesn’t.

38. I speak with her in French. (French)

39a. We do a lot of things (French)

39b. we do together.

40a. We like to (French)
40b. sing together.

41a. When I sing (French)

41b. my daughter answer.

42a. I speaks English (English)

42b. and she answer English.

43a. I doesn’t understand English (English)

43b. but my daughter speaks with me.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

At the beginning of this segment of the transcript, Patricia stated, “I speak French, but my daughter doesn’t” [37a-37b]. She presented from the onset of this excerpt that both she and her daughter make different language choices. While Patricia continues to use a language that she was schooled in and used at home when she was growing up in the Ivory Coast, her daughter, who once spoke French at home with her, now after entering school speaks in English at home more. They are now speaking in two different languages—French and English. Patricia elaborated later: “I doesn’t understand English, but my daughter speaks with me” [44a-44b]. Patricia’s daughter speaks in English, the language that she is learning while living in the United States and that is being reinforced while she is attending an ECCE program.

Patricia spoke about how she makes adjustments in her approach and communication with her daughter in order to allow for English language and literacy exchanges. She takes language risks, explaining, “I speaks English, and she answer English” [42a-42b]. While Patricia disclosed to having a limited comprehension of English, she is willing to experiment with a language that is unfamiliar to her in order to develop her oral proficiency and bridge the language difference in order to maintain her interactions with her daughter. Patricia hinted that
she displays her own eagerness to learn English when she implied that the songs that they share have English components. Patricia said, “when I sing, my daughter answer” [41a-41b]. While Patricia did not disclose if she is singing in French or English, she did state earlier that she speaks in both languages to her daughter. Nevertheless, the fact that she did not say the specific language in this line also displays how she has created an environment that allows for flexibility of languages in her home. Patricia’s narration of the differing preferences in language use at home with her young child who attends an ECCE program and the ways in which she changes her own established linguistic patterns for the unfamiliar one of English are shared by other research participants.

**Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting.** Patricia narrated her meeting with the teacher:

*Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teachers about her language learning.*

47a. The teacher told me (English)
47b. I have conference yesterday (English)
47c. since my daughter got here
47d. she got progress.
48. She learns a lot. (English)
49a. She understands every time (English)
49b. when they give that to her.
50. She understands all of it. (English)
51a. She’s not so good (English)
51b. at the math.
52a. I feel much better (French)
52b. hearing that.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia said at the beginning of this excerpt, “I have a conference yesterday” [47b]. She was referring to attending a meeting with her young child’s teachers. She did not provide much detail about what was shared other than that “The teacher told me . . . since my daughter got here, she got progress” [47a-47d]. She then emphasized that her daughter is able to comprehend what is occurring in her English-speaking classroom when she said, “she understands all of it” [50; see also 49a]. She brought up a concern that the teachers have with her daughter’s performance in one area when she said, “she’s not so good at the math” [51a-51b]. However, Patricia did express that she felt more at ease with knowing how her daughter was doing in regard to her English language development and assignments when she said, “I feel much better, hearing that” [52a-52b]. Patricia continued to explain how she made a decision to support her daughter’s learning after receiving information about her daughter’s progress:

_Interviewer: Have you received any advice from your child’s teachers or anyone else on how to help her be an English reader, writer and speaker?_

55a. The baby’s uncle (French)
55b. he told me
55c. after I finished the parent conference
55d. the child uncle called
55e. and he said
55f. he could help the child
55g. in the math
Patricia disclosed that she was not completely at ease with the entire assessment from her daughter’s teachers and that she left the parent-teacher conference uncertain about her role in helping her child, specifically in the area of math. She said, “after I finished the parent conference the child uncle called, and he said he could help the child in the math in French” [55d-55i]. She did not clarify with the teachers how she can support her child at home, given that she herself is an English language learner, and has never attended an educational system in the United States as a child. Instead, she found a family member to receive guidance about how to better support her daughter at home. Her family member assured her that “…the Math in French and English are the same” [55i-55k]. Patricia is told by her daughter’s uncle that the schooling around math is similar regardless of the language of instruction. She appeared to believe that her family member can serve as a helpful resource, saying, “and he said that to me so he can improve her Math” [56a-56d]. Patricia did not speak about discussing any of this with her young daughter’s teachers, nor did she discuss having heard from the teachers how she could personally
support her child. Patricia made specific decisions regarding how to support her daughter’s school assignments in her home.

In the following excerpts, Patricia expounds upon her experiences. Patricia revealed the ways in which her daughter uses English in their home:

*Interviewer: Does she enjoy the process of learning English?*

28a. My daughter since she come here (English)
28b. she learned a lot.

29a. When she was no used to come here (English)
29b. she didn’t understand very well
29c. but she does speak English now
29d. my daughter.

30a. And then she’s trying to teach me too (French)
30b. how to say the words.

31. So she is learning a lot here. (French)
32. She is good at writing. (French)
33a. She is good at writing (French)
33b. at reading.
34a. She is not so good (French)
34b. at the math.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia presented that there is a clear contrast in her young daughter’s English abilities when she compares what her daughter was like before she entered the school and what she is like now that she attends the school. She said, “My daughter since she come here she learned a lot”
This mother notices the progress that her young daughter has made in her ability to express herself in English. She continued to explain: “When she was no used to come here, she didn’t understand very well, but she does speak English now, my daughter” [29a-29d]. Patricia noted that her daughter’s comprehension of the English language has improved in very noticeable ways. She then stated, “And then she’s trying to teach me too how to say the words. So she is learning a lot here” [30a-31]. Patricia’s young daughter is sharing what she is learning in school at home with her mother. Patricia stated that “she’s trying to teach me too” [30a], which indicates that the school-like activities that her daughter is engaging in at school are being replicated at home in her interactions with her mother.

Patricia noted that there are benefits to her daughter’s enthusiasm with using the English language at home and engaging in various activities that she was exposed to at school, and that her daughter’s skill in English reading and writing is “good:” “She is good at writing. She is good at writing at reading” [32-33b]. She communicated that her daughter’s incremental advances in her English language use are indicators that she is doing well in school. Patricia solidified her perspective of her belief in her daughter’s growing English language competence when she stated, “And then she’s trying to teach me too how to say the words” [30a-30b]. Her daughter appears to be providing her with tutorials on English vocabulary. All of the “say[ing]” [30b], “writing” [32-33b] and “reading” [33b] is happening in English in Patricia’s home, which is the language that her young daughter is exposed to primarily through instruction and through socialization at school. Patricia expressed her delight in seeing her daughter perform these school-like tasks without prompting from an adult and entirely because of her own enthusiasm about learning English:

35a. Because I sees her (English)
35b. she always like to writing.

36a. Even when we take the train (French)
36b. she trying to put something
36c. write something in the train
36d. she always want to put something
36e. in the paper
36f. so she likes it.

(Patricia, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Patricia spoke of herself as an observer as her child engages in English activities that she is learning at school. She said, “because I sees her, she always like to writing” [35a-35b]. She is “always” [35b] viewing her young daughter using print and symbols that she has learned in English from school. Her daughter’s interest in using English has become more than a school-related task; it is apparent in much of the everyday routine of their lives together. She continued with, “Even when we take the train, she trying to put something, write something in the train, she always want to put something, in the paper” [36a-36e]. Patricia made a point of saying that even at unexpected moments, such as traveling on public transportation, she notices her daughter using some literacy skill introduced in school. Patricia alluded to her limited understanding of what her daughter is writing by referring to it as “something” [36a, 36b, 36e] three times in this segment of this transcript. She is not entirely certain what her daughter is communicating through her written words because it is communicated in English.

The next narrative that I present is Jennifer’s.
Jennifer’s Narrative

Jennifer has four children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal and is the second to last child. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent. She reported about her background and upbringing below:

*Interviewer: What are the places you lived before living here?*

1a. I have been living here
1b. since I got here
1c. since I got in the US.
2a. Before that
2b. I lived in Mali.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer clearly stated that she has lived in two places during her lifetime. She said, “I have been living here, since I got here, since I got in the US” [1a-1c]. Jennifer’s use of the adverb “here” [1a] in this excerpt refers to New York City, which is her current residence. She then simply stated where she spent her childhood and young adulthood: “before that, I lived in Mali” [2a-2b]. Jennifer provided details about what her life was like when she was young:

*Interviewer: What sort of things did you do with your family?*

7a. I really liked to live with my family
7b. my sisters
7c. and brothers.
8. We used to live together.
9a. I still remember them sometimes
9b. how we were living.
10. You know

11. I’m still missing that times.

12. So you know.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer expressed how pleasant her life in Mali was during her childhood in the presence of her siblings. She said, “I really like to live with my family, my sisters and brothers. We used to live together” [7a-7c]. She provided insight to the listener about how important her siblings were in establishing a place to live that she found pleasant. Jennifer continued to share, “I still remember them sometimes, how we were living. You know, I’m still missing that times” [9a-11]. She was nostalgic as she recalled her childhood in Mali, and she had a longing to return to how things once were. Jennifer elaborated upon occurrences of oral traditions that were shared with her during her childhood.

Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences. Jennifer expressed the prevalence of oral traditions in her life:

Interviewer: If I were there with your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?

58a. Oh yeah

58b. when they were a child

58c. you know

58d. when they were young.

59. They used to tell us their stories.

60. I still remember them.

61a. Like my mom
61b. her parents passed away
61c. really early
61d. when she was young
61e. but she doesn’t remember exactly.
62a. But the person
62b. who brought her up
62c. she talks about it
62d. about them.
63. That’s her mother sisters.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer displayed through her language that the accounts of the past were presented on a regular basis to her as a child when she stated, “They used to tell us their stories” [59]. Jennifer’s phrase “used to” in this segment of the transcript conveys that the adults in her life had a habit of sharing past anecdotes and history with her. Jennifer used the pronoun “they” in this statement in reference to her mother and to her extended family, whom she later revealed in the excerpt with, "That’s her mother sisters" [63]. Past experiences were not communicated solely by her mother; several other people in Jennifer’s extended family also took part in the telling of past experiences. These other family members offered details to the accounts of the past that Jennifer’s mother could not provide. Jennifer explained that her own mother faced tragedy as a young child and lost her parent, “…but she doesn’t remember exactly. But the person, who brought her up, she talks about it, about them” [61e-62d]. Jennifer’s extended family played a crucial role in her life with helping to illuminate the occurrences of the past that were significant to how her own mother was raised.
Jennifer spoke in the excerpt about a way in which the stories that she heard as a child made a long-lasting impression on her. Jennifer was a child immersed in an environment where she was surrounded by her siblings, her mother, and her extended family, who did a great deal of the talking. She stated, “they used to tell us their stories” [59] in reference to her aunts. She also stated, “she talks about it” [62c], in reference to her mother. Jennifer presented herself as a child who was primarily a listener to the accounts that were shared with her.

Jennifer used her language to indicate how the stories that she heard from the adults were mainly about their own childhood when she said, “Oh yeah, when they were a child, you know, when they were young” [58a-58d.]. These narratives were specific accounts about the occasion of being a child and being raised with specific values, insight, norms, and thoughts. Jennifer’s parents, siblings, and extended family members reiterated these ways of thinking, being, and making meaning by repeating accounts. It also appears that the adults were primarily the speakers in these exchanges with young Jennifer.

Jennifer did not spend the greater portion of the year residing with her parents, and this meant that the oral presentations she experienced were not primarily from her parents. She has vivid memories of the stories that her parents shared with her in addition to those that were shared with her by her extended family. In the excerpt above, Jennifer recalled how her extended family emphasized certain stories that revealed and clarified her family’s history and experiences to her. Jennifer also expressed in the excerpt below how dialects in a country can vary and that she had difficulty engaging fully with a key conversational partner in her life, her sister-in-law.

*Interviewer: If I were there with you and your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?*

83a. So my sister used to tell me that
Jennifer expressed in the excerpt above how different ways of speaking and understanding the same language induced a poignant memory for her growing up. Jennifer referred to her sister-in-law, whom she lived with, when she stated, “She used to tell me in her language and the sound that they were making” [84a-84b]. The specific dialect that Jennifer was exposed to through interactions with her sister-in-law occurred, as “my sister used to tell me that so the village she was growing up there” [83a-83b]. Jennifer attempted to engage with her sister-in-law; she explained, “the way I answer her, she laughed, because I’m not used to talk like them” [86a-86c]. As a child, Jennifer would make attempts to mimic the form of language that her sister-in-law modeled for her.

Jennifer mentioned twice in the excerpt above how her attempts at speaking the language that her sister-in-law was fluent in were considered humorous [85b, 86b]. She expounded upon how these occurrences unfolded, saying, “When I answer her, she laughs” [85a-85b]. Jennifer
recognized that she should try to acquire the language that was being spoken to her by a prevalent person in her life, but her efforts were not met with encouragement. Instead, they were critiqued. Jennifer made it clear that she did not have mastery of the dialect that her sister-in-law grew up speaking and that she was different when she stated, “because I’m not used to talk like them” [86a]. These experiences left an impression on Jennifer that has lasted into her adulthood. This excerpt ends with Jennifer saying, “so I still remember those things” [87a-87b]. The moments of speaking with her sister-in-law and realizing that she could not fully explain herself in a different dialect established her identity as part of her own village and language community.

Jennifer found that there was an expectation that she would be able to recognize and participate in a different language community that was now in her own home by the presence of her sister-in-law. She remarked on how her sister-in-law took the time to teach her ways of communicating. Jennifer stated, “she used to tell me in her language and the sound that they were making” [84a-84b]. During these exchanges with her sister-in-law, Jennifer used what she was learning about the new dialect to expand how she communicated with her sister in law.

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** Jennifer is now raising four children in Little Senegal with her husband. Her second to last child attends an ECCE program. Below, she has provided details on how language unfolds in her home:

*Interviewer: What language do you speak at home?*

153. We do speak Bambara in the house.

154a. But when I talk to them in my language

154b. they answer me in English.

155. But sometimes it’s good for me though.

156a. Sometimes
156b. I need vocabulary in English.
157a. It teach me too
157b. when they speak to me in English.
158a. But I also want them
158b. to know my language.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer, at the beginning of this excerpt, stated, “we do speak Bambara in the house” [153]. She was referring to her husband and herself, who are speaking their native language of Bambara to their children. She then described the occurrences between herself and all four of her children, including her child who is in the ECCE program: “but when I talk to them in my language, they answer me in English” [154a-154b]. Jennifer’s children exhibit that they understand what she is communicating by their ability to respond, but they are not using Bambara like their mother. The children are using the language that they are exposed to while growing up in New York City—English. At the end of this segment of the transcript, Jennifer emphasized how important Bambara is to her and her children’s ability to display their own skill when using her native heritage language. She stated, “But I also want them, to know my language” [158a-158b]. She began this sentence with the conjunction “but” [158a], which signifies that she is contrasting the ways in which her children develop language proficiency in English and Bambara. She used the possessive “my language” [158b], which displays the intimacy and connection that she has to the language that she grew up with. This mother’s desire not to lose her connection to her native heritage language is evident. All of this occurs while Jennifer’s children continue to choose English in their daily interactions.
Jennifer recognizes that both English and Bambara are important and displays this through her actions. Her continued preference for her native language is displayed by her exchanges with her husband in Bambara in front of their children, her speaking directly to her children in Bambara despite their continuing to answer her in English, and lastly by her own admission of her desire that each of her children become versed in Bambara at the end of this excerpt of the transcript. However, Jennifer spoke about being open to learning English when she said, “but sometimes, it’s good for me though. Sometimes, I need vocabulary in English. It teach me too” [155-157a]. She, like Patricia, makes changes in her home that allow for her children to continue to speak in the ways they choose. She placed a positive value statement on acquiring the English language when she said, “it’s good for me though” [155]. Jennifer recognizes the limitations in her own English lexical abilities and recognizes that her children can help her become much more proficient, as in when she said, “sometimes, I need vocabulary in English. It teach me too” [156a-157a]. Jennifer allows and supports the English exchanges between her and her children, including her child that is in an ECCE program. She also noted that all four of her children are speaking with each other in English.

Interviewer: What are some examples of what your child has learned at home or with family/community members in her use of English?

159a. Cause you know
159b. I need someone to talk to them
159c. in the English
160. It can improve my English too
161. So I can say yes
162. They helping me
163. Yes
164a. They helping me
164b. in English
165a. When they answer me in English
165b. It improve me too

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

In this excerpt, Jennifer mentioned, “…they answer me in English” [165a]. She was referring to her four children, including her child who attends an ECCE program. She noted that their conversations are in English, even though she is speaking with them in her heritage language. Through these daily interactions that are meaningful, the siblings are affecting their mother; as she explained, “They helping me” [162 & 164a]. Jennifer emphasized that the siblings extend her ability to speak and be understood in English by using this language in their daily exchanges.

English is a part of the interactions within the household even when Jennifer is speaking with her children in her native heritage language. She admitted that her own grasp of English is limited, saying, “Cause you know, I need someone to talk to them, in the English. It can improve my English too” [159a-160]. Jennifer notices that there is more that her children can learn from a much more fluent speaker of English and believes that her own grasp of that language cannot assist her children the way that she wishes. She said, “it can improve my English too” [160]. Jennifer’s words indicate that she welcomes the conversations that her children are having and welcomes the idea of having a much more knowledgeable speaker in English informing her on how the language works. All of this suggests that she sees her children’s interactions with English speakers at school and elsewhere as indirectly benefiting her.
Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting. Jennifer reported that she primarily receives updates about her daughter’s progress during parent-teacher conferences. She has a fluctuating work schedule in the service industry that presents a number of demands on her time that are not always planned for. She explained:

Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teachers about her language learning.

240. Yeah
241a. At the first semester
241b. she was a little behind.
242a. But yesterday
242b. I had a meeting with them
242c. and she got improved.
243a. She told me
243b. she’s changing a lot.
244a. She’s doing the writing
244b. is very good.
245. The reading is very good.
246a. Everything is very good
246b. except for Math.
247. She is a little behind.
248. Yeah.
249. Yesterday parent conference
Jennifer revealed that she learned about her daughter’s progress in her ECCE program when saying, “I had a meeting with them” [242b]. She clarified that “a meeting” [242b] was “yesterday parent conference” [249]. Jennifer’s use of the pronoun “them” [242b] referred to the teachers in her young daughter’s life. This mother remarked about one of the teachers with, “she told me she’s changing a lot” [243a-243b]. She presented a list of school subject areas that were reported to her by the teachers as areas that her daughter is doing well in or finding challenging. She did not communicate about her child’s performance at length, which hints at the lack of information that was revealed during the conference by the teachers or a disconnect in learning from the meeting all of the information offered due to her limited English language comprehension.

Jennifer continued to share about her interaction with her young daughter’s teachers in the segment of the transcript below:

251a. I was listening to her
251b. when she was doing
251c. the situation
251d. what’s going on in the class
251e. and with Mavis.
252a. I was listening to her
252b. and you know
252c. she showed me the paper
252d. with what has been done.
And I saw all of it.

I listened to her.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer presented herself as a receiver of information from the teachers when she repeated, “I was listening to her” [251a, 252a, 254]. She emphasized that she was being attentive during the conference. She also discussed how she received her daughter’s report card when she said “she showed me the paper, with what has been done” [252c-252d]. During this parent-teacher conference, Jennifer received “the paper” [252c] that revealed how her daughter was performing and “with what has been done” [252d]. Jennifer confirmed that she is knowledgeable about her daughter’s progress from the perspective of the teachers, and that she was attentive “when she was doing the situation” [251b-251c].

According to Jennifer’s description, the teachers do the majority of the talking. The fact that Jennifer did not speak much during this meeting is further revealed when she continued with the following:

I have received one letter

last week

The week before last week

They were talking about that

but I forgot to bring with me yesterday

to ask her about that again

because I still need

a question about it.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)
Jennifer said, “I have received one letter, last week. The week before last week. They were talking about that” [255a-257a]. There was a written correspondence that was sent home by the teachers in an attempt to raise Jennifer’s attention to her daughter’s progress in school. Jennifer stated that despite receiving it “the week before last week” [256], she had not spoken directly with the teachers about it until they raised this topic during the meeting. She said, “They were talking about that” [257a]. She did not include herself in the conversation about the letter; instead, she gave the impression through her words that the teachers were providing her with their insight. Jennifer left this meeting not fully understanding all that was communicated with her about the letter. She stated at the end of this excerpt, “…I still need a question about it” [257e]. She regretted not having brought the letter with her during the meeting and said, “but I forgot to bring with me yesterday to ask her about that again” [257b-257c]. There is a level of uncertainty for Jennifer, which she has not brought to their attention. This lack of clarity about her role on how to best support her child is revealed when she continued to expound upon her experience at the parent-teacher conference:

*Interviewer: Have you received any advice from your child’s teachers or anyone else?*

258a. But they were talking about some how

258b. to improve her

258c. how to help her.

259. Yes.

260a. She says

260b. They have some little group

260c. and she has to join them

260d. to improve her skill.
261. Yes.

262. Yes.

263a. She was talking about

263b. a lot of things yesterday.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer spoke about a number of ways in which the teachers plan to intervene to assist her daughter’s academic growth. She presented the teachers as the dominant speakers who conveyed a great deal of information to her about her daughter. She said, “but they were talking about some how to improve her how to help her” [258a-258c], and “she was talking about a lot of things yesterday” [263a-263b]. All of the ways in which Jennifer communicated that her daughter can be supported came from how the teachers planned to intervene in the school setting. She revealed the words of the teacher: “She says they have some little group, and she has to join them to improve her skill” [260a-260d]. Jennifer was made aware of one way in which the school is addressing her daughter’s need to progress in English. Jennifer revealed how she manages the homework assignments that her daughter brings home.

Jennifer shared the ways in which her young child extends what she is learning at school in their home by describing the ways in which the school advises that she follow up at home:

*Interviewer: Does she enjoy the process of learning English?*

177a. She does

177b. She does

177c. She does.

178a. Yeah cause when we got home

178b. she complete the homework
178c. now after school.

179a. She also

179b. when she get home

179c. she also want to keep writing on the paper

179d. and drawing the pictures.

180. She really like it.

181. She like Maroon Academy.

182. Yes.

(Jennifer, personal communication, February 16, 2017)

Jennifer stated, “she complete the homework, now after school” [178b-178c]. She made it clear that her daughter is the one who is working on the assignments. She does not include herself in these moments as an active participant who is guiding or prompting her daughter. She continued by saying, “She also, when she get home, she also want to keep writing on the paper, and drawing the pictures” [179a-179d]. Her daughter appears to eagerly engage in the school-like tasks and continue to do them on her own accord. While Jennifer referred to herself at these moments with school assignments and activities as an observer, she takes a more active role in a different school-like activity that she prompts based on her knowledge of what she knows about school in the United States.

Below, Jennifer has spoken about the ways that she engages with her young child in order to enhance her knowledge and use of English:

*Interviewer: Are there any games that you play with Mavis or things that involve speaking or using books?*

192. Yes
193a. Sometimes I go the library
193b. to take books for her
193c. and she does read them
193d. before she goes to bed.
194a. Yeah and you know
194b. sometimes I’m asking her
194c. what is the book about
194d. and sometimes she explain.
195. You know.
196a. But she like to read to herself
196b. she doesn’t like to read loudly
196c. but I want to hear her
196d. but she doesn’t like that.
197a. I like to push her to read louder
197b. so it’s good for her
197c. even when she is in class
197d. she’s going to get used to it.
198a. But you know
198b. my kids are my kids
199a. They
199b. they so quiet
199c. in the school
200. Yeah
Jennifer revealed that there are several English language activities that she promotes at home in her interactions with her young child. She said, “Sometimes I go the library, to take books for her, and she does read them, before she goes to bed” [193a-193d]. Jennifer makes trips to the library to provide more options to expand her daughter’s English-language-learning. This assumption can be made because she revealed that she has a concern about her daughter’s performance at school when she said, “I like to push her to read louder, so it’s good for her, even when she is in class, she’s going to get used to it” [197a-197d]. She used the words “I like to push her to read louder” [197a], which illustrates her own desire as a mother to see her daughter excel. She places a certain level of pressure on her daughter to perform in a way that she believes is valued in the school setting as an English literacy behavior. Her insight on this matter was evident when she mentioned the benefits of her daughter’s learning to amplify her voice: “so it’s good for her, even when she is in class” [197b-197c]. Jennifer emphasized her perspective that her daughter’s ability to perform in the English language is instrumental to her receiving the benefits of her schooling. She ended this segment of the transcript with the following: “but you know my kids are my kids. They they so quiet in the school. Yeah.” [198a-200]. She expressed an awareness of her children’s tendency to be quiet like she is.

The next narrative is that of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth’s Narrative

Elizabeth has three children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in the Little Senegal section of Harlem. This interview was conducted in English at the request of the parent.

Elizabeth provides insight into her personal background below:

*Interviewer: What were some of the countries that you went to and moved to?*
6a. First it was from Mali
6b. well I was born over there.
7a. And then from Mali we visited France
7b. well you know
7c. both of my parents were born over there.
8a. From France to Congo
8b. which is Zaire
8c. from France to Corte D’vorie
8d. which is one of the African countries.
9a. And then from France to Senegal
9b. that’s when we moved to Senegal.
10a. so even while we were in France
10b. we did like Switzerland
10c. London
10d. like all round.
11. That was just like little vacations.
12a. but my dad like to move
12b. and liked to go do business.
(Elizabeth, personal communication, May 25, 2017)

Elizabeth provided numerous details regarding the places that she both visited during her childhood and grew up. She recalled her movement from country to country at the beginning of this excerpt: “First it was from Mali, well I was born over there” [6a-6b]. She established that Mali was her birthplace and that “both of my parents were born over there” [7c]. Her direct
heritage was linked to Mali along with that of her parents. Elizabeth shared several countries throughout both the African continent and Europe that she visited. Her list was vast, and she summarized her travels through Europe with the choice of words “like all around” [10d]. She summarized that the cause of these trips was manifold: “that was just like little vacations, but my dad like to move, and liked to go do business” [11-12b]. While some of these trips occurred because of pleasure, they also occurred because of her father’s disposition. Elizabeth recognized that her father “like to move, and like to go do business” [12a-12b]. Her father’s preferences and career, Elizabeth expressed directly, influenced her frequent movement from country to country as a child.

Elizabeth positively recalled her experience, as a child, of living in different countries. She elucidates her perspective below:

*Interviewer: What was the experience like for you as a child?*

1a. Ahh it was really a great and amazing experience

1b. going to different places

1c. seeing different cultures

1d. different people

1e. languages.

2a. It was like amazing

2b. hearing another language that you never heard before

2c. trying to understand what they saying.

3a. I just felt like my mind was like a machine

3b. just trying to adapt to everything.

(Elizabeth, personal communication, May 25, 2017)
Elizabeth has a high regard for the constant movement that she experienced as a child. She said, “Ahh it was really a great and amazing experience” [1a], and, later in this excerpt, she reiterated, “it was like amazing” [2a]. She expressed the flurry of activity that she was constantly immersed in as a child: “going to different places, seeing different cultures, different people, languages” [1b-1e]. Elizabeth was exposed at a young age to a number of different people, ways of being, and ways of communicating. She found this a rewarding experience that was stimulating at a young age. She shared, “I just felt like my mind was like a machine, just trying to adapt to everything” [3a-3b]. Elizabeth described her ability to adjust to the different form of communication and behavior as if “my mind was like a machine” [3a]. Elizabeth suggested that her brain was operating like an apparatus that was capable of accomplishing the immense task of providing her with the language and behavior needed to function within her community in Senegal.

**Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences.** Elizabeth explains below the features and experience of oral traditions in her life, as she learned about her parents’ country of origin, Mali:

*Interviewer: If I were there with your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?*

12a. Yes, yes
12b. stories used to be from mommy
12c. when she was growing up
12d. and they both grew up in the village
12e. so the lifestyle was different from
12f. umm what’s going on in the city.
13a. They used to tell us
13b. ummm how they used to go in the farm
13c. or ummm like in the sea to fish or catch animals.
14. It was pretty good.
15. At that point we wished we lived that life.

(Elizabeth, personal communication, March 2, 2017)

Elizabeth affirmed that narratives were shared with her at the beginning of this excerpt of the transcript: “Yes, yes stories used to be from mommy” [12a-12b]. She indicated that there were several stories that she was made aware of. Later in this excerpt, she emphasized that these stories were not only told to her once. Instead, it was an occurrence that happened numerous times, which is shown when she said, “They used to tell us” [13a]. Elizabeth’s phrase “used to” [12b, 13a] appears twice in this segment of the transcript, which indicates that the adults were accustomed to sharing with her.

As Elizabeth noted the stark contrasts in the ways of living between her parents and herself, she also noted that their way of living was positive. She shared that her parents’ preferred ways of living “was pretty good” [14]. Hearing these accounts from her parents elicited a sense of longing in Elizabeth for a life in the village of Mali, her parents’ country of origin, and created a desire within her: “at that point we wished we lived that life” [15]. She also revealed that this desire to live like her parents was one that was shared by stating “we wished” [15]. The listener can speculate that the “we” [15] in her statement alludes to her siblings, who were also hearing these renditions of the past. The oral traditions that Elizabeth joined as a child became her connection to a country that she was not raised in.
Elizabeth was provided with insight into a way of living that she did not experience because she was being raised in a city in Senegal and not in a small village in Mali. She expressed that she compared her own experiences with that of her parents when she said, “when she was growing up and they both grew up in the village so the lifestyle was different from ummm what’s going on in the city” [12c-12f]. Elizabeth’s ability to recall the details that were shared with her displays her role as a listener during these moments when adults were sharing oral traditions.

She also expressed that this storytelling was not exclusively conveyed by her mother. Instead, she implied that her father also shared about his life when Elizabeth stated, “They used to tell us” [13a]. As a child, Elizabeth often accompanied her father on his business trips throughout Africa and Europe, which afforded an opportunity in their time alone for her to learn more about his upbringing. Her father and her mother informed Elizabeth about details of the past and were active speakers in these occasions. Elizabeth illuminated how the stories shared with her about the past connected her to her country of origin and other relatives. She also explained how she learned to navigate her lack of fluency of Wolof when she initially moved to Senegal as a child:

*Interviewer: What are some things I would see you doing and hear you saying, if I were there?*

29a. One time my mom told me

29b. to go to the store and get an egg

29c. so when I got there

29d. and I kept telling them egg

29e. but in French

29f. and ummm the guy he came from another country
29g. and he wasn’t speaking
29h. I mean he came from the village
29i. and he wasn’t understanding
29j. so I had to make a noise
29k. and show him how the chicken say ooohhh
29l. and show him how the egg come out.
30a. And then for years
30b. for years they keep mocking me with that.
31a. For years...

(Elizabeth, personal communication, March 2, 2017)

Elizabeth expressed in the excerpt above how she learned through engaging in everyday tasks, like “one time my mom told me to go to the store and get an egg” [29a-29b]. Through this particular interaction, Elizabeth learned the importance of engaging in specific and multiple modes for meaning-making and expression in an environment that was new to her. Elizabeth at this time was new to Senegal and grew up speaking Soninke and French. When she entered the store that day, she explained, she attempted to communicate with the shopkeeper in various ways. At first, this was to no avail. As she stated, “and I kept telling them egg, but in French” [29d-29e]. She continued to use a language that she was more familiar with to communicate, and then she realized that this strategy was not working. Elizabeth revealed, “and ummm the guy he came from another country, and he wasn’t speaking, I mean he came from the village and he wasn’t understanding” [29f-29i]. When Elizabeth became aware that the shopkeeper could not comprehend what she was attempting to purchase, she changed her strategy of communication. She acknowledged that residing in different places in Senegal could change how people
communicated and what language they used. She used gestures and noisemaking to convey what it was that she needed. She elaborated, saying, “so I had to make a noise and show him how the chicken say ooohhhh and show him how the egg come out” [29j-29l]. In this particular setting, Elizabeth realized that her command of the French language would not enable her to acquire what she needed from the shop, so she used other ways to communicate her point much more effectively.

Elizabeth made it clear that her identity is different from that of the shopkeeper when she at first remarked about his inability to understand French with, “and ummm the guy, he came from another country and he wasn’t speaking, I mean he came from the village” [29f-29h]. Elizabeth corrected herself during this statement about the shopkeeper’s origin because his lack of understanding of French did not relate to with his being from an entirely different country. Instead, he was from Senegal but resided in the countryside where one of the widely spoken languages was Wolof. Elizabeth’s lack of command of Wolof when she first moved to Senegal was an aspect of her identity that differentiated her from the people that she now lived with. She was distinguished by these differences throughout her time when she resided in the countryside.

After the incident, when she described a chicken through gestures and sounds, Elizabeth explained, “and then for years, for years they keep mocking me with that. For years...” [30a-31a]. There was a lingering consequence where others found her humorous and teased her for having a limited ability to converse the way that others did in Wolof, which made her continue to be seen as different.

Elizabeth demonstrated how this event that she described between the shopkeepers and her revealed that she learned to adjust to different situations that required knowledge of a culture and language that was new to her as a child. At first, Elizabeth spoke about repeating herself in
the language that she was most comfortable with, when she says, “and I kept telling them egg, but in French” [29d-29e]. She then realized that without a command of Wolof, she could not explain what she needed to the shopkeeper “[because] he wasn’t understanding” [29i]. She was resourceful and found a way to express herself. She explained, “so I had to make a noise, and show him how the chicken say ooohhh, and show him how the egg come out” [29j-29l]. Elizabeth used an expanded form of expression that included noisemaking and gestures to communicate her point effectively in a language community that she was not fully versed to navigate within. This adjustment as an outsider to a country and community that was new to her made her the target of teasing by others in the community.

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** Elizabeth discussed the different languages that she exposed her children to because of her own competency with various languages that she developed at a young age.

*Interviewer: What language do you speak at home?*

41. We speak Soninke in the house.

42a. It’s a language from Mali

42b. originated from Mali.

43a. Here and there I speak French

43b. but it is not something that I speak fluent in the house

43c. and I speak Wolof too

43d. so they are around all of those languages.

44a. But yet they understand the Soninke

44b. but only speak English.

(Elizabeth, personal communication, May 25, 2017)
Elizabeth began this excerpt with, “we speak Soninke in the house” [41]. She was referring to her husband and her speaking her mother-tongue from the country that she was born in, Mali. While Elizabeth did not reside in Mali for a significant amount of time as a child, she spoke Soninke with her family when she lived in Senegal and France. Elizabeth continued to explain the other languages that she still speaks in the United States: “here and there I speak French, but it not something that I speak fluent in the house” [43a-43b]. The international language that Elizabeth was schooled in is not the one that she speaks on a regular basis in her communication with her children and husband in their home. Elizabeth continued, noting an additional language that she speaks: “and I speak Wolof too” [43c]. These languages are not used in mutual exclusion; on the contrary, there is a fluid use of all of the different languages in the home. Elizabeth reiterated the fact that her children are hearing Soninke, French, and Wolof at home from her with her remark, “so they around all of those languages” [43d].

Although adults in the home use three languages—Soninke, French, and Wolof—Elizabeth finds that her children are not speaking to her in any of these languages. She acknowledged that they are able to comprehend her native heritage language, saying, “but yet they understand the Soninke” [44a]. Her daughter that attends an ECCE program is also being referred to in the aforementioned statement, which means that she has an understanding of Soninke and a recognition of how it works, enough so that she can listen and grasp what her mother is saying. The use of any of the other languages beyond comprehension was not mentioned. Her children continue to “only speak English” [44b]. Elizabeth has fostered an environment in her home that allows for her children to express themselves in English even while she is speaking many different languages. She continues to speak with them in Soninke but allows for her children to have the flexibility to express themselves in English. Elizabeth
expresses how the two older siblings are integral to their youngest sibling’s English language development through the excerpt below:

_Interviewer:_ *What are some examples of what your child has learned at home or with family/community members in her use of English?*

46a. I wouldn’t say that she was learning it

46b. because she has two other siblings that already there

46c. that already speak it

46d. speak English already.

47a. I would say I taught my older one

47b. but the little one she already was speaking it.

... 

103b. English is something she heard all the time

103c. that’s from the sisters

103d. being that she had older sisters.

_(Elizabeth, personal communication, May 25, 2017)_

Elizabeth established from the onset of this excerpt that she defines learning in a specific manor that entails overt experiences that are planned when she said, “I wouldn’t say that she was learning it” [46a]. Elizabeth continued: “I would say I taught my older one” [47a]. Here, she alluded to the lessons around the English language that she “taught” [47a] to her first child. By the time she had her youngest daughter of the three children, there was an acquisition of the English language occurred naturally, as reflected by Elizabeth’s statement, “but the little one she already was speaking it” [47b]. This mother attributed this fact to the immersive experience of language use in her home: “that’s from the sisters, being that she had older sisters” [103c-103d].
Elizabeth’s child was presented through Elizabeth’s words as having developed her English language abilities by being in the presence of her older siblings.

Elizabeth continued to explain that “because she has two other siblings that already there, that already speak it, speak English already” [46b-46d]. This mother emphasized the substantial influence the older siblings have on their youngest sibling because they are versed in the English language and are conducting their daily interactions and practices in English. Elizabeth used the word “already” [46b, 46d, 47b] three times in the segment of the transcript to indicate that the English environment was already constructed when the youngest sibling arrived. Elizabeth highlighted the environment of her home by saying, “English is something she heard all the time” [103b]. Her use of the phrase “all the time” [103b] denotes that this occurrence was noticeable in the home because of its consistency.

**Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting.** Elizabeth described having consistent interactions with her daughter’s teachers. She reported about her experiences:

*Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teacher about her language learning.*

61a. Ummm the teachers
61b. and I have a great relationship.
62. Actually they all have my number.
63a. If something happen daily
63b. they would text me
63c. even if they don’t want to do it
63d. on the day time
63e. the night time
63f. I told them you are free to call me at any time
63g. so they would text me or call me
63h. and tell me what happened
63i. or she was amazing today
63j. or she did a great job.

64. So I have a great communication with them.

65a. And here and there I would come in the school
65b. even just for five minutes to see them
65c. and what’s going on
65d. and they take their time
65e. and they take their free time to tell me.

(Elizabeth, personal communication, March 2, 2017)

At the beginning of this excerpt, Elizabeth confirmed that she has established a positive repertoire with her daughter’s teachers at the ECCE program that she attends. She stated, “Ummm the teachers and I have a great relationship” [61a-61b]. Elizabeth used the value statement “great” [61b] to emphasize how well she perceives the communication is between herself and the teachers. She elaborated on her relationship with the teachers when she said, “actually they all have my number” [62]. Elizabeth used the words “my number” [62] to indicate her telephone number, which she has made available for the teachers to use when and how they see fit.

Elizabeth provided additional details, reporting that “I told [her child’s teachers] you are free to call me at any time” [63f]. She equated her openness and availability to the established
communication she has with the teachers. Elizabeth stated, “so I have a great communication with them” [64]. In addition to being available via telephone, Elizabeth makes herself physically present in her daughter’s ECCE program. She said, “and here and there I would come in the school, even just for five minutes to see them and what’s going on” [65a-65c]. She occasionally makes brief appearances at her daughter’s ECCE program with a perspective of that of an observer as she goes “to see them and what’s going on” [65c]. Elizabeth revealed that these in-person appearances at the ECCE program have been beneficial, as “…they take their time, and they take their free time to tell me” [65d-65e]. The relationship that Elizabeth has in place with the teachers has fostered an environment where they make an effort to speak with her about her child when she is present at the program.

Elizabeth provided additional details about the specific conversations that she has with her child’s teachers:

*Interviewer: If I were there, what would I hear you and the teachers saying to each other?*

66a. Good things.
66b. Good things.
67a. No complaint about it.
67b. They tell me she does her homework.
68. Everything is completed.
69. I never heard them complain about anything.
70a. The only thing they say is that sometimes to discipline
70b. to stop laughing
70c. and to focus
70d. but other than that her reading everything is good.
Elizabeth speaks with her young child’s teachers with a great deal of regularity, but the school primarily dictates the content and form of these conversations. She assured me that the conversations, for the most part, are positive with the teachers when she said, “Good things. Good things. No complaint about it. They tell me she does her homework. Everything is completed” [66a-68]. She then proceeded to remark on the areas that teachers have raised as concerns. Elizabeth expressed that she is not alarmed by the challenges that her young child is having, ending this excerpt of this transcript with “everything good” [72f]. Below contains insight on how Elizabeth becomes aware of the English progress that her young child has made at school, which confirms what the teachers indicate that they see in school:

Interviewer: How are you interacting (with your child) when you use English?

184a. Yeah
184b. when she coming home
184c. and reading for me
Elizabeth clearly stated that there is a distinction between how her daughter spoke English prior to entering an ECCE program and after attending. She said, “Even though she spoke English in the house, this is like something she is learning from school” [186a-186b]. She mentioned the expansion of her daughter’s vocabulary when she referenced that her daughter was “coming and having the paper with the words” [187b, 184d]. Elizabeth noted that there was a specific assignment from her child’s teachers that she was bringing home. She expressed how notable her daughter’s development in the English language was because of her “spelling them [vocabulary], telling me what it means” [187c-187d]. She clearly stated, “that was growth” [189], in regard to her daughter’s knowledge and use of English.
Earlier in this excerpt of Elizabeth’s transcript, she provided insight into how she chooses to work with each of her children, including her young child, on their assignments for school:

*Interviewer: How are you interacting when you use English? And when you use your home language?*

119. I’ve been here.

120a. I speak English daily with the kids

120b. outside

120c. with my work

120d. it’s like English every day.

121a. But at the same time

121b. my native language I speak it every day too.

122a. So even when I talk to them

122b. I speak both languages

122c. but when I’m helping them with their homework

122d. it’s like simply English.

123a. And it’s so funny

123b. when I speak they always correcting me with my English.

124a. They always correct me

124b. and they always laugh at my accent

124c. and how I pronounce the words.

125. Yeah.

(Elizabeth, personal communication, May 25, 2017)
At the onset of this portion of the transcript, Elizabeth confirmed how she communicates while living in the United States. She stated, “I’ve been here. I speak English daily with the kids, outside, with my work, it’s like English every day. But at the same time, my native language I speak it every day too.” [119-121b]. Communicating in each of the languages that she is referencing—English and Soninke—is not segmented neatly into one part of her life. On the contrary, these languages find their place in different parts of her everyday life that are dependent upon whom she is speaking with and where she is. Elizabeth explained, “so even when I talk to them, I speak both languages” [122a-122b]. Elizabeth clarified that there is one occasion where she chooses to only use English. She said, “but when I’m helping them with their homework, it’s like simply English” [122c-122d]. Elizabeth chooses to communicate “simply English” [122c] when she is supporting her children with their assignments from school. She does this even though “when I speak they always correcting me with my English. They always correct me, and they always laugh at my accent, and how I pronounce the words. Yeah” [123b-125]. Her use of the language and pronunciation are not at the same level as that of her children. Elizabeth stated, “They always correct me” [123]. Despite facing this challenge, she continues to choose English when dealing with homework.

The next narrative is that of Michael.

Michael’s Narrative

Michael has two children, one of whom attends an ECCE program in the Little Senegal section of Harlem. Both interviews were conducted in English at the request of the parent.

Michael discussed his background in the following excerpt:

*Interviewer: Can you tell me where you lived before?*

1a. I was born in the Congo
1b. the Congo Brazzaville
1c. where I lived for the first four years of my life.
2a. And during the first four years in my life
2b. I lived with my maternal grandparents.
3a. But
3b. yeah
3c. I lived with my maternal grandparents
3d. and time was really divided between my maternal grandparents
3e. and visiting my paternal family.
4a. So
4b. you know
4c. cause yeah.
5a. And then
5b. just that in 1982
5c. when I was four
5d. we moved to the current Senegal
5e. where my dad was completing his medical studies.
6a. So we lived there from 1982 to 1990.
6b. Then 1990 we moved to France.

(Michael, personal communication, May 25, 2017)

Michael clearly stated his birthplace, even though he did not spend a great deal of time there. He said, “I was born in the Congo, the Congo Brazzaville, where I lived for the first four years of my life” [1a-1c]. While this was a brief period of his life, it was significant because it
was his birthplace. Michael provided additional details about this time of his life, including that “I lived with my maternal grandparents” [3c]. During this period of his life, Michael was raised primarily by his grandparents. He continued to explain, “and time was really divided between my maternal grandparents, and visiting my paternal family” [3d-3e]. Michael spent time with both sides of his family from both his mother and father. There were several transitions in residency that he underwent. He shared, “when I was four, we moved to current Senegal, where my dad was completing his medical studies” [5c-5e]. Michael explained that the change in residency from his birthplace to another country on the continent of Africa was caused by his father’s educational pursuits. He then shared about another transition in residency: “then 1990 we moved to France” [6b]. He was then still a child and now living in Europe.

**Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences.** Michael found that his connection to the Congo was sustained when he moved to Senegal and interacted with various groups of people and had many different experiences by hearing stories told by his parents. Michael explained:

*Interviewer: If I were there with your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?*

54a. Ummm

54b. well they spoke a lot about growing up

54c. because as you understand now

54d. I spent all my life away from the Congo.

55. They would talk a lot about it.

56a. well my mom about being a city girl

56b. visiting you know my grandparent’s village
56c. villages in different areas for example.

57. My daddy would talk about either traveling to the north...

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)

Michael expressed that there was a recurrence of stories about his parent’s lives that he heard while he was a child when he stated, “ummm well they would talk a lot about it” [54a-54b]. He used the adverbial phrase “a lot” [54a, 55] twice in this brief excerpt in order to convey the repetitive nature of the telling of the stories about his family, his history, and his country of origin.

Michael emphasized the importance of hearing these stories as a child living in Senegal. He said, “because as you understand now, I spent all my life away from the Congo” [54c-54d]. Michael’s parents intentionally sustained his connection to a country that he was not raised in. He situated the listener with an understanding that these unveilings about the past provided him with insight into the Congo. He was able to give vivid accounts of his parents’ experiences in their birth country. There was an account of the past and a value of learning and knowing the Congo that was expressed to him by his parents. His parents made it their priority that he would not lose his connection to the Congo, even though he was living a different life in an entirely different country. Below, Michael explained the impression that was left on him:

_Interviewer: Well what did that all teach you?_

100a. It built a sense of identity.

101a. It basically put inside of me

101b. that I came from somewhere

101c. that my people have a history

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)
The storytelling had a profound influence on whom Michael knew himself to be, which he expressed when he said, “it built a sense of identity” [100a]. It provided him with insight and knowledge of a place in the world that meant a great deal to his family. Michael stated, “it basically put inside of me, that I came from somewhere” [101a-101b]. He knew through his parents’ renditions of the past “that my people have a history” [101c]. It gave him a sense of knowing and connection to a people and land that he had not resided in for very long.

Michael presented himself primarily as an attentive listener as he spoke about the ways in which his parents shared their stories with him as a child. As an adult, he is able to recall specific details of the history and narrations that his parents shared. He did not mention the ways in which he participated in oral presentation episodes other than displaying that he listened and took in what his parents had to say. He developed a knowledge and understanding about the Congo that he was able to share many details about.

Michael remarked on how his parents were the ones who were dispelling the information and knowledge onto him as a child. He said, “well they spoke a lot about growing up” [54b] and “They would talk a lot about it” [55]. The pronoun “they” that Michael used in the aforementioned statement refers to Michael’s parents.

Michael had various language expectations placed on him that were dependent upon whom he was speaking with and where he was located. He explained his dexterity with languages as a common practice, not an anomaly, which he expounded upon below:

*Interviewer: If I were there with you and your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?*

54a. In Africa you have no choice

54b. you have to learn a second language.
At the start of this excerpt, Michael expressed how crucial it is to learn to speak another language when he states, “in Africa you have no choice, you have to learn a second language” [54a-54b]. Michael spoke about the acquisition of languages as being the only option when a person resides in Africa. As a child in the Congo, he spoke Lingala fluently, which was his mother-tongue. In addition, his parents and his extended family communicated with him in French. When he moved to Senegal at four years old, he continued to communicate with his parents and their extended network of friends in French. In order to be understood and to understand in Senegal, Michael learned to speak Wolof. Michael also spoke about the importance of learning “. . . a European language, well we do French, yeah you know.” [56a-56c]. Michael learned to communicate effectively in various language communities in Senegal, including that of his family, school setting, community members, and his expanded network.

Michael emphasized that his awareness of his identity as a person who was not born in Senegal was prevalent through his awareness of language and the importance of learning to communicate effectively in various language communities. He stated, “you would learn anyways, being a foreigner in that country” [55a-55b] when referencing learning new languages. There is a place and use of the local language, and there was also the need to be able to converse in an international language. As he explained, “you have to learn a European
language, well we do French” [56a-56b]. Michael’s lack of knowledge of the local language solidified his status as a newcomer, and his continued use of the international language established his identity as different from those whom he lived with in his community in Senegal.

Michael expressed in his excerpt generally that living in Africa requires difference in the choices that are made in how to communicate and with whom to communicate. When Michael moved from the Congo to Senegal, he adapted the ability to communicate Lingala and French at home, French at school, French with his expanded network, and Wolf with the larger community in Senegal. Michael’s view is that this change in language use was inevitable and essential in order to live in Africa, which was highlighted when he said, “in Africa you have no choice, you have to learn a second language” [54a-54b].

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** Michael explained how he and his wife determined a way in which they could sustain their children’s learning of various languages in their home. He illustrated their language practices in their home:

*Interviewer: Tell me about your children’s experiences with language and literacy?*

123a. We asked ourselves many questions

123b. in the case of Bill.

124. He spoke English with his mom.

125a. He spoke Frenlish with me

125b. that means French and English

125c. and he spoke Spanish at day care.

126a. And it took him a while

126b. from the moment he learned the alphabet

126c. and he learned syllables
126d. that he was able to spell.

127a. And this lovely girl
127b. she is 4
127c. and she still can’t do it.

128a. But
128b. you know
128c. they’re different kids
128d. and we also learned
128e. that each child learns at their own pace
128f. you know.

130a. And with Amy
130b. she actually expresses more interest in French
130c. than he did when he was her age.

131. He didn’t like it.
131a. We used to go to France every year
131b. and he would be happy to be back home.

132. “Finally I can speak.”

133a. Really wow
133b. you know?

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)

Michael illustrated at the very beginning of this segment that there was a specific system that was established in his home to ensure that his children would be learning various languages. He described what was done for language engagement for his older child and explained that he
has continued this process with his youngest daughter, who is in an ECCE setting. Each received
the same approach, but there were different results. Michael stated, “We asked ourselves many
questions, in the case of Bill” [123a-123b]. Michael referred to himself and his wife when he
said “asked ourselves questions” [123a]. He demonstrated that here was a sense of uncertainty
about their parenting approach when they considered and compared their oldest son to their
youngest daughter’s acquisition of language and literacy. Michael explained about his older son
that the routine with language that was established entailed that “He spoke English with his
mom. He spoke Frenlish with me, that means French and English, and he spoke Spanish at day
care” [124-125c]. There was an emphasis that was placed on English by both parents. His older
son was exposed to both French and Spanish, while his youngest daughter, who now attends an
ECCE setting, is exposed to French, which, Michael explained, he took responsibility for
providing. His commitment to French and emphasis for his older child was shown by his
providing insight into a choice he made to travel: “We used to go to France every year” [131a].
Michael explained that they “used to go” [131a] in order to reference how these trips were taken
at one time during a regular interval in the lives of his wife, his son, and him, but the family no
longer takes these trips. These trips, he suggested, were taken partly to expose his older son to
the French language, but his son did not receive them well. Michael explained his son’s
response: “…he would be happy to be back home. ‘Finally I can speak.’” [131b-132]. He also
expressed his own disappointment at his son’s inability to become proficient in French,
remarking, “Really wow, you know?” [133a-133b].

Michael acknowledged that the growth of his young daughter’s French abilities is
apparent when he said, “And with Amy, she actually expresses more interest in French” [130a-
130c] He later explained how this “interest” [130b] manifests itself in his daughter and how he
sustains her “interest” [130b]. Michael elaborated about the different strategies he employs to develop his young daughter’s French language acquisition:

180a. But what I tend to do with her though
180b. is print sketches of clothing and body parts in French
180c. and it worked.
181a. But the only problem is consistency
181b. but I do that to make sure that she is doing French
181c. so we are not very consistent.
182. That is the only problem with that process.

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)

Michael expounded on the approaches to learning that he employs with his daughter when he stated, “but what I tend to do with her though, is print sketches of clothing and body parts in French” [180a-180b]. This father ensures that his young daughter can identify everyday items in both French and in English through symbols and verbally. His commitment to his daughter’s French was highlighted when he said, “but I do that to make sure that she is doing French” [181b]. Michael expressed his concern through this statement that his daughter would not obtain exposure to French without his providing this intentional guidance.

Michael acknowledged the challenges of his son being exposed to three different languages: “and it took him a while, from the moment he learned the alphabet, and he learned syllables, that he was able to spell” [126a-126d]. His oldest child showed a facility with English language literacy ability. Michael then compared his oldest child to his youngest child, saying, “and this lovely girl, she is 4, and she still can’t do it” [127a-127c]. His daughter is attending an ECCE program and has not displayed ease with the English language at the same age that her
brother did. Michael has responded with an understanding temperament. He said, “But, you know, they’re different kids, and we also learned that each child learns at their own pace, you know” [128a-128e]. He has embraced the notion that both of his children are in a process of learning languages that has them on different paths. While his oldest appeared to accelerate with the English language, his youngest is accelerating at her “own pace” [128e] in English and is surpassing her older brother in French. With both parents at home reinforcing English, there has been a space created in the home for the language. There appears to be more of a concentrated effort toward the youngest child’s proficiency in French. Michael described some of the exchanges that his children have and how they all occur in English. His quotation below illustrates the relationship that his children have with one another:

206. They play Legos.
207. They fight for everything else.
208. What I mean…
209a. We chit chat in the living room
209b. in English.
210a. I would get him Netflix or iTunes
210b. and play a movie for them.
211a. They will watch it
211b. you know.
212a. Yeah
212b. I want to make sure that they learned to support each other.
213. They learn to complement each other.
214a. And I always tell Noah
214b. “Listen, there is two of you. If something happens, if I’m not here, you need to be able to protect your sister or to guide your sister.”

215. You know?

216. It’s not easy because she’s bossy.

217a. They have games for word recognition in French

217b. but their interactions really are only in English.

(Michael, personal communication, May 25, 2017)

Michael expressed that there are numerous everyday activities that take place in his home between his older son and youngest daughter. He discussed how “They play Legos. They fight for everything else” [206-207]. He presented his children as typical siblings who enjoy each other at times and who get into disagreements. Michael continued to explain how they do a number of activities together as a family: “we chit chat in the living room in English” [209a-209b]. They have conversations as a family where Michael’s young child has her parents and older sibling modeling how to keep a conversation in English. He later mentioned in this excerpt how English-only conversations are typical between the siblings: “They have games for word recognition in French, but their interactions really are only in English” [217a-217b]. This father noted that even with resources in the French language, “their interactions really are only in English” [217b].

As Michael listed all of the activities that are interwoven into the lives of his children during a normal day at home, the ways in which English is a part of each one is apparent. It is in the interactions between brother and sister in the “chit chat,” [209a] “Netflix or iTunes,” [210a] and “movie[s]” [210b]. English is interwoven naturally into everything that they are doing and that his young daughter is a part of, both in language and literacy.
Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting. Michael encountered his young child’s teachers during transitions. He provided details about his experiences:

Interviewer: Have you had any discussions with your child’s teachers about her language-learning?

120a. No, because I just drop her

120b. and I actually dropped her

120c. three times this week.

121. “Daddy has to go, sorry.”

122. “Hello, Miss, I’m sorry I have to go.”

(Michael, personal communication, May 25, 2017)

Michael offered a glimpse into how the encounters with his daughter’s teachers unfold at a rapid pace as he transitions his daughter to school. He confirmed that these encounters occur in the morning when he said, “No, because I just drop her, and I actually dropped her three times this week” [120a-120c]. He then revealed how he addresses his daughter in the morning with, “Daddy has to go, sorry” [121]. Michael’s words hint at his regret that he has to leave his daughter quickly. He then addresses the teacher with, “Hello, Miss, I’m sorry I have to go” [122]. He speaks directly with the teacher. His words emphasized the brevity of his encounter with the teacher and that there is virtually no exchange of information between them.

Michael continued to elaborate on his encounters with his young daughter’s teachers at the ECCE setting:

227a. I actually drop her off

227b. I never pick her up.
228a. I have to drop her off on my way to work
228b. so it is when I do that between 8:00-8:10.
229a. The teacher is just receiving students
229b. and is signing students in
229c. so she doesn’t get much time to spend
229d. to be asking me questions.
230. So we have not had that conversation.
231a. But given that
231b. they moved her to a more advanced class
231c. I would like to believe that it is going well.
232a. And I could see too
232b. that her language is changing
232c. and she umm
232d. she
232e. her speech changes
232f. in that she doesn’t just make statements.
233. She asks lots of questions.

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)

Michael clarified that his encounter with the teacher takes place solely during the morning transition. His time frame is stringent, and his sense of urgency to move from his daughter’s school to his next destination is revealed through his words. He said, “I have to drop her off on my way to work, so it is when I do that between 8:00-8:10” [228a-228b]. Michael has approximately ten minutes to transition his daughter, and this is all occurring during a very hectic
time of the day for the ECCE program that his young daughter attends. He reasons that a much
lengthier conversation is impossible because “The teacher is just receiving students, and is
signing students in, so she doesn’t get much time to spend to be asking me questions” [229a-
229d]. Michael recognizes that there is a great deal occurring at the ECCE program when he
arrives with his young daughter that presents a challenge to engage in a conversation. The
communication is minimal, if it occurs at all, and appears to remain centered around pleasantries.

Michael garners how his daughter is doing based on the progress that he sees in his
daughter. He stated, “I would like to believe that it is going well” [231c]. He based his
assessment of his daughter on the fact that “… I could see too that her language is changing, and
she umm she her speech changes in that she doesn’t just make statements. She asks lots of
questions” [232a-233]. Michael notices that his young child is using the English language in
much more complicated ways, and he attributed some of her advancement to the influence of the
ECCE setting she attends.

Michael presented the ways in which the encounters with the teachers at his young
child’s ECCE program are not in-depth conversations:

*Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teachers about her language
learning.*

224a. The only question was

224b. “Do you speak French to her at home?”

225. “Yes I do.”

226a. So they make sure that they put her with a lady

226b. that actually teaches French in the school that she goes to.

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)
Michael was candid about the lack of interaction between him and his young child’s teachers. He stated that there was one query that he received from the school. He said, “The only question was ‘Do you speak French to her at home?’” [224a-224b]. Michael communicated with his words that this was a solitary interaction that he recalls having with the school, and that it was a preliminary question about his daughter’s environment at home. His reply to the teachers at the ECCE program was, “Yes I do” [225]. Michael replied with a simple affirmation that does not reveal any details about his interactions with his daughter in French. He also did not reveal the nuances of the language experience that his young child is having in his home as he speaks both English and French. Instead, Michael stated that the teachers made decisions based on his confirmation about his daughter’s language-learning: “so they make sure that they put her with a lady, that actually teaches French in the school that she goes to” [226a-226b]. His young daughter was placed in the care of a teacher who could support her French language development. The teachers responded to his affirmation with an educational plan that Michael did not state whether he was provided many details about. Michael looks for progress in his child’s language and reading ability through his interactions with her and through updates that his wife shares with him, since she picks their daughter up from school daily. He explained: 

_Interviewer: In school your child will be learning to be an English speaker, reader, and writer. In what ways do you think your child will respond or is responding?_

189a. Being that this is a household

189b. that essentially speaks English

189c. I don’t think that it presents a challenge to her

189d. I think it is very natural.

190a. She goes to a daycare
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190b. that is structured like a school.

191a. She was in the classroom that corresponds to her age

191b. but they actually moved her to the five year olds

191c. because she knows the alphabet.

192a. She knows how to count till

192b. I don’t know how far she can count

192c. but she can count

192d. and can identify many words

192e. you know.

(Michael, personal communication, February 25, 2017)

Michael presented his perspective on his English use at home as a positive one from the onset of this excerpt with his words, “Being that this is a household that essentially speaks English, I don’t think that it presents a challenge to her, I think it is very natural” [189a-189d]. He described his daughter’s use and comprehension of the English language as “very natural” [189d]. He expressed that English language use comes easily for his young child. He emphasized the ease that his child is experiencing in her language- and literacy-learning at the ECCE program with his comment, “I don’t think that it presents a challenge to her” [189c]. He made an assessment about his daughter’s growth in the English language based partly on how the school is responding to his daughter.

Michael views the importance of English language awareness and use as one that has led to his own daughter excelling through her ECCE program. He said, “She was in the classroom that corresponds to her age, but they actually moved her to the five year olds” [191a-191b]. Michael alluded to his belief that his daughter is performing beyond her age group because of her
knowledge and her use of the English. He continued to provide more details: “because she knows the alphabet. She knows how to count till, I don’t know how far she can count, and can identify many words, you know” [191c-192e]. Michael’s daughter’s awareness and knowledge of English is seen by him at home, and he speculated that this is what has led to her being awarded with advancement to a grade above her age group.

The next narrative is that of Linda’s.

**Linda’s Narrative**

Linda has three children, and her youngest child attends an ECCE program in Little Senegal. Both interviews were conducted in English at the request of the parent. She presented details about her upbringing and background in the subsequent excerpt:

*Interviewer: What are the places you lived before living here in Little Senegal?*

1a. I used to live in West Africa
1b. in Senegal
1c. and uh
1d. and I born in there
1e. and raised in there
1f. before coming to the United States.

(Linda, personal communication, March 20, 2017)

Linda reveals that she resided in one other place prior to coming to the United States. She said, “I used to live in West Africa, in Senegal” [1a-1b]. She continued, providing additional details: “and I born in there, and raised in there” [1d-1e]. Linda’s country of origin was also the country that she grew up in. She did not move to several different residences in different countries. Instead, she had a consistent upbringing in one location, Senegal.
**Immigrant family members’ early literacy and language experiences.** Linda spoke below about her experiences with oral presentations, presentations that were exhibited and organized by her extended family through music:

*Interviewer: If I were there with your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about*

57a. So all the time

58. We like to

57b. they like to sing for us.

59a. Yeah the adults

59b. like sing for us.

60a. And those singing

60b. is like um talk

60c. cause they want us

60d. they want us

60e. to be happy.

61a. It’s like a story

61b. but its good

61c. when you hear it.

62a. It’s like you can hear it

62b. like a sound

62c. but sometimes you can hear it

62d. like advice

62e. and talk.
(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Linda emphasized the ways in which oral presentations in the medium of songs were used “all the time” [57a]. She made it clear that the music she experienced as a child was an integral part of her interactions and practices with her family. Music was a regular occurrence in Linda’s life.

Linda offered insight into the pleasurable mood that the music evoked and sustained with her use of the words “happy” [60e], and “good” [61b]. Linda revealed, “And those singing, is like um talk” [60a-60b], while “It’s like a story” [61a]. Linda recognized that the adults wanted their communication through their music to be instructive. Linda expounded on the feature of the music that extended its features “like a sound but sometimes you can hear it like advice and talk” [62b-62e]. She elaborated about the specific direction that she received from her parents about how to live earlier in the interview:

*Interviewer: Can you tell me any other lessons the adults shared with you?*

35a. With our parents  
35b. they gonna tell us  
35c. you have to be like that  
35e. have to be straight  
35f. you have to be honest  
35g. you have to be  
35h. you know  
35i. sometimes shy  
35j. or you know correct  
35k. all the time and
35l. talk with people
35m. with kindness
35n. and nice
36a. That’s what
36b. they always advising

(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

There are specific behaviors and personal qualities that her parents guided her on with their stating that she needed to be “straight, honest, shy, correct, talk with kindness, and nice” [35f-35n]. All of the aforementioned attributes were ways of interacting with the world and ways of being that were valued and conveyed by those raising her. Linda was taught as a child that there were common understandings on how to be in the world that her parents were holding her to. Linda’s parents were teaching her and exerting their direct influence into the choices that she made and how she chose to operate in her life.

Linda then followed up with an incomplete thought with “We like to” [58], which suggests that she regarded herself as having an active role as an audience member in making her preferences known. As a child, she could influence how oral presentations in the medium of music unfolded and were delivered to her. She continued, explaining, “they like to sing for us” [57c], referencing the adults in her life. She did not elaborate on whether she sang as well but suggested that her role as a child in that moment influenced how and what the adults chose to perform. Linda was expected as a child to be an active listener and participant in the experience of hearing the music.

Linda stated, “yeah the adults like to sing for us” [59a-59b]. She expressed that the parents and relatives found pleasure in sharing this form of expression with her. She indicated
that there were other children who were a part of this experience through her use of the pronoun “us” [35b] in this portion of her response. The adults created a space where there was a group experience that Linda was a part of and participated in as a child. The adults were the primary conveyers of information through music.

When Linda entered school, she was required to communicate with the adults in formal French. She explained the features of this experience:

Interviewer: What did those songs teach you or the lessons that the adults shared? What are other things that it taught you?

62. Yeah

63a. You know

63b. we talk Wolof at home

63c. but we learn French

63d. yeah

63e. at school.

64a. We learn French

64b. but that’s why

64c. we mixing our own language

64d. and the French

64e. also back home.

(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Linda presented how language was used in some distinct ways both at home with her family and in school. While growing up in Senegal, she explained that she communicated with
her parents and family members differently than when she attended school. She stated, “Yeah, we talk Wolof at home, but we learn French yeah at school” [62-63e]. Linda’s mother-tongue was not used in the school setting. As a child, she was put in a position of being required to learn a language that shared no similarities to her home language and was not mirrored in her experience at school. On the contrary, she found that she was being held to an expectation of acquiring a language that did not share any of the features of the language that she spoke with her family, peers, and extended family. In order to communicate and to learn, Linda said, “we mixing our own language and the French, also back home” [64c-64d]. Linda did not have these languages operating in a mutually exclusive way. On the contrary, she was incorporating her growing knowledge of French into her linguistic repertoire of Wolof.

Linda recognized there was a change in how she used her vernacular when she entered school. She now had an expanded linguistic choice that she brought home with her, which was reflected when she stated, “we mixing our own language, and the French, also back home” [64c-64e]. She also referred to herself as being a part of a group, which, in this case, referred to the group of children who were also a part of the same way of living and being—children who had limited exposure to the international language demands that the school now imposed and were immersed in an environment where they operated within their local language. She was a part of a group that she could identify with, had a common experience with, and therefore felt connected to.

In her home surrounded by her friends, family, and siblings, Linda stated, “we talk Wolof at home” [63b]. These various groups of people held her to a standard of not only learning but also being able to exhibit the behavior and features that identified her as part of the language community. She then displayed that there was an abrupt change when she said, “but we learn
French, yeah, at school” [63c-63e]. Then, there was an additional change as she stated, “we mixing our own language, and the French, also back home” [64c-64e]. The life of school had such an influence on her that her choices in how she now communicated in her home changed to reflect what she was learning and exposed to at school. While Linda never moved from one geographical location to another, she did move from one language community to another while residing in the village of her youth. There were adjustments that she made in order to learn, communicate, and understand the various languages communities that she was a part of. Linda did not speak the languages in a strictly separate manner. On the contrary, she incorporated Wolof and French into various facets of communication in her life.

**Immigrant family members’ home practices and experiences.** Linda explained the ways in which she notices her youngest child’s language ability:

*Interviewer: Tell me about your child’s experiences with language and literacy.*

178a. You know
178b. right now
178c. the way she’s talking English
178d. she don’t talk my language.

180. You know yeah
181a. Yesterday
181b. my husband was telling me that
181c. “now you see that Carol. Carol don’t want to talk the language no more.”
182a. I say
182b. “It’s normal because of the school. She just get in and she like it. That’s why.”

(Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017)
Linda expressed what she witnesses in her youngest child, who has recently began an ECCE program: “You know, right now, the way she’s talking English, she don’t talk my language” [178a-178d]. Linda remarked on how her daughter’s language ability in English is strengthening currently and that her ability to communicate in Wolof is no longer being shown. Linda conveyed that Wolof is a language that she is connected to by using the words “my language” [178d]. Her use of the word “my” [178d], which is a possessive case of I used as an attributive adjective, denotes belonging. This sentiment about Wolof is one that appears to be shared by Linda’s husband, who remarked on their young child’s lack of use of Wolof when he said to her, “Now you see that Carol. Carol don’t want to talk the language no more” [181c]. There is a sense of loss that is communicated through Linda’s husband’s observation.

Linda emphasized how important it is to her that her youngest daughter sustains her ability to speak Wolof when she discussed her interactions with her daughter in further detail:

184a. When I talk her Wolof
184b. her response is English.
185a. Sometimes I have to say
185b. Carol what did I say in my language?
186a. Say it
186b. and then he repeat it.
187a. She understand
187b. but she not getting easy to talk
187c. that because of here
187d. the school
187e. you know.
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(Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017)

Linda narrated how she continues with her mother-tongue in her communication with her youngest child: “when I talk her Wolof, her response is English:” [184a-184b]. Even though her questioning and conversing is in Wolof, her daughter, Carol, responds in English. Linda displayed that she wants her daughter’s ability to communicate in Wolof to remain strong when she makes specific requests of her daughter. She stated, “Sometimes I have to say, Carol what did I say in my language?” [185a-185b]. Linda spoke of her concern that her daughter is not able to have full comprehension of Wolof. She then has her daughter practice producing Wolof in her own words. As she revealed, she expects her daughter to “say it and then he repeat it” [186a-186b]. She uses her daily interactions to have lessons on the language use and provides the repetition of the language that she believes will strengthen her daughter’s familiarity with and ability in Wolof. About her daughter’s abilities with Wolof, Linda observed, “she understand, but she not getting easy to talk” [187a-187b]. Linda has taken note that her daughter is displaying reluctance in producing the language, which was confirmed by her statement, “but she not getting easy to talk” [187b]. Linda reasons that there has been a change in her daughter where she once spoke Wolof and now chooses not to do so. This mother stated “that . . . here, the school, you know” [187c-187e] has encouraged her daughter’s language preference to be that of English.

When Linda explained the exchange that she had with her spouse, she expressed an acceptance to the fact that her daughter is now exhibiting a preference for English. She stated, “Yesterday, my husband was telling me that ‘now you see that Carol. Carol don’t want to talk the language no more’” [181a-181c]. Linda’s husband raised a concern about Carol’s less frequent communication in their home language of Wolof. Linda’s husband’s use of the words
“don’t want” [181c] signifies that there is a lack of desire to engage in speaking Wolof. Linda responded with, “It’s normal because of the school. She just get in and she like it. That’s why” [182a-182b]. Linda stated that she understands the process that her daughter is currently going through and that she views her tendency to use English as “normal” [182b].

Linda elaborated later in this interview about her reasoning for placing an emphasis on her children obtaining fluency in her native heritage language:

268a. Yeah because you know
268b. sometime you always thinking about going back home
268c. sometime vacation
268d. or going see your parents
268e. and hang out with them.
269a. And they don’t speak English
269b. especially the parents
269c. so you can see the kid whose learning
269d. sometime they speak English.
270a. But the big people in the family
270b. sometime they don’t speak English.
271a. So if you
271b. if you
271c. then that day
271d. you cannot benefit to talk with them
271e. at that time
271f. because you cannot understand together.
Linda described her connection with the family that she has left, geographically speaking, in Senegal but is still very much connected to when she said, “sometime you always thinking about going back home, sometime vacation, or going see your parents, and hang out with them” [268b-268e]. Linda expressed that she still holds a great deal of sentiment for Senegal when she referred to it as “back home” [268b] and listed integral people in her life that remain “your parents” [268d]. She emphasized how a discontinuity between the language that her children are learning in the United States and the language of “back home” [268] exists because “…the big people in the family, sometime they don’t speak English” [270a-270b]. Linda expressed that this is a concern for her that she views as a missed opportunity for her children when she stated, “then that day, you cannot benefit to talk with them, at that time because you cannot understand together” [271c-271f]. There is an exchange of learning that cannot take place between the older people who are a part of Linda’s life and her own children if they “cannot understand together” [271f].

Linda remarked about how her youngest daughter’s English skill and awareness has been fostered by her exchanges with her siblings and by her watching television shows in English:

_Interviewer: What are some examples of what your child has learned at home or with family/community members in her use of English?_

145a. You know Carol experience

145b. is his sister and brother.

146a. Because in the house

146b. we talk our language

146c. me and my husband.
147a. She was talking
147b. our language also.
148a. But you know the brother and sister
148b. talk English together between them.
149a. Carol learned from them
149b. and the TV also.
150a. You know the cartoon
150b. when she’s looking at
150c. and she was like it
150d. she liked to do that.

(Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017)

Linda accounted for her youngest child English development by saying, “You know Carol experience, is his sister and brother” [145a-145b]. This research participant clearly stated that there is no delineation between what her youngest child is learning about language in comparison to her older siblings. She clarified later in this excerpt: “but you know, the brother and sister talk English together between them” [148a-148b]. Carol’s older sibling had an influence on her because they “talk English together between them” [148b]. Linda confirmed that her youngest daughter, “Carol learned from them” [149a]. Linda affirmed that her daughter developed her English skill set and awareness from her older brother and sister, who were having everyday interactions and conversations in her presence and with her.

Linda continued to elaborate on another factor that influenced her young daughter’s grasp and development of the English language, which was that “Carol learned from them and the TV also. You know the cartoon” [149a-150a]. Carol’s television watching entailed viewing shows in
English and developed her knowledge and background in the English language. Linda acknowledged that it is a pleasurable pastime for her young daughter when she said, “and she was like it, she liked to do that” [150c-150d]. Her use of “like” [150c, 150d] twice highlights that watching television was viewed as pleasurable by Carol.

**Immigrant family members’ encounters with the early childhood education and care (ECCE) setting.** Linda receives updates about her young daughter’s progress by attending the scheduled parent-teacher conferences. She disclosed, in the following excerpt, the ways in which this meeting time with her daughter’s teacher unfolded:

*Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teachers about her language learning.*

243a. Ah

243b. we didn’t discuss anything yet

243c. because they do one report card

243d. and what we just talk is

243e. when she was coming in

243f. she didn’t talk anything.

244. She didn’t know how to anything

245. She didn’t know how to write and read.

246a. A couple of words

246b. recognize the letters.

247. But now she start to do it.

248a. That’s why

248b. that’s the only thing we talk about.
249. Yeah.

250. Not that much.

(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Linda used specific words to convey that she did not believe that any substantive information was presented during the parent-teacher conferences about her daughter’s progress. She emphasized this sentiment with the use of her words, “Ah we didn’t discuss anything yet” [243a-243b], “that’s the only things we talk about” [248b] and “not that much” [250]. Linda’s language choice hints at a lack of new information, details, and/or a possible misunderstanding about what was being communicated to her during the meeting with her young child’s teachers. She did mention that “…they do one report card” [243c]. Linda received a written account of her daughter’s quality of work and performance.

Linda revealed that she and the teachers engaged in a conversation regarding her young daughter’s English language use and knowledge. She shared, “and what we just talk is, when she was coming in she didn’t talk anything. She didn’t know how to anything. She didn’t know how to write and read” [243d-245]. From Linda’s perspective, the teachers viewed her daughter with deficit perspective with her repeated use of the word “didn’t” [243f-245] to indicate that her young daughter was unable to accomplish specific tasks. From Linda’s point of view, she is understanding that the teachers’ use of the word “anything” [243f, 244] refers to the school’s perspective that her daughter had not obtained the particular skills and abilities that they deemed the most important for schooling. According to Linda, her daughter’s inability to complete a number of school-focused tasks in English was the focus of their meeting with her. Linda did not share that she countered or expanded their perspective about her daughter’s learning prior to her schooling. Instead, she appears to agree with them during this meeting since she included herself
as a participant in the conversation with her statement, “and what we just talk is” [243d]. Linda reported that her daughter’s English language awareness and use has been stimulated since she began attending an ECCE program. She said, “but now she start to do it” [247] in reference to her daughter exhibiting new abilities to manipulate “a couple of words, recognize letters” [246a-246b].

Linda explained in a subsequent interview that she does not rely solely upon the parent-teacher conference to learn more about how her young daughter is performing in the school. She had a scheduling conflict that made her unavailable to attend the second parent-teacher conference. Linda recalled the details of her interactions with her daughter’s teachers:

Interviewer: Please tell me about your discussions with your child’s teachers about her language learning.

414a. I don’t do the second one yet
414b. cause I don’t get a chance
414c. to sit with the teacher.
415. Cause I miss that appointment that day.
416a. Cause Carol was having an appointment
416b. in the hospital that day.
417a. She is telling me now
417b. that she is changing a little bit.
418. The way she was quiet.
419. She is changing a little bit
420. She’s talking to the kids a little bit.
421a. Sometime
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421b. if we discuss when I come pick her up or drop her
421c. I ask her how’s she’s doing

(Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017)

Linda expressed her inability to attend the scheduled meeting time with her comment, “I don’t do the second one yet, cause I don’t get a chance to sit with the teacher. Cause I miss that appointment that day” [414a-415]. She creates other opportunities to speak with the teacher during transitions. She said, “sometime, if we discuss when I come pick her up or drop her, I ask her how’s she’s doing” [421a-421c]. This time when Linda “pick her up or drop her” [421a] is a brief and possibly hectic moment of the day as families, children, and educators are moving children from one person to another and from one location to another. Even though these times of the day present their challenges, Linda recalled the ways in which she has learned what is occurring with her child in her ECCE setting. She prompts the teacher for information during a transition. As she explained, “I ask her how’s she’s doing” [421c]. She expressed that the teacher communicates with her about her daughter’s progress when she stated, “She is telling me now, that she is changing a little bit. The way she was quiet. She is changing a little bit. She’s talking to the kids a little bit” [417a-420]. Linda learns that her daughter is exhibiting behavior that is seen as positive in the ECCE setting when she picks up her daughter.

Linda provided insight into how she was directed to support her young child during the first parent-teacher conference that she attended. She reveals below:

_Interviewer: Have you received any advice from Carol’s teachers or anyone else?_

261a. Yeah
261b. the teachers tell me just to help her at
261c. at home to write
261d. especially to practice her name

261e. and recognize the letters.

262. Yeah.

263. And they advise me on that.

264. Yeah.

265a. Try to write the name and the last name

265b. and recognize it

265c. and the letters.

(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

There are specific school-like activities that, Linda stated, the teachers “advise me on” [263]. Linda did not depict that an exchange of ideas occurred between the teachers and her through her words. Her words indicate that the teachers were the ones who were providing the information and direction about what should occur at home. Linda stated, “Yeah, the teachers tell me just to help her at at home to write, the teachers tell me” [261a-261c], “and they advise me on that” [263]. The educators occupy a stance of authority in Linda’s recollection, where they are making suggestions about different ways in which Linda could choose to spend her time with her daughter. The activities that she is told to engage her child in at home were to “try to write the name and the last name, and recognize it, and the letters” [265a-265c]. These are specific tasks that the teachers share with her.

Linda described how the process of completing school assignments unfolds for her young child:

*Interviewer: Are there other things about your child that shows you that she is enjoying learning English?*
187a. You know
187b. that they got a homework.
188a. Ahh
188b. all the time
188c. when we get home
188d. she gonna take a shower
188e. and say
188f. “Mommy what they say in here?”
189. He brought the homework by herself.
190a. She say
191a. Sometimes
191b. if I don’t understand
191c. I’m a tell her
191d. for wait
191e. for Pansy.
192a. But sometimes
192b. Pansy always busy
192c. she’s crying
192d. she’s saying
192e. “Mommy I wanna a help. I need help. I wanna do my homework. You know I don’t do it maybe the teacher gonna be mad at me.”
193a. I say
193b. “no the teacher not gonna be mad.”
194. She like it
195. She like it

(Linda, personal communication, February 2, 2017)

Linda provided details about how the completion of these school activities at home is a significant one that occurs “all the time” [188b]. There is a sense of urgency from her young daughter, as she wants to complete her tasks from the school expediently. Linda revealed, “when we get home, she gonna take a shower, and say, ‘Mommy what they say in here?’ He brought the homework by herself” [188c-189]. Her daughter has prioritized this completion of her homework over other things at home, which is shown by her choosing to bring this work to her mother as soon as she possibly can. Linda’s young daughter keeps repeating her cry for assistance when “she say, ‘Mommy what do they say in here? Mommy what they say in here? So mommy help me’” [190a-190b]. Linda’s young daughter’s eagerness to do well in school is shown through Linda’s words. Her words also hint at a level of stress and anxiousness that her young daughter feels when she is not immediately receiving the support she has requested. Linda stated, “she’s crying, she’s saying ‘Mommy I wanna a help. I need help. I wanna do my homework” [192c-192e]. Linda now finds herself attempting to console her young daughter, while she herself is unable to provide the support that her child needs in order to complete the tasks.

Linda is dependent upon her older daughter to guide her youngest child, “but sometimes, Pansy always busy” [192a-192b]. Linda communicated that Pansy has her own time-consuming school assignments and demands when she comes home from school and is unable to address her little sister’s needs. Linda further emphasized the angst that these school assignments create in her house as she shared her young child’s concern: “You know I don’t do it maybe the teacher
gonna be mad at me” [192d-192e]. Her young daughter fears a negative repercussion from her teacher if she does not complete the task during the night that it is assigned. Linda uses her words to reassure her daughter that she will not be penalized. As she explained, “I say, ‘no the teacher not gonna be mad’” [193a-193b]. Linda did not state if she has made any of these exchanges around homework apparent to her young child’s teachers, nor did she reveal that the task of completing homework is one that she leans on the guidance of her oldest daughter for. Even with these tense moments that occur in the home with completing school tasks, Linda is positive her daughter’s learning of the English language is something that she likes. Linda confirmed, “She like it. She like it” [194-195]. It is viewed as an enjoyable process from Linda’s perspective.

Linda revealed that she is particular about the language that she uses when she is completing school-related tasks with her young daughter and each of her children. She speaks about this below:

_Interviewer: What language do you speak in different places?_

346. You know it’s a time.

347a. Like when we talk about here and the learning

347b. we talk English.

348. I got those points.

349a. But when we playing in the house

349b. or talk our stuff

349c. we talk our language.

350a. I do that

350b. when I start to understand English.
351a. And I have to do that also
351b. because we’re here.
352. And that’s why I do it.
353. And I like to do it.
354. Cause we here.

(Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017)

This excerpt of this transcript begins with Linda stating, “You know it’s a time” [346]. She made it clear that there is a suitable behavior for specific situations. She continued to elaborate: “like when we talk about here and the learning, we talk English. I got those points” [347a-348]. Linda used the noun “here” [347a] to reference the United States. The aspects of schooling are presented to her young daughter in English as they reside in the states. Linda said, “I got those points” [348], hinting at the meeting she had with her daughter’s teachers when they provided her with specific English language and literacy tasks that she should do and reinforce at home with her child. She then stated, “but when we playing in the house, or talk our stuff, we talk our language” [349a-349c]. Linda is intentional about using her native heritage language only when interacting with her children and family around tasks that are not related to schooling. She emphasized twice in this excerpt, “and I have to do that also, because we’re here” [351a-351b; see also 354]. She provided insight into her reasoning for ensuring that she makes decisions that support the competency needed to communicate in an English-based environment in the United States, where her daughter attends an ECCE program that delivers instruction in English and where her young child meets peers who are speaking English.
Concluding Remarks

The section “Analysis of Individual Narrative” presented the stories of each of the six research participants as a whole story with the guiding research questions informing the information that was shared. This chapter presented the ways in which Francophone African-born family members expressed their personal accounts of their own early language and literacy development, their perspectives on their role and on the household factors that mediated processes through which their child acquired English language and literacy growth, and their descriptions of their interactions with the educational setting in regards to their child’s early English language and literacy growth. In order to investigate the narratives further, I conducted an Inclusive Analysis of Individual Narratives, which appears in Chapter five, where I will continue to present findings.
CHAPTER FIVE: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents the thematic understandings that emerged when I investigated the meanings within and across each of the six narratives provided by the Francophone African-born family members. I sought to understand the following through this research study: the particular ways in which each respondent incorporated their childhood experiences and interactions in regards to their own early language and literacy development, into their renditions of their past, into their beliefs pertaining the nature of their relationship to their children as they developed their English language and literacy repertoire, and into their retelling of encounters with their children’s educators and schooling. Chapter five further develops what I learned from the research participants individually in Chapter four. In this chapter, I investigate the narratives together as a coherent whole and then present themes and findings from the comprehensive unit. This chapter is divided into two sections, Inclusive Analysis of Narratives and Findings.

Inclusive Analysis of Narratives and Findings

Chapter four presented the narratives of each of the six research participants with granularity. These narratives were organized by the guiding research questions. The nuanced experiences of the individual respondents were evident through their retelling and now form the basis of the inclusive analysis.

In this section, I will bring together the six narratives to discover the themes from which I derived the findings, using the following process. I placed the narratives of all of the six respondents alongside each other. I considered the narratives as a coherent unit, identified what occurred in the narratives with some regularity across all of the respondents. I considered the patterns that emerged when I looked at the narratives as a group and considered what was indicative of many of the research participants, and what was indicative of an outlier, which
offered a contrast among the research participants. I expressed what was noteworthy through salient themes and sub-themes that emerged. This process provided a way of seeing clearly what was occurring across the narratives. The details of the narratives of all six participants informed the discovery of the major themes and sub-themes, and in this chapter I illustrate those themes and findings. This chapter is organized according to the study’s guiding research questions.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 depict each of the three guiding research questions for this study, the major themes and sub-themes that emerged from an investigation of the narratives as a whole, and the findings that were derived from the themes and sub-themes. These displays show how themes and sub-themes inform the findings.

In the next section of the chapter, I will present each major theme with a general statement that provides insight into the particular topic of concern for each research question that the study is embedded in. I will present the sub-themes with the specific data that was garnered through looking at the narratives as a group. I will present the finding that was informed by the major themes and sub-theme.

**Immigrant Family Members’ Own Early Language and Literacy**

The early childhood events and interactions that the six research participants shared were ones that emphasized connection and communication with the adults around them. The six research participants expressed the various ways in which they learned “ways of acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, dressing, thinking, and believing” (Gee, 1990) while living in specific language and literacy communities. The role of their parents was integral as they learned how to operate in the world with various language and literacy skills, knowledge, and behaviors. The analysis resulted in two major themes relevant to the first research question about participants’ early language and literacy experiences. The major themes were (a) salience of oral
traditions and (b) the customariness of navigating multilingual contexts. These major themes and findings are depicted in Figure 1, and then explored further in this portion of the chapter.

**Figure 1.** The themes, sub-themes, and findings that correspond with the first guiding research question are depicted.

**Salience of Oral Traditions**

The first theme, salience of oral traditions, had two sub-themes: stories have a profound impact and stories are recurring. According to all six of the research participants, oral traditions are considered a valuable source of information regarding people’s past, lineage, upbringing, and beliefs. This storytelling, according to the six research participants, encouraged each of them to recognize and internalize a social and moral standard to uphold in their own life. Each of the six research participants described the ways that meaningful occasions and the past were expressed
to them by the adults in their lives. I will highlight the sub-themes—stories have a profound impact, stories are recurring, and extended family and parents’ stories—through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

**Stories have a profound impact.** Each of the six participants expressed how the oral traditions they received as young children within their families were delivered in the mode of stories, wise sayings, and songs. They each illuminated the importance of oral presentations that revealed details about their countries of origin, shared history, values, norms, and common understandings of their families and communities. These oral renditions encompassed major life lessons, served a purpose in shaping the meaning that each research participant expressed that they attributed to their lives, and were crucial in keeping the knowledge of the past and present relevant. The adults in their lives, which often included the research participants’ parents, illustrated their own lives and the lives of those who were significant in their families through oral traditions.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
### Table 5

*Sub-theme: Stories have a profound impact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Stories about his namesake from research participant’s parent</td>
<td>March 4, 2017, line 7c</td>
<td>My father used to tell me about my grandfather who I was named after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Stories about research participant’s father as a student</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 12a-14</td>
<td>My daddy used to tell when he was a child he was so smart in the class. He used to go to the school and study and he was very smart in the class. He used to tell that a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Stories from research participant’s mother and aunts about her mother’s upbringing</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 59-63</td>
<td>They used to tell us their stories. I still remember them. Like my mom, her parents passed away, really early when she was young, but she doesn’t remember exactly. But the person who brought her up she talks about it about them. That’s her mother sisters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Stories from research participant’s parents about their upbringing</td>
<td>March 2, 2017, lines 13a-15</td>
<td>They used to tell us, ummm how they used to go in the farm, or ummm like in the sea to fish or catch animals. It was pretty good. At that point we wished we lived that life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Stories about research participant’s birthplace from his parents</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, lines 100a-101c</td>
<td>It built a sense of identity. It basically put inside of me that I came from somewhere, that my people have a history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Songs that were meaningful from adults in research participant’s life</td>
<td>February 2, 2017, lines 62b-62e</td>
<td>...like a sound but sometimes you can hear it like advice and talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme—stories have a profound impact—highlighted the ways in which the respondents learned who they were and their understanding of who their families and communities were. They learned about their culture, history, art, and ideas. The research participants narrated moments that were crucial in providing them with insight into the behaviors and functioning of their communities, which, in some instances, they were not geographically residing in as children.

**Stories are recurring.** There was an emphasis through the six informants’ narrations on the recursive nature of oral traditions in their households as children. They were frequent and common place occurrences. The research participants stated that parents were crucial in revealing stories about past experiences, history, and shared understandings. In addition to parents, four of the research participants expressed that expanded networks of siblings, friends, extended family, and other community members were important in sustaining oral traditions. For each of these research participants, the adults in their lives took an active role in both communicating and authoring the information that was relayed to them as children.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
Table 6

Sub-theme: Stories are recurring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Extended family members shared oral traditions</td>
<td>March 4, 2017, line 7a</td>
<td>We would talk a lot about our family history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Oral traditions were shared by research participant’s parents</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, line 11a</td>
<td>They used to talk the old stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Oral traditions were shared by research participant’s parents and siblings</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, line 59</td>
<td>They used to tell us their stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Oral traditions were shared by research participant’s mother</td>
<td>March 2, 2017, lines 12a-12f</td>
<td>Yes, yes, stories used to be from mommy. When she was growing up and they both grew up in the village, so the lifestyle was different from umm what’s going on in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Oral traditions were shared by research participant’s parents</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, line 54b</td>
<td>...well they spoke a lot about growing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Parents and extended family members shared oral traditions</td>
<td>February 2, 2017, lines 57a-57b</td>
<td>So all the time…they like to sing for us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sub-theme—stories are recurring—presents, from the research participants’ perspectives, how extended family members’ and parents’ stories provided insight into the ways that these adults were actively guiding the research participants during their youth, through the transmission of knowledge and information that they wanted to emphasize. The adults in their lives included their families, extended network, community, and people who were not actually related but functioned like kin. They provided constant renditions of the past and common
understandings that highlighted specific lessons, values, and community norms. There was a reinforcement of the significance of these past moments, values and lessons as revealed to the participants as young children. The respondents candidly reported moments in their young lives of being an attentive listener, which was a role that was valued across their various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The research participants learned through the modeling of the adults the nature of oral traditions and its place in their lives.

The major theme of the salience of oral traditions was illuminated through the telling of stories, wise sayings, and songs from the respondents, underscoring how these traditions were a prevalent part of the encounters with the adults in their lives as children. This consistent reinforcement of specific values and ways of being created a common understanding of the norms by which they were expected to conduct their lives as children. These stories shared by the research participants were intimate and revealed not only what occurred according to each respondent but also what was important and what it meant to each of them, and they even provided glimpses into their current perspective. The narratives were structured by the respondents in order to share their understanding of the relationships, the plots, the actors, and the events that were reflected through their stories and that influence who they are. Each of the research participants had different ways of relaying how their various narratives intersected, diverged, and contradicted one another. The storytelling from some of the respondents clearly articulated the lessons learned and the specific insights they gained through various experiences, while others did not. The nature of the presentation of these stories highlights the complexity of each individual research participant and how nuanced their experiences are in their narration of their own self-conception. Upon consideration of these themes and sub-themes across the narratives, I can make the following assertion as a finding:
Finding 1: During childhoods immersed in oral traditions, Francophone African-born parents were introduced to common understandings, values, and history integral to their identities and their families’ identities, and these traditions are apparent when they narrate their lives as adults.

According to each of the research participants, oral traditions remained an important part of who they are, how they understand why things function the way that they do, and the meaning that they learned to attribute to life. There were specific lessons about life that were shared with the respondents as children, which were a relevant and persistent part of their upbringing. African history was framed and interpreted through these oral traditions in ways that included their families and their communities. Stories, lessons, myths, proverbs, epic narrations, and songs were conveyed to the participants in segments that were easy for them to recall and share. As the participants explained these occasions as children, they conveyed how the adults in their lives were aware of the context and the people involved in the telling and that these moments resonated with them. As the participants explained, these occasions could not have been replicated in the same way through written text. Oral traditions were a crucial aspect of their upbringing.

The customariness of navigating multilingual contexts

The second theme, the customariness of navigating multilingual contexts, had two sub-themes: participants experienced discontinuities and convergences in their language use and language experiences are fundamental. The second major theme relevant to the first research question about participants’ own early language and literacy experiences concerns how, throughout their lives, they became accustomed to navigating multilingual contexts. Language and literacy practices are socially organized experiences in which individuals engage. Their early
exposure to variances in expressing, understanding, and recognizing those who were both a part of their language community and not a part of their language community was important to the six research participants. All six of the informants spoke candidly about having varying language expectations placed on them, dependent upon whom they were with and where they were. They shared stories of navigating various contexts as children both in their homes and outside of their homes. In the subsequent section, the six research participants express the ways in which they engaged with various language communities as children. I will highlight the sub-themes—participants experienced discontinuities and convergences in their language use and language experiences are fundamental—through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

Participants experienced discontinuities and convergences in their language use and exposure. The multilingualism and cultural diversity of Africa is illustrated through each of the six research participants, as they shared the various ways in which an awareness and fluency in a language and literacy practice either stimulated and/or hindered their ability to effectively communicate within a given language community. There are numerous values, attitudes, and feelings that were reflected about the use of different languages and literacy practices for each of the participants. In their narratives, the six research participants conveyed that there was a pattern of them leaving and rejoining different speech communities. There were various opportunities throughout the young lives of the six research participants to interact with different language communities, which were facilitated by physical moves and/or by the presence of people with different forms of communication within their society. The research participants expressed that their interactions with various speech communities discontinued and converged at various times as they left and entered these communities.
The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

Table 7

Sub-theme: Participants experienced discontinuities and convergences in their language use and exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Varying language experiences when residing in smaller municipality</td>
<td>March 4, 2017, lines 52a-55e</td>
<td>But when I was in the small city or countryside, in French it was only my mom or my dad. Most of all the teachers. Apart from that we speak Bambara. So I was like practicing my dad he was a teacher, like I told you, so he used to like to correct all the time then to discipline the proper way of saying things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Research participant’s parents knew Arabic</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 20a-20c</td>
<td>But they didn’t teach me how to learn in the book that they had in Arabic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Attempts to speak different language met with humor</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 83a-85b</td>
<td>So my sister used to tell me that, so the village she was growing up there. She used to tell me in her language, and the sound that they were making. When I answer her she laughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Using body language to communicate in a language community new to the research participant</td>
<td>March 2, 2017, lines 29j-29l</td>
<td>So I had to make a noise and show him how the chicken say ooohhhh and show him how the egg come out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Navigating a different language community as a child</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, lines 54a-54b</td>
<td>In Africa you have no choice, you have to learn a second language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme, participants experienced discontinuities and convergences in their language use, provides insight into the ways in which the research participants found means to both disconnect and connect with language communities that were in their midst as children. This need to adapt their ways of communicating was prompted for some of the participants by physical moves, while for others it occurred as they entered schooling or interacted with someone within their community who had a different way of communicating. The language diversity and dexterity of the countries within Africa that the participants resided in are evident through the narrations that they shared.

Language experiences are fundamental to social and historical identity formation. The six research participants reported various ways of engaging with different language communities. For three of the research participants—James, Elizabeth and Michael—a move to a new place of residence as a child prompted encounters with different language communities. Each of the aforementioned research participants described the ways in which they had to learn to correspond within their new communities in order to navigate everyday circumstances.

Furthermore, these occasions of being understood and learning a new language distinguished these research participants from the community of people they were now living with. The three research participants who did not physically move from their birth places as children—Linda, Patricia, and Jennifer—shared that they encountered different languages and dialects as a child in their homes and within their communities. This exposure to variance in language occurred, as the research participants explained that there was a recurrence of them leaving and rejoining specific
language communities. The six research participants narrated the various ways that knowledge and exposure to other means of communicating and identifying with a group that shared a historical and social identity were made apparent to them at a young age. These experiences, as reported by the research participants, were fundamental to providing them with a reference of who they were and who their community was. The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

Table 8

*Sub-theme: Language experiences are fundamental to social and historical identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Lines</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Language encounters with older adults in the countryside</td>
<td>March 4, 2017, lines 57a-60</td>
<td>So growing up in the city we had the tendency of mixing some French words in the Bambara language even nowadays. That’s why some people who grow up in the city that’s what happen to us so when we go to the countryside and you speak to those old people they say “Oh you don’t speak Bambara.” Because we mix up the French words. That’s why we different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Differing language experiences from parents</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 16a-18</td>
<td>My parents did Arabic school, but I studied in French. They just put me in a French school, and they didn’t teach me Arabic. But they just put me in French school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Distinguished herself from her sister-in-law based on language experiences and exposure</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 85a-85b</td>
<td>The way I answer her she laughed, because I’m not used to talk like them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme, language experiences are fundamental, was supported by the research participants’ reports of being exposed to different ways of communicating, which solidified their understanding of the language community that they identified with and shared a common social and historical identity with. Their language that was shared among those who were a part of the same language community also communicated specific values and norms for their particular group. As children, the research participants were able to identify differences in the ways in which they communicated that made it apparent when they were part of a specific language community or when they were not.

The major theme of being accustomed to navigating multilingual contexts highlights the ways in which each of the research participants discussed interactions with different language communities that they encountered throughout their childhoods. All of the research participants
expressed the importance of being flexible in their ability to communicate by adopting an additional language, repertoire, and/or way of being in their everyday experiences in order to communicate with those around them. Upon consideration of these themes and sub-themes across the narratives, I can make the following assertion as a finding:

**Finding 2:** Multilingualism was common throughout participants’ upbringing, and facility in functioning in multiple language communities and contexts shaped and became part of their identities.

The research participants’ responses provided insight into the ways that they both recognized and engaged with multiple language communities as children. The respondents found that there were encounters that were fostered with various language communities in their homes, larger communities, and through their schooling experiences. All of the research participants developed an awareness and understanding of how language can be used to both connect and distance oneself with the features of understanding and being that are encompassed by different language communities.

**Immigrant Family Members’ Home Practices and Experiences**

Each of the six immigrant family members spoke about the challenges of raising their children in a country that they had not been raised in. They each spoke of different ways that they aspired for their children to sustain a connection to their heritage language, identity, and family. The parents’ statements indicate that they strived to achieve this. The analysis resulted in two major themes relevant to the second research question about the ways in which the six research participants reported the nature of their home practices and experiences regarding the early language and literacy acquisition of their children. The major themes were (a) continuity of
fostering family connectedness and identity and (b) sibling language input. These major themes and findings are depicted in Figure 2 and then explored further in this portion of the chapter.

**Figure 2.** The themes, sub-themes, and findings that correspond with the second guiding research question are depicted.

**Continuity of Fostering Family Connectedness and Identity**

The first theme, continuity of fostering family connectedness and identity, had two sub-themes: families are deliberate about language use in the home and home life accommodates English. There is a focus for each of the research participants on ensuring that their children feel connected to the countries, ideologies, and people of their heritage, to the United States, and to the community and family that children interact with. The participants prioritize exposing the children in the home with experiences in receiving and hearing their heritage language, sometimes directed towards them or to others in their household. These types of language and
literacy events reach across various social groups, situations, and locations. These parts of the identity of each of the research participants have been established and reinforced by their family’s daily interactions. The subsequent sections provide further insight into the ways in which each immigrant family member narrated their language and literacy interactions with their children who are in an ECCE setting. I will highlight the sub-themes, deliberate language use in the home, and accommodating English through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

**Families are deliberate about language use in their home.** Each of the six research participants expressed the importance of continuing to sustain their heritage languages with their children and shared the various ways they integrated the languages into the everyday experiences of their children, which included trips to their birthplace, conversations in their heritage language, exposure to different languages, and access to literacy materials in other languages. The six research participants communicated the importance of their children being able to communicate and understand their heritage languages because doing so fostered the ability for them to “understand together” (Linda, personal communication, May 20, 2017) with their family members who were both in the United States and abroad. Each of the research participants expressed through their narrations a concern that their children would be unable to communicate their thoughts, ideas, and feelings in their heritage languages to their family members and their extended community.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
Table 9

*Sub-theme: Families are deliberate about language use in their home*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcription Lines</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 148a-149d</td>
<td>Made decision to strengthen children’s French communication through a trip to Mali for a year</td>
<td>That’s why I say, I would have changed it. Both of us, my wife and myself should speak to her in English and Bambara, no I mean French and Bambara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 37a-38</td>
<td>Communicates with her child in her heritage language</td>
<td>I speak with her in French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 156a-158b</td>
<td>Desires to sustain heritage language at home</td>
<td>Sometimes, I need vocabulary in English. It teach me too, when they speak to me in English. But I also want them, to know my language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 119-122b</td>
<td>Research participant’s children are in a multilingual environment at home</td>
<td>I’ve been here. I speak English daily with my kids, outside, with my work, it’s like English every day. But at the same time, my native language I speak it every day too. So when I talk to them, I speak with languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, lines 180a-182</td>
<td>Exposes child to French language and wants to do more</td>
<td>But what I tend to do with her though, is print sketches of clothing and body parts in French. But the only problem is consistency, but I do that to make sure that she is doing French, so we are not very consistent. That is the only problem with that process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LITERACY IN CHILDREN OF FRANCOPHONE AFRICAN IMMIGRANTS

| Linda       | May 20, 2017, lines 184a-187e; lines 268a-269a; lines 271a-271f | Research participant has developed strategies to strengthen heritage language use | When I talk her Wolof, her response is English. Sometimes I have to say, Carol what did I say in my language? Say it, and then he repeat it. She understand, but he not getting easy to talk, that because of here, the school, you know. Yeah because you know, sometime you always thinking about going back home, sometime vacation, or going see your parents, and hang out with them. And they don’t speak English…So if you, if you, then that day, you cannot benefit to talk with them, at that time, because you cannot understand together. |

The sub-theme—families are deliberate about language use in their home—was apparent as each of the respondents shared their continued use and preference for their heritage languages in their homes in varying degrees. They each expressed that they took at least two of the following measures: went to great lengths to continue conversations and interactions in their homes in their heritage languages, visited their countries of their childhood, and reinforced language use through various literacy strategies to increase exposure to heritage languages. While one of the research participants, James, had made the decision to use English with his young child from birth, he expressed a sentiment of regret through his words, “that’s why I say I would have changed it” (May 20, 2017, line 148a). The other five respondents expressed the ways in which they used their native languages in commonplace and daily interactions with their children. There was a tension that was evident directly and indirectly through the participants words as they described the measures that they took to sustain their heritage languages, their observations of their children no longer communicating in their heritage languages, and their continued decision to use their heritage languages despite the prevalence of English.
**Home life accommodates English.** Each of the six research participants expressed the importance of supporting the acquisition of the English language. These informants acknowledge that their children’s development of their English repertoire was a prevalent component to their successfully communicating in their community in the United States. The research participants described the ways in which their home environments were made comfortable for their children to speak in English as they were stimulated by different forms of media, conversations and play in English, interactions with English speaking siblings, a mainly positive disposition from parents as their children expressed themselves in English, and a willingness to incorporate English in their homes, despite their varying degrees of comfort with the language.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

Table 10

*Sub-theme: Home life accommodates English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Research participant’s son was exposed to English prior to trip to Mali and had to develop the language upon his return to the U.S</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, line 161</td>
<td>For Timothy he had to start learning again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Research participant engages daughter in English with her limited comprehension of the language</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 44a-44b</td>
<td>I doesn’t understand English but my daughter speaks with me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme—home life accommodates English—presents the various ways that the six research participants allowed for their young children to express themselves in English at home and display their growing fluency of the language.

**Sibling Language Input**

The second theme, siblings’ language input, had two sub-themes: siblings become intermediaries for and teachers of English and English is omnipresent. Siblings stimulate an English language- and literacy- learning environment in their homes through their communication and experiences that extend from school into their homes. Five of the six research participants had more than one child and at least one older child who was school-age. These respondents
were Linda, Elizabeth, Patricia, Michael, and James. Each of these five respondents narrated the ways in which the older sibling was an English language teacher for their younger sibling who attends an ECCE program. They each equated that the daily interactions that occurred between the siblings stimulated English language use and growth in their young child. I will highlight the sub-themes, siblings as language teachers and English is omnipresent, through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

**siblings become intermediaries for and teachers of English.** Five research participants in this study spoke of how their young children received a significant portion of English language input from his/her sibling. They described the ways in which siblings stimulated and strengthened their young child’s English awareness through conversations, interactions, play, reading, and engaging with multiple forms of media. These informants described how they saw their children become more versed English speakers and saw the benefits of these interactions. The research participants expressed that they observed their children communicating predominately in English with each other.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
Table 11

*Sub-theme: Siblings become intermediaries for and teachers of English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Older sibling Lesley helped younger sibling with English</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 235a-235f</td>
<td>So I would let Lesley be around, so when he’s reading, or saying words, or watching the news, so that's how I learned that he was learning things fast. He was learning things quickly. When he tried to speak to Lesley, sometimes, most of the time in English, and when he try to read everything, that he tries to show me that by reading aloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Recognizes that both she and her children require exposure to a much more fluent English speaker</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 159a-160</td>
<td>Cause you know, I need someone to talk to them, in the English. It can improve my English too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Acknowledges the significance of the English language interactions between siblings</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 103b-103d</td>
<td>English is something she heard all the time, that’s from the sisters, being that she had older sisters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Observes that children have exchanges in English</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 217a-217b</td>
<td>They have games for word recognition in French, but their interactions really are only in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Observes the predominate use of English between siblings</td>
<td>May 20, 2017, lines 147a-149b</td>
<td>She was talking, our language also. But you know the brother and sister, talk English together between them. Carol learned from them, and the TV also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sub-theme—siblings become intermediaries for and teachers of English—was illustrated through the narrations of five immigrant family members who had more than one
child. They discussed how these relationships had a significant effect in stimulating their younger sibling’s use of the English language with frequency in their interactions. Each of these family members described ways in which daily communication and play between siblings occurred in English, even when their children were fluent in other languages. There was an intentional choice and preference to sustain the English language that they were immersed in at school and through the media in their home. Sibling communication operates in a dynamic environment of the students’ language-learning. Each of the five research participants discussed how integral sibling relationships are in establishing an environment in the home where English is the norm.

**English is omnipresent.** The English language is an important part of the milieu of these six research participants. It has found its way into the homes of these research participants through the siblings, through presence of media in their households, and through the ECCE. English is not limited to a certain time of day or to specific occasions in the households of the six research participants. Instead, they describe the use of the English language as a norm that is interwoven into their daily experiences. English is omnipresent, as it is part of the lives of the immigrant families in their homes, school, and community in New York and in media. It is established.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
Table 12

**Sub-theme: English is omnipresent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript Line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Young child displays English language knowledge</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 237d-237f</td>
<td>When he tried to speak to Lesley, sometimes, most of the time in English, and when he try to read everything, that he tries to show me that, by reading aloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>English speaking and interactions despite limitations</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 42a-43b</td>
<td>I speaks English, and she answer English. I doesn’t understand English, but my daughter speaks with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Positive attitude towards English language</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 164a-165b</td>
<td>They helping me in English. When they answer me in English. It improve me too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Young child’s language environment is primarily English</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, line 103b</td>
<td>English is something she heard all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Activities and interactions in home are in English language</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 209a-211b</td>
<td>We chit chat in the living room in English. I would get him Netflix or iTunes, and play a movie for them. They will watch it. You know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>English language interactions occur in English among siblings and through the presence of media</td>
<td>May 20, 2017, lines 146a-150d</td>
<td>Because in the house we talk our language me and my husband. She was talking our language also. But you know the brother and sister talk English together between them. Carol learned from them and the TV also. You know the cartoon when she’s looking at and she was like it, she liked to do that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sub-theme, English is omnipresent, became apparent in the participants’ talk as they described the presence of the English language through daily socialization through relationships,
institutions, and the media that the young children were immersed in. The majority of the research participants met the consuming nature of English with some surprise because they could recall their children speaking their heritage languages before entering school. The participants expressed the ways in which their children chose to express themselves primarily in the English language. It was a sudden change that was facilitated by their child’s immersion and socialization in the English language.

The major theme—continuity of fostering family connectedness and identity—was recognized in the reports of the experiences shared by the six research participants. They expressed their desire to have their children sustain their heritage languages. The major theme, sibling language input, conveyed the ways in which the research participants recognized the influence that siblings had in influencing the English language development of their younger siblings. The six research participants made accommodations in their own communication with their children in order facilitate English language development. Each of the research participants described the ways in which they spoke or attempted to speak English with their children, even though they had varying degrees of comfort with the language. While two of the research participants conveyed that they decided to communicate primarily with their children in English in their home, they also expressed a desire for their children to know one of their heritage languages. The respondents expressed the ways in which they supported their children’s English language responses even when they addressed their children in their heritage language. All of the participants intentionally allowed for their children to utilize their newfound English skill set in their homes. Upon consideration of these themes and sub-themes across the narratives, I can make the following assertion as a finding:
Finding 3: According to Francophone African-born parents, their childrearing decisions have included intentional actions in their home life to sustain their heritage languages while simultaneously supporting English language development, but their narratives indicate a tension resulting from striving to satisfy both aims.

The research participants reported their attempts at sustaining two different types of learning. In one regard, the respondents described the different ways that they attempt to develop their children’s heritage language, which they view as a direct connection to their language background and extended family and community. Correspondingly, the research participants narrated the different ways that they support the academic language, English, in their homes, which they view as a direct testament to their children’s successful immersion and navigation into the schooling process in the United States. Each of the research participants expressed various levels of success in managing the evolving nature of the development of these language abilities and awareness.

As they narrate their lives, the research participants’ examples of the language practices that they employed with their young children to continue to use and cultivate their native languages and English revealed a tension. There were conflicting linguistic demands made clear by their sharing. English was a major part of their young children’s lives through media, sibling exchanges, and through their own communication, while their continued native language use was also important, as they fostered connections with their larger network and family members. These language choices were complicated and nuanced for each of the respondents.
Immigrant Family Members’ Encounters with the Early Childhood Education and Care (ECCE) Settings

Four of the research participants revealed that their encounters with the educators at their children’s ECCE setting usually occurred during transitions, including arrival and dismissal times at the schools, and during their scheduled parent-teacher conferences. Patricia, Jennifer, Michael, and Linda discussed the ways in which their opportunities to learn more about their children’s early language and literacy growth from the teachers were during typically brief encounters. Elizabeth and James shared that they had more frequent encounters with their children’s educators, which included phone calls and school-run meetings. These encounters were predominately school-initiated, and the agendas were established by the educators. The one-way communication described by Elizabeth and James was echoed in the narratives of the other four research participants. The analysis resulted in two major themes relevant to the third research question about the ways in which the six research participants reported their encounters with the ECCE settings. The major themes were (a) barriers to communication and (b) the unimportance of multilingualism at school. These major themes and findings are depicted in Figure 3 and then explored further in this portion of the chapter.
Figure 3. The themes, sub-themes, and findings that correspond with the third guiding research question are depicted.

**Barriers to Communication**

The first theme, barriers to communication, had two sub-themes: encounters during conferences and transitions and one-way communication. Immigrant families are inundated with challenges as they seek to meaningfully engage in their children’s early education. Four barriers for these foreign-born family members include a limited proficiency in English language and literacy, limited understanding of how to navigate the educational system in the United States, limited understanding of the cultural norms and values in the United States, and dealing with the adjustment to a new country. In this particular study, each of the six research participants shared how they are experiencing the efforts of the ECCE settings and revealed their personal perspectives and attitudes regarding their encounters with the teachers. I will highlight the sub-
themes, brevity of encounters with exceptions, and one-way communication through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

**Brevity of encounters with exceptions.** Each of the six research participants expressed various ways in which they were experiencing the efforts of the teachers in the ECCE programs with their young children. While the encounters with teachers were unique for each of the participants dependent upon who they are, what they know of schooling in the United States, their own outlook on their roles and that of the teachers, and their established relationships with the ECCE settings, there were two themes that intersected across all six of the participants. Four of the parents expressed that they had minimal contact with the ECCE setting, which occurred often during transitions, including arrival and dismissal, and parent-teacher conferences. Two of the participants spoke about having established strong relationships with their young child’s teachers as they attended parent-teacher conferences, transition times, school meetings, and corresponded via telephone.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

*Table 13*

**Sub-theme: Brevity of encounters with exceptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Describes how he was viewed as reliable by the teachers</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 203a-203c</td>
<td>All the time they had to do something, if they wanted to talk to a parent, then they knew I would be there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Uncertain about how to proceed after the report from the teachers on her child’s progress</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 47a-52b, 55a-56d</td>
<td>The teacher told me. I have conference yesterday, since my daughter got here, she got progress. She learns a lot. She understands every time, when they give that to her. She understands all of it. She’s not so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jennifer  | The research participant explains what she learned about her daughter during a parent-teacher conference | February 16, 2017, lines 240-247 | Yeah. At the first semester, she was a little behind. But yesterday, I had a meeting with them, and she got improved. She told me, she’s changing a lot. She’s doing the writing is very good. The reading is very good. Everything is very good, except for Math. She is a little behind.

Elizabeth  | Research participant made herself available to the teachers | March 2, 2017, lines 61a-65e | Ummm the teachers and I have a great relationship. Actually they all have my number. If something happen daily, they would text me even if they don’t want to do it on the day time the night time. I told them you are free to call me at any time, so they would text me or call me and tell me what happened, or she was amazing today, or she did a great job. So I have a great communication with them. And here and there I would come in the school, even just for five minutes to see them and what’s going on, and they take their time. and they take their free time to tell me.

Michael  | Communication with his daughter and her teacher during morning transition | May 25, 2017, lines 121-122 | Daddy has to go, sorry. Hello, Miss. I’m sorry I have to go.

Linda  | Research participant initiates exchanges between herself and | May 20, 2017, lines 421a-421c | Sometime, if we discuss when I come pick her up or drop her, I ask her how’s she’s doing.
The sub-theme, brevity of encounters with exceptions, illuminated the ways in which the research participants described their interactions with the teachers at the ECCE settings. Four of the respondents explained that these encounters occurred primarily during short periods of time that included scheduled parent-teacher conferences and transitions of their children during arrival and dismissal. Two of the research participants, Elizabeth and James, expressed that they sustained well-established relationships at their children’s ECCE settings and that they attended various meetings and events and were contacted on their personal telephone by the teachers.

One-way communication. All six respondents shared details of their interactions with their children’s teachers that can be characterized as one-way communication and teacher-directed. The six research participants indicated that they were largely in the role of a listener during their encounters with their young child’s teachers. They each provided examples of the ways in which the ECCE teachers did the majority of the talking, as the parents were given updates and directives. The six informants shared that the school communicated that they should adopt school-like practices in their home to reinforce English language use and literacy. The messages received from the school advised interaction in English at home, thus implying that the language of the school community was of greater importance than any of the native heritage languages that were being spoken at home. They also narrated a closed-ended query between the ECCE teachers and themselves that did not stimulate an exchange between them. According to the research participants’ narrations, the ECCE teachers determined how the conversations unfolded between the parents and them.
The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

Table 14

*Sub-theme: One-way communication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Research participant’s child’s lack of fluency in English was concerning to the school</td>
<td>March 4, 2017, lines 50a-53</td>
<td>When he came back to Prep World ahhh, when they came back, so he lose his English totally. It was even a big problem, because when we talk, they say it better to read and speak in English. I was getting call every single day. The principal was comment on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Report received about her daughter during parent-teacher conference</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 47a-48</td>
<td>The teacher told me. I have conference yesterday, since my daughter got here, she got progress. She learns a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Research participant explains her role during parent-teacher conference</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 251a-254</td>
<td>I was listening to her when she was doing, the situation, what’s going on in the class and with Mavis. I was listening to her and you know she showed me the paper, with what has been done. And I saw all of it. I listened to her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 16, 2017 lines 263a-263b</td>
<td>She was talking about, a lot of things yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Research participant explains the report from the teacher about her child</td>
<td>March 2, 2017, lines 67-70d</td>
<td>They tell me she does her homework. Everything is completed. I never heard them complain about anything. The only thing they say is that sometimes to discipline, to stop laughing, and to focus, but other than that her reading everything is good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme, one-way communication, was illuminated by each of the six research participants who characterized their encounters with educators in ways that indicated that the teachers were advising that they should stimulate their children’s early English language and literacy at home through various school-like activities and interactions. There were no participants who expressed having reciprocal conversations aimed at two-way learning between the educators and themselves in their young child’s life.

**Unimportance of Multilingualism at School**

The second theme, unimportance of multilingualism at school, had two sub-themes: involvement with school assignments and the primacy of English reaches into the home. Educational attainment and academic success for immigrant families can be perceived as facilitated primarily through English language and literacy proficiency through schooling. The monolingual environment of academic institutions is exemplified through the encounters that parents have with the educators and through the assignments that children bring home. Presently, as parents themselves, all six of the research participants discussed various ways that they choose to engage with the school assignments that entered their homes through their children. All participants narrated their ability and/or challenges they faced with supporting their children...
through their English language and literacy school tasks. The six immigrant family members shared a preference for using English at home with their young children when communicating about school assignments. The six research participants did not express ways in which they could utilize their multilingual repertoire when engaging in schooling. Instead, there was a focus through the schooling assignments and through the encounters with the educators to display dexterity in solely English language use.

The research participants reveal their perspectives in the subsequent section. I will highlight the sub-themes—engaging with school assignments and transitions and the primacy of English reaches into the home—through the specific examples and renderings that were shared by the research participants.

Involvement with school assignments. Each of the six research participants narrated different ways in which their young children had them encountering schooling through the assignments, tasks, and behaviors that they brought home. The six research participants had various ways of managing the English academic assignments that were entering their homes through their children. Each of the participants expressed that they provided time for their children to complete their homework. The six respondents do not express that there is an option of engaging with the educators and with the assignments that are brought home through their multilingual abilities. Instead, the six research participants narrate the ways in which they make accommodations to their own ways of communicating in order to express themselves in English with the educators and with their children when involved in schooling activities.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:
Table 15

*Sub-theme: Involvement with school assignments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Strategy with homework</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 216a-221c</td>
<td>I let them do it, struggle and find out… So they can find the mistakes in that area. So they can figure it out. If they can not, then I know that they have done the most hardest part, and then I would let the teacher do the next day in the school. So I would just follow every single homework, and try to put my initial on it, that I tried to helped them look at the homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Explains how her daughter guides her through the English language</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 30a-30b</td>
<td>And then she’s trying to teach me too how to say the words. So she is learning a lot here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Explains how her daughter engages in school tasks without adult prompting</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 178a-182</td>
<td>Yeah cause when we got home, she complete the homework now after school. She also when she get home, she also want to keep writing on the paper and drawing the pictures. She really like it. She like Maroon Academy. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Observation of child’s progress through school assignments</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 184a-189</td>
<td>Yeah, when she coming home, and reading for me and spelling out certain word. Yeah, those were like wow. Even though she spoke English in the house, this is like something she is learning from school. Yeah, coming and having the paper with the words, spelling them, telling me what it means. Yeah. That was growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Observation of child's progress through school assignments</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, lines 191c-192e</td>
<td>She knows the alphabet. She knows how to count till, I don’t know how far she can count, and can identify many words, you know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sub-theme, involvement with school assignments, presents the varied ways in which each research participant becomes involved with their children’s school assignments. Jennifer and Linda expressed that their children are enthusiastic about finishing their school assignments and that they support them by providing the time for them to complete their work. Linda and James discussed their dependence upon their older children to clarify and guide their younger children through assignments. These two parents recognized and expressed that they each have their limitations in English proficiency that inhibit their ability to sufficiently support their children. Patricia and Elizabeth indicated that their children’s growth in English directly benefits their own growth in English, as the lessons from school make their way into their homes. Each of the research participants shared that they create time and space in their lives to have their children display their learning through their school assignments.

The primacy of English reaches into the home. The six research participants expressed that their children are primarily immersed in an environment that is English-only through their siblings, school community, academic assignments, and media. The multilingual abilities and knowledge of the six research participants are not viewed as integral to schooling, according to their narrations. These research participants each expressed different ways in which they emphasize English through the choices that they make in both language and literacy occasions that involve schooling and that they facilitate between themselves and their children in their
homes. While of the research participants’ proficiency in English ranges widely, they each expressed that they made intentional choices to communicate in English when working with their children on school assignments. For the five research participants that have multiple children, the older siblings were integral in supporting the English language and literacy development of the younger children. The six research participants narrated that there appears to be a lack of importance about multilingualism at school through their encounters with the academic institution, and instead the primacy of the English language that their children are immersed in is valued. This environment has enumerated the challenges for parents in sustaining their heritage languages in their children.

The following table displays transcript evidence from each of the six research participants that supports this particular sub-theme:

Table 16

Sub-theme: The primacy of English reaches into the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Date and Transcript line</th>
<th>Transcript Evidence Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Strategy to foster literacy in English language</td>
<td>May 13, 2017, lines 221a-222f</td>
<td>So I would just follow every single homework, and try to put my initial on it that I tried to helped them look at the homework. That way I tell everything in English, because I don’t want to mix it up ahhh, so that in Timothy head, or both of them that by explaining in French. I’m not going to help them develop their English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Exchanges with daughter in English language</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 42a-43b</td>
<td>I speaks English, and she answer English. I doesn’t understand English, but my daughter speaks with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Strategy to foster literacy in English language</td>
<td>Date and Lines</td>
<td>Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Parent-teacher conference observation of child’s lack of English fluency</td>
<td>February 16, 2017, lines 243d-245</td>
<td>I like to push her to read louder. And what we just talk is, when she was coming in she didn’t talk anything. She didn’t know how to anything. She didn’t know how to write and read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Strategy to foster literacy in English language</td>
<td>May 25, 2017, lines 122c-122d</td>
<td>But when I’m helping them with their homework, it’s like simply English”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Observation of his daughter’s English language and literacy acquisition</td>
<td>February 25, 2017, lines 189a-189d</td>
<td>Being that this is a household, that essentially speaks English. I don’t think that it presents a challenge to her. I think it is very natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Strategy to foster literacy in English language</td>
<td>February 2, 2017, lines 196a-196d</td>
<td>But she like to read to herself, she doesn’t like to read loudly, but I want to hear her, but she doesn’t like that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sub-theme, the primacy of English reaches into the home, revealed that the research participants assumed a range of roles to support their children’s language and literacy growth, ranging from coaching their children in the English language to merely observing their children as they completed various English language and literacy tasks. While there was variance in the roles that the parents employed based on their personal experience and competency with the English language and U.S. schooling, there was consensus among all of the participants that English use equated to growth and success in school for their children. Three research participants spoke candidly about ensuring that they only used the English language, no matter their own proficiency, when working with their young children through their school-related
tasks. All six of the participants expressed that their children’s ability to perform in English would equate to their being able to excel in school. There were three family members who revealed that their children were enthusiastic about their growing English repertoire, which they displayed at home, but were faced with challenges when performing in English in their ECCE settings.

The major theme, barriers to communication, revealed that there are numerous challenges that families from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds face when attempting to develop and sustain meaningful partnerships with the educators in their children’s ECCE settings. The major theme, unimportance of multilingualism at school, was evident when respondents shared the specific role that they assumed in the schooling process of their young children in order to aid in their English language development. Upon consideration of these themes and sub-themes across the narratives, I can make the following assertion as a finding:

**Finding 4: Francophone African-born parents characterize their interactions with educators in ECCE settings as predominately one-way and prescriptive. Furthermore, they had interchanges with ECCE setting educators that ignored their multicultural heritage and bi/multilingualism.**

Multilingualism has an uncertain status when it comes to schooling. Respondents view ECCE settings as monolingual sites that subscribe first and foremost to making English language and literacy development a priority. The research participants described the ways that the primacy of English reaches into the home and is communicated as an expectation within the homes of their children through the academic assignments and predominately one-way communication. The research participants shared that they recognize an expectation from the school that the parental role is that of an agent of schooling that reinforces the academic learning
at home. There is limited exchange, acknowledgement, and/or validation by the ECCE settings regarding the meaning and capacity that provokes these immigrant parents to sustain their heritage languages and literacy environments within their homes with their children.

Concluding Remarks

Chapter four began with an overview of the steps that I took in order to investigate the data that was presented in the narratives. In the section Participants’ Narratives, I presented each of the individual narratives of the research participants, which meticulously highlight their nuanced experiences and their complexity of perspective. In Chapter five, I unified all of the narratives as a comprehensive whole, identified themes and sub-themes that emerged, and drew four findings. The findings were explained for each guiding research question. The next chapter will discuss the implications of the study and the opportunities for further investigation.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This dissertation reports on research that I conducted to learn the ways in which Francophone African-born immigrants narrate their own early language and literacy experiences, their perspectives on their children’s early language and literacy acquisition, and their reports on how they are experiencing the efforts of early childhood education and care (ECCE) settings in the Little Senegal section of New York City. In previous chapters, I provided an analysis of the narratives that were shared through in-depth interviews of six research participants. This chapter will briefly reintroduce essential details (the background and design of the study) and then proceed to discussions of the findings and their implications. This final chapter is divided into four sections: (a) Background, Relevant Scholarship, Purpose of the Study, and Design, which restates the origin of the study; (b) Discussion of Findings, which further examines the assertions made in Chapter five through the research scholarship; (c) Implications, which provides considerations that policy makers, researchers, learning practitioners, parents, and community partners could undertake in order to cultivate more inclusive family literacy programs for Francophone African-born parents and their children in ECCE settings; and (d) Limitations for Study/Considerations for Further Study, which acknowledges the confines of the research while positing related topics that warrant ongoing investigation to support the development of comprehensive family and intergenerational literacy programs in ECCE settings.

Background

This portion of the chapter re-establishes the relevant scholarship, purpose of the study, and design that were introduced in Chapters One, Two, and Three. This background information frames the discussion of the research findings and implications.
**Relevant Scholarship**

Scholarship on emergent literacy research, family and intergenerational literacy programs and African-born immigrants, and information concerning ECCE settings in New York City form the foundation for this study. This section presents research on the framing and implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programs that work with families who are culturally and linguistically diverse. The extant research on African-born immigrants is explored with an awareness that an absence in scholarship, educational policy, and curriculum design exists. Finally, this section of the chapter presents the current growth of ECCE settings in New York City.

**Emergent literacy research.** Children’s growth in language and literacy begins at birth, before they are exposed to conventional reading and writing that occurs through compulsory schooling (Ehri & Roberts, 2006). The first five years of a child’s life are instrumental in their literacy and language development (Kim & Byington, 2016). Emergent literacy research has provided insight into the ways in which parents’ and caretakers’ language and literacy practices and interactions with young children directly influence their children’s language and literacy acquisition, knowledge, and awareness (Duncan, Dowsett, & Claessens, 2007; Phillips & Shonkoff, 2000; Pianta, LaParo, Payne, Cox, & Bradley, 2002; Sticht & McDonald, 1989; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). The emergent literacy scholarship established an understanding that parents are their children’s first teachers (Cordry & Wilson, 2004). Furthermore, emergent literacy research has established that oral language and literacy practices that align with school expectations lead to children’s “readiness” for schooling and their later academic prowess (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Duncan, Dowsett & Claessens, 2007; Pianta et al., 2002; Shanahan & Lonigan, 2013).
Family and intergenerational literacy programs. Family and intergenerational programs have a broad definition, with the adults in children’s lives being utilized to strengthen their literacy awareness with both indirect and direct guidance from schools (Nickse, 1990). Hannon (2003) defined family literacy programs as “programmes to teach literacy that acknowledge and make use of learner’s family relationships and engagement in family literacy practices” (p. 100). The implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programs varies, with the existence of programs that provide direct instruction to parents on the ways in which they can engage in literacy activities through adult education programs. Correspondingly, there exist family and intergenerational literacy programs that indirectly provide instruction to parents regarding literacy knowledge and skills through providing children with activities at school that require completion at home (Van Steensel, McElvany, Kurvers, & Herppich, 2011). In this particular research study, the narratives give reason to conclude that the respondents were engaged in a Type 4 family literacy model, where their children’s literacy behavior and knowledge were directly influenced by a school-based program that was teacher-supervised and had homework assignments and reading materials provided by the school (Nickse, 1990). The research participants did not state directly that they were aware of an explicit family literacy program, but in the Type 4 model, the parents do not receive explicit literacy instruction, and there is an expectation from the school that their ability to support literacy at home may vary.

Historically, school readiness assessments have not acknowledged the robust nature of literacy and language experiences and practices of linguistically and culturally diverse families (Souto-Manning, 2013). The nature of the relationship between home and school has been presented in empirical research studies predominately in two ways: “Worlds Apart frameworks” and “Worlds Together frameworks” (Doucet, 2011, p. 2707). The “Worlds Apart frameworks”
are reflected in emergent literacy and family involvement empirical studies as distinct differences in expectations, values, and practices of home and school (Cook-Cottone, 2004; Doucet, 2005; Li, 2003; Pransky & Bailey, 2005; Sabry & Bruna, 2007; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Yamauchi & Tharp, 1995; Zéphir, 2001). Emergent literacy and family involvement scholarship claims that inadequacies at home persist, which has a negative effect on school readiness (Crozier & Reay, 2005; Fine, 1993; Graue, Kroeger, & Prager, 2001; Lareau, 1994, 1996, 2000).

“Worlds Together frameworks” in family involvement and emergent literacy research present the ways in which values, beliefs, and expectations between home and school can coalesce to intentionally meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Doucet, 2008; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2004; Valdès, 1996). In family involvement and emergent literacy research, “Worlds Together frameworks” acknowledge that there are opportunities to connect learning and awareness between home and school. The development of reciprocal relationships and an expanded understanding of how language and literacy is being used in diverse home settings are crucial to the growth of partnerships between home and school (Bright, 1996; Cairney, 2000; Epstein, 2001; Hall, 2008; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2004; Smith, 2009; Valdès, 1996). The various facets of children’s lives influence their language and literacy development and are considered interconnected and interdependent (Weiss, Coffman, Post, Bouffard, & Little, 2005). The experiences and context of home are not negated by educators and policymakers. Instead, they are incorporated into the decisions made about how to best create an ideal learning environment for culturally and linguistically diverse families and their children (Doucet, 2011; Epstein, 2001).

Immigrant families can view the imposition of American values and English language use in their lives and that of their children’s lives as imposing upon the survival of their own
identities, ideology, and heritage languages (Bulcroft et al., 1996; Doucet, 2011; Driscoll et al., 2008). There are implications to forging partnerships between home and school that can include the loss of home culture and adverse effects on social and educational outcomes for children (Doucet, 2011; Varela et al., 2004). Doucet (2011) asserted that “bridging can feel threatening to immigrant families” (p. 2710). In order to counter the American values and English language use, immigrant families have made decisions to send their children abroad to their social networks and extended families for periods of time and/or inform their children that this is an option when their developing ideologies, behaviors, and social capital are conflicting with that of their heritage (Olsen, 1997; Orellana, Thorne, Chee, & Lam, 2001; Trueba, 1998). Immigrant families also make the intentional decision to maintain their heritage language in their homes and negotiate its place in the lives of their young children (García & Kleifgen, 2010; Valdes, 2014).

Lawrence-Lightfoot (2004) posited that parents insert their own childhood histories, insecurities, and fears into their children’s parent-teacher conferences, which presents an obstacle in the creation of meaningful partnerships and exchanges between parents and educators.

Culturally and linguistically diverse groups of people who have been historically marginalized in the United States find that their children enter a schooling system where their identities are not widely recognized or considered (Auerbach, 1989, 1995, 2002). There are demands from academic institutions to have immigrant children assimilate by speaking the English language like a native speaker and to accept U.S. values. These diverse groups of children are being held to upper and middle class European standards that perpetuate the “culture of power,” which includes the rules and expectations of identity and practices that are viewed as the standard (Auerbach, 1989, 1995, 2002; Delpit, 1995). These disadvantages perpetuate
institutional racism and normalize it into the experience of diverse groups of families and their children (Gregg, Rugg, & Stoneman, 2012; Guo, 2006).

In this particular research study, the six respondents did not mention any instances in their conversations with ECCE personnel concerning their own cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Moreover, the research participants did not reveal that the educators queried them about their perspectives to facilitate learning experiences of their young children. Instead, the research participants narrated several instances where they were given a number of directives from the ECCE settings about how to develop their children’s language and literacy acquisition. These occasions primarily took place during parent-teacher conferences, transitions to and from school, and through the frequent assignments that were sent home. Furthermore, the standard that their children were being held to by the ECCE settings to judge their progress was an academic one that did not include the expectations and insight of the families themselves. In the narrations of the research participants, the absence of discussion about family members’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds suggests that their cultural identity and multilingualism were disregarded by teachers in ECCE settings.

**African-born immigrants.** There is minimal scholarship on immigrant children in urban schools, especially of those who are a part of the newer wave of immigrants in the United States, which includes African-born immigrants (Goodwin, 2002). This presents a challenge, as recommendations can be made by researchers, politicians, educational administrators, and learning practitioners in the development of educational policy, multicultural education, and family and intergenerational literacy programming that are not appropriate to the context and needs of this particular population (Hamza, 2005; Harushimana & Awokoya, 2011; Venters & Gany, 2011). Regarding African immigrants, Harushimana and Awokoya (2011) asserted that,
after reviewing the planning processes of U.S. educational institutions and curriculum initiatives, a “superficial understanding [exists] among American-born educators and peers [with] little known about their histories, their cultures, and their achievements” (p. 34).

African-born immigrants and their children contend with the “majority-in-the-minority” hegemony (Bullivant, 1981). Their racialized identity of Black is acknowledged in the United States, while their specific cultural and ethnic backgrounds remain poorly understood (Castellanos & Jones, 2003). African-born immigrants are an expanding group in the United States that has increased by 71% since the year 2000, according to the 2016 Pew Research Analysis (Anderson & López, 2018). New York City is a large metropolis that has received the largest influx of African-born immigrants (Zong & Batalova, 2017). The Little Senegal section of Harlem in New York is a testament to the growing diversity of this minority immigrant population, as it has become home to many Francophone African-born immigrants from countries like Senegal, Ghana, and the Congo. The demographic representation of African immigrants has created changes for the minority populations within the communities that they reside in and the schools that their children attend.

**ECCE settings in NYC.** Contemporary migration changes to New York City’s African-born population has coincided with an expansion of early childhood care and education settings (ECCE). In 2018, 70,000 pre-kindergarten children in the city attended a five-day-a-week ECCE program (Shapiro, 2019). The student enrollment data for 2017-2018 indicates that nearly 45% of the pre-kindergarten children come from homes where they were immersed in other languages that were not English (Morell & Medellin, 2019, p. 1). There are 1,850 ECCE programs located in district schools, charter schools, and pre-kindergarten centers. A number of these programs are located in the Little Senegal section of New York City and are working with Francophone
African-born families and their children. The creation of these ECCE programs have stimulated conversations and debates among parents, educators, and politicians about how to best serve children of immigrants (de Montlaur, 2019). The Department of Education’s Division of Early Childhood has recently promoted the term Emergent Multilingual Learner (EMLL) “to refer to preschool children before kindergarten who are learning a language other than English and who have the opportunity to become bilingual or multilingual in school” (Morell & Medellin, 2019, p. 1). The Department of Education indicates that it is promoting an inclusive ideology through the use of the term EMLL that both acknowledges the linguistic identity of diverse children and views that there are positive features of this linguistic ability that should be stimulated by schools.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research study is to develop an understanding of the perspectives, knowledges, and lived experiences of Francophone African-born immigrant family members as they narrate their own early language and literacy acquisition, their understandings of their children’s early English literacy and language acquisition, and their explanation of their interactions with the ECCE settings.

The questions that guided this study are:

- What do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members report about their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school?
- How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members explain their roles in their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?
• How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members describe their encounters in early childhood care and education settings that center on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?

Design

This study was qualitative and applied an in-depth interview design to uncover the narratives of six Francophone-African born immigrants in the Little Senegal section of Harlem in New York City. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) advised that the specific procedure employed when utilizing narrative inquiry should incorporate the following elements: “beginning the story, living the story, and writing the narrative” (p. 3). In the “beginning the story” stage, I identified four female and two male research participants through a purposeful sample. Each of the respondents had a child who attended an ECCE setting. Five of the research participants had more than one child, while one participant had one child. Five of the respondents for the research study I met during the drop off transition time at their ECCE setting, where I presented a detailed study invitation (see Appendix B). One research participant was introduced to me and the research study through a mutual friend. In addition, I met the two respondents for the pilot interviews during the drop-off transition time at their ECCE setting. Each of the research participants and those who participated in the pilot interviews was provided with information about their access to a French interpreter, whom I had personally trained to work on this study. The respondents were made aware that their participation was voluntary. The risks and benefits of the study were explained in detail to the respondents. In this research study, I identify the respondents as Francophone African-born immigrants, with an acknowledgement that that the data make evident that the respondents encompass various nationalities, experiences, languages, and ideologies.
In the stage of “living the story,” I collected data from each of the research participants through two in-depth, semi-structured interviews, which I audio-taped and meticulously transcribed. I took field notes and observations during the interviews, in order to capture specific elements, like the atmosphere, participants’ posture, gestures, temperament, and stance that were part of the experience of the interviews but would not be apparent through the audio recording. I developed the semi-structured interview protocols, and I have included them for reference in Appendices G and H. The initial and subsequent interview protocols were informed by Mishler (1986), who recommended conversational interviews; Creswell et al. (2007), who advised open-ended questions that provide flexibility for additional information and points of clarification; and Riessman (2008), who recommends that interviews stimulate detailed accounts.

In order to prepare for the “writing the narrative” stage, I managed the data from the semi-structured interviews through the program Dedoose. I used this software to organize the data from the various participants. I engaged in the analysis through several different stages. This particular research study was informed conceptually by Gee’s (1996, 2001, 2014) sociolinguistic theory. I identified meaning units through a thorough review of each of the individual narratives of the six research participants and from a comprehensive review of a compilation of all of the narratives as one unit. I integrated data from the themes, sub-themes, semi-structured interviews, memos, and my theoretical and conceptual framework to generate a comprehensive written account and to draw findings from the analysis.
Discussion of Findings

In Chapter five, I asserted four findings based upon my consideration of the themes and sub-themes that emerged across the narratives of the six research participants. In this section, I will underscore the central ideas in each of the findings.

Finding 1: During childhoods immersed in oral traditions, Francophone African-born parents were introduced to common understandings, values, and history integral to their identities and their families’ identities, and these traditions are apparent when they narrate their lives as adults.

The research participants emphasized the ways in which they learned their identity as part of a specific culture and family through the oral traditions. Each of the respondents referenced oral traditions—in the form of rendition, song, wise sayings, and historical accounts—that were delivered to them as young children by their parents and their extended family. With noticeable certainty, they shared who they were as children and the norms that they were expected to uphold through their lives. This identity and these expectations were conveyed through commonplace interactions that were woven into their lives as young children.

The respondents’ particular upbringings were shaped by oral traditions and directly influenced the nature of the telling of their own stories. Riessman (2002a, 2002b) asserted that people communicate and reinterprett their experiences through stories. The ways in which the research participants emphasized various elements of their stories included values of the collective identity and the role of the adults in their lives as models who shaped their experiences and learning as young children. The research participants presented the development of the foundation of their multifaceted and distinct identities through the long-lasting impression that oral traditions made in their lives.
Finding 2: Multilingualism was common throughout participants’ upbringing, and facility in functioning in multiple language communities and contexts shaped and became part of their identities.

Each of the six research participants spoke about the different ways in which they were engaged in speaking and understanding different languages and dialects when they were children. This was a common experience that was shared by the respondents who physically moved from their birthplace during their childhoods and for those who remained in their birthplace throughout their young lives. These occasions of meeting people who spoke various languages and dialects occurred in their homes, in their broader community, and at school through a myriad of experiences. The research participants explained that the adults around them expected them to adjust to the language expectations that they encountered by developing the ability to communicate and understand the language or dialect that was new to them. Each of the respondents expressed the ways in which their ability to navigate the new language provided them access into a different language community. There were also respondents who explained how the challenges that they faced in learning the new language or dialect signified which language communities they were a part of and which language communities they were not a part of. Each of the language communities that the research participants described had its own history, artifacts, culture, and ways of knowing, which was crucial to the participants’ establishment of their own identities and ability to effectively communicate with different language communities.
Finding 3: According to Francophone African-born parents, their childrearing decisions have included intentional actions in their home life to sustain their heritage languages while simultaneously supporting English language development, but their narratives indicate a tension resulting from striving to satisfy both aims.

Each of the six research participants expressed the importance of their children learning their heritage languages and learning English. The six respondents acknowledged that English was crucial to their children’s ability to advance academically. The five participants with multiple children narrated the ways in which the older siblings strengthened the abilities of their younger siblings to communicate and use English literacy and language, through their everyday interactions which occurred primarily in English. These five respondents provided their children with the ability and space to express themselves in English and interact with their siblings in English because of an importance they attributed to this language in their children’s academic progress.

Correspondingly, each of the six research participants expressed the ways in which they continued to engage with their children in their heritage languages. As described by some of the respondents, they continued communication in their heritage languages with their young children, even when their children responded in English. Three of the research participants mentioned that they arranged trips abroad to strengthen their children’s ability to communicate and connect with their family members who have remained in the family’s homeland or now reside in other parts of the world. Linda (communication, May 20, 2017, 271f) succinctly articulated this idea with the concept of “understand together,” which expresses the continued longing that she had for her children to take part in the exchange of family stories when they re-unite from time to time with relatives who are not nearby but share that common heritage. This
sentiment of having their children become proficient in their ability to express themselves fully with their extended family members and community in their heritage language was one that was shared by each of the participants. While there were two research participants who shared that they spoke with their children mainly in English, they also expressed their desire for their children to speak their heritage languages. The ability of the research participants to continue to hold onto their affiliation with specific affinity groups and being able to distinguish specific identities allowed for them to continue to establish that they were a “certain type of person” (Gee, 2000, p. 100). The use of heritage languages established a sense of kinship and recognition.

The competing objectives of sustaining their heritage languages and English was revealed through the research participants’ narrations as they shared about their exchanges and language practices. The participants expressed an ideology that supported the maintenance and value of their heritage languages. They also expressed the ways in which they engaged their children through homework assignments in English because of the belief that this reinforcement was needed to develop academic language. Each of the six respondents shared their awareness of the growing use and exposure to English that their young children were experiencing through their socialization at school and their encounters with it in the home through sibling exchanges and media. The research participants’ young children’s responses to their parents in English, even when they were prompted by their heritage language, signified a loss of culture and knowledge that the parents attempted to negotiate. These negotiations of language were evident through the research participants’ prompting of their children to speak in their heritage languages and providing opportunities for their children to spend time abroad to reinforce their heritage languages with their extended family and social networks.
Finding 4: Francophone African-born parents characterize their interactions with educators in ECCE settings as predominately one-way and prescriptive. Furthermore, they had interchanges with ECCE setting educators that ignored their multicultural heritage and bi/multilingualism.

Each of the six research participants described the ways in which English increasingly dominated the lives of their young children once they entered the ECCE settings, through media, interactions with siblings, school assignments, and their children’s enthusiasm to display their growing abilities as speakers of English. Moreover, the six respondents spoke about the importance of English in their children’s academic lives. Three of the participants shared candidly that they intentionally spoke in English when assisting their children with their homework assignments, even though in many instances the English fluency of their children surpassed their fluency in English.

The primacy of English was reinforced through the interactions that the research participants expressed they had with the educators and administrators at their children’s ECCE settings. The knowledge, awareness and value of multilingualism that the research participants narrated having was not acknowledged or affirmed through their interactions with the ECCE settings. Instead, English dominated their encounters with their children’s teachers and was given precedence in their homes when completing academic tasks.

Each of the research participants described the ways in which they were in the role of a listener, while their children’s teachers were the talkers, during parent-teacher conferences. Although two research participants described their encounters with their children’s teachers as frequent, they characterized those instances in a way that made the communication appear to be one-way. In their stories, they did not portray themselves as cultivating an exchange with their
children’s teachers that was directed by them; instead, it appeared that the educators controlled the content and unfolding of the conversations. For each of the respondents, parent-teacher conferences were crucial in providing an opportunity for them to learn about their children’s progress. In addition, each of the research participants described brief interactions with their children’s teachers during their drop off and pick up routine to and from the ECCE settings. Only one respondent described the ways in which she prompted her daughter’s teacher with a question about her progress during a transition time.

**Implications for Policy, Practice, and Scholarship**

For stakeholders in various spheres that influence Francophone-African born immigrants and their children’s lives, there are several implications arising from the findings of this research study. The findings indicate that there is a need for more expanded understanding and research of African culture and African-born immigrants’ experiences in the United States; there is a need to foster robust communication and exchanges between families and their children’s teachers in ECCE settings; and there is a need for expanded culturally relevant pedagogy training and “equity literacy” development. These implications for practice, policy, and research will be examined in this portion of the chapter.

**Expanded Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Training and “Equity Literacy” Development**

The narratives of the six research participants revealed that their multilingual abilities, knowledge, awareness, and cultural backgrounds were not acknowledged through their encounters within the ECCE settings. Each of the respondents discussed the ways in which their young children’s learning was organized and reinforced through English-only assignments and through their English communication with their children’s teachers. Each of the participants chose to support their children’s academic tasks through their own English language and literacy
abilities or through the support of older siblings in their households. Three of the respondents emphasized the importance of using English, despite their own limitations in the language, when they were completing academic assignments. All six of the research participants, seemingly influenced by their educators at their children’s schools, equated the reinforcement of English at home as a way to expedite their child’s English-language-learning.

At the same time, each of the research participants expressed how their own facility with multiple languages and their desires to sustain their children’s connection with their families and countries abroad made their heritage languages important to them. The research participants narrated the challenges they faced in sustaining their children’s allegiance to their history, culture, and extended family while also wanting their children to successfully navigate the English language required of them in their academic environments. The primacy of English was further established through media and siblings and through their children’s eagerness to extend their newfound skill set in their homes. While multilingualism is present in the lives of the African-born immigrants and their children, it has an ambiguous presence in the ECCE settings. Multilingualism is vaguely acknowledged and is not affirmed as a crucial component to the lives of the research participants in the ECCE settings. The respondents’ narratives about their interactions with school personnel reveal that their complex identities were not fully embraced by the ECCE settings.

The marginalization that the research participants faced in the ECCE settings has implications for teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners. Teacher education programs provide opportunities to extend the learning and practice of both in-service and pre-service teachers, which is important. Teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners can broaden the conceptualizations and enactments of
family and intergenerational literacy programs by challenging cursory beliefs and stereotypes that are made regarding who African-born immigrants are, how their language and literacy practices manifest, and the ways that these family members are assets in the classroom and in their children’s lives. Allen, Jackson, and Knight (2012) supported the creation of programs for African-born immigrants that “affirm, develop, or negotiate their cultural identities and view their ability to speak their mother tongue as an asset worth maintaining” (p. 9). Cultural integrity can be maintained through a positive and comprehensive portrayal and understanding of these culturally and linguistically diverse families.

Based on the narratives, it is likely that a misunderstanding prevails among teachers about the use of heritage languages and the acquisition of the English language. Learning practitioners can become more self-aware and self-reflective as they ponder and encounter their implicit biases that can lead to privileging English and a deficit perspective. In classrooms throughout the United States, teachers are often unable to communicate or provide instruction in a language other than English and have limited knowledge and understanding on the topic of second language development (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2016). The use of multiple languages can be viewed as a threat to the privileged status of English. This has led to the dominance of English-only instruction and the “subordination of home languages to English [which] often causes students personal, cultural, and familial tensions” (Billings & Walqui, 2017, p. 1). As linguistically diverse students attempt to reconcile the use and relevance of their home language and their growing fluency of the language of prestige, English, they can compromise their home language to the point where their fluency is greatly diminished and leads to the phenomenon “subtractive bilingualism” (Cummins, 1981). The resources and social capital that the knowledge and use of the heritage language fostered are no longer available to those speakers who have lost
their abilities to use this language. It is pivotal for learning practitioners to contemplate and intentionally plan how they will create a more inclusive learning environment that does not discriminate against those who have language and heritage differences that do not align with ideologies of who an American is and how English should be spoken.

The reality of multilingualism in the lives and identity of Francophone African-born immigrants is important for educational administrators and learning practitioners in ECCE settings to acknowledge. Each of the family members expressed the ways in which they were circumstantial bilinguals, which are people who develop language fluency in order to participate “economically and civically in the new society in which they find themselves” (Billings & Walqui, 2017, p. 1). Moreover, multilingualism should be understood as an asset that may be beneficial to family and intergenerational literacy programming. Culturally and linguistically diverse children enter ECCE settings with a number of language and literacy experiences that should not be discounted because they did not occur in the predominant language of English. Instead, ECCE educational administrators and learning practitioners should account for the demographic changes in their schools that reflect the inclusion of language minority communities, like African-born immigrants, to inform the conception and implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programs that sustain the multilingual experiences of young children.

There are further implications of this finding for ECCE educational administrators and learning practitioners to consider in their creation and implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programs. Immigrant families in urban settings are faced with an onslaught of challenges that include their own adaptation to their new home, uncertainty as a linguistically-underrepresented community in the education system, and new demands as they
navigate raising their children in an unfamiliar metropolis that has its own challenges in pollution, crime, and stress (Auerbach, 1989, 1995, 2002). Scholarship on immigrant families has revealed that immigrants attempt to maintain their heritage languages in various ways, including trips to their native heritage countries and continued use of their native languages in their homes (Bulcroft et al., 1996; Driscoll et al., 2008). The continued use of heritage languages is an attempt by immigrant families to provide familiarity, stability, values, a sense of identity, and continued connection in order to buffer all of challenges encountered while integrating into a new country. Based upon the narratives in this particular research study, educators need to acknowledge that the continued use of a heritage language in the home is not a rejection of English but rather a purposeful attempt to keep their children and themselves connected to family members.

In addition, there are different ways in which teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners can present information and communicate in a responsive and recognizable way with culturally and linguistically diverse families. Garcia (2009) offered a possible framework with “translanguaging [which] is the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential” (p. 140). Translanguaging can provide the structures in the educational environment for students to engage in their “full linguistic repertoire” from the different languages that they are versed in in order to facilitate learning a new language (García, 2009). Alamillo, Yun, and Bennett (2017) posited that translanguaging pedagogy affirms the linguistic identity and diversity of multilingual children by framing their acquisition of languages with an additive perspective. Through translanguaging, there is no mandate that English needs to dominate all of the instruction, communication, and learning.
Instead, children are encouraged to use what they know in other languages to develop their facility in the newly acquired language (Alamillo et al. 2017; García, 2009). The tenets of translanguaging can be used to inform family and intergenerational programming. Linguistically and culturally diverse families can be encouraged to use the languages that they comprehend in order to better understand what is being asked of their children. Teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners can develop ways of utilizing the different languages of the diverse families to “teach to and through” (Gay, 2013) those languages in order to reach families in a way that recognizes and validates their contributions.

Culturally relevant pedagogy is pivotal for teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners to ensure that while recommendations are being made on how to best meet the needs for academic growth and wellbeing of diverse groups of students, considerations should be made on how to affirm their identities in the classrooms and schools, and conversations should be fostered in the larger school community that critically examine and challenge the inequities that exist and are perpetuated by the educational institution (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Currently the teaching force in the United States is predominately comprised of young, white, middle class, female teachers who are encountering a growing level of demographic diversity within their classrooms (Goodwin, 2002). The various facets of identity for diverse groups of students are under constant negotiation in the educational setting (Yon, 2000). ECCE administrators and learning practitioners can learn more about their own biases regarding immigrant families and second language learners to reframe how they are working with the families to meet the needs of their children. Parents can be positioned into an active role in determining the learning plans for their children and the learning occasions in their homes.
“Equity literacy” extends cultural competency and multicultural education by focusing on addressing inequities faced by those who are culturally and linguistically diverse (Gorski, 2009). Such a conception of literacy emphasizes social justice—which, Freire (1968/1998/2005) contended, is the main objective of education—to empower the marginalized to critique the institutions that uphold inequities. Equity literacy “cultivates in teachers the knowledge and skills necessary to become a threat to the existence of inequity in their spheres of influence” (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015, p. 37). Equity, instead of culture, is emphasized, which positions teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning practitioners to acknowledge and address the hegemonic forces—including racism, linguicism, xenophobia, and other institutional barriers—that impact the lives of underrepresented language communities. “Equity literacy” is a framework and a movement to “recognize, redress, and respond to inequity and sustain equity initiatives” (Gorski, 2013). Furthermore, it provides a way for the development of socially and critically conscious programming that views and makes changes to the systems and institutions in order to honor the identities and experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse families.

There are implications for educational policy to debunk anti-immigration sentiments, which continue to be debated by various states that have upheld English-only education initiatives, like Massachusetts and Arizona (Billings & Walqui, 2017). New York City, like a number of states, is rethinking its approach to multilingual language learners in the classroom. It has recently developed a framework of core principals to foster the learning and growth of EMLLs that promotes the use of heritage languages as a scaffold to learning other languages and a belief that the knowledge of multiple languages is beneficial to the learner (Morell & Medellin, 2019; see also Billings & Walqui, 2017). These educational policy changes and initiatives in
New York City are taking place in a climate that is hostile to immigrants and where the validation of multilingual instruction is still questioned.

The implications for policy, practice, and scholarship are summarized in Figure 4. Educational policy makers, researchers, teacher education programs, educational leaders, and learning practitioners can utilize the conclusions made from this study in order to better work with African-born immigrant families and their children in ECCE settings.

Robust Understanding of Both Dissimilarities and Commonalities of African-born Immigrants

This research study revealed that there are nuances in the experiences, identities, ideologies, and narratives of each of the respondents who identified as Francophone African-born immigrants. The identifier, Francophone African-born immigrant, does not encapsulate the full experiences and complex identities of this group of people. African-born immigrants are a heterogeneous group with a multitude of birthplaces and various connections to other countries. Four out of the six research participants in this study had moved from their birthplace to another linguistic community during their young lives. The languages that each of the participants considered their heritage languages, home languages, and mother-tongue varied, as each participant shared that they spoke more than one language and that some of these languages were reflected in their homes while others were not.

Harushimana (2007) argued that in the United States, the diverse cultural and linguistic identities of African-born immigrants are not considered, as they are mainly identified as “Black,” which equates primarily to African American and not to African-born or Caribbean-born. Furthermore, the identities of African-born immigrants are subsumed by the identifier “Black” in assessment data and in educational policy (Awokoya & Clark, 2008). There is a
dichotomy of being hyper-visible because of the assumptions that are made about the Black immigrant’s racial identity while also being invisible because their diversity of perspective, experience, and history is not recognized in educational policy and in programming of intergenerational and family literacy. This lack of acknowledgement and affirmation of who African-born immigrants are in the United States has implications for educational policy leaders who influence how the history and identity of Africa and African-born immigrants are presented and understood in U.S. schools (Awokoya, 2009; Ukpokudu, 1996). There is also a misrepresentation of the linguistic diversity on the continent of Africa, with debates about which languages are valid and whether multilingualism should be considered an asset. In addition, Michira (2002) emphasized the ways in which the media in the United States presents an inaccurate portrayal of Africa and African-immigrants as a place and people who lack Western knowledge and conventions, thus rendering this population as uneducated and uncivilized.

The creation and implementation of family and literacy programming should be expanded to include curricular design and pedagogy that recognize and include the vast diversity of African-born immigrants. An appropriate outreach and partnership between the ECCE settings and the African-born immigrant families could be stimulated by educational administrators who emphasize that learning practitioners need to learn from the families themselves. The implication for educational policy leaders is that larger changes must be made in curriculum and pedagogy to debunk stereotypes and misconceptions about Africa and African-immigrants. Curriculum, textbooks, and media must be more representative of the experiences and identities of this underrepresented language community.

The limited representation and understanding of Africa and African-immigrants in educational settings have implications for researchers. Scholarship on African-born immigrants
in the U.S. education system regarding how they experience schooling, their social status, economic status, and psychological wellbeing is largely underrepresented (Harishumana, 2007; Knight, 2011). Research is needed to offer a more substantive understanding of the experiences, backgrounds, and ideologies of African-born immigrants, especially as their children are entering the classrooms of the United States in much greater numbers, as contemporary migration trends reflect. The current preconceived notions held about Africa and African-born immigrants in the U.S. media and in the education system could be challenged by an array of scholarship. New research on the African-born immigrant experience could challenge and discourage the superficial belief that a census-required designation of “Black” equates to one culture or one way of being.

The expectations and supports could be created in educational policy to ensure that district leaders, administrators, and learning practitioners engage in conversations and practices that yield broader cultural perspective as they learn more about African-born immigrants’ identities, specific experiences, expectations, knowledges, awareness, and meanings that they ascribe to their prior experiences.

**Two-way Communication and Reciprocal Partnerships Needed Between Home and School**

This research study underscored the scholarship that has illuminated the ways in which family and intergenerational literacy programs can view immigrant families from a deficit perspective. When family and intergenerational programs operate with such a deficit orientation toward families, the roles of linguistically and culturally diverse families can be limited to promoting English-only expectations on their children. The six respondents narrated the ways in which they were informed about the values and practices of schooling through their involvement with school assignments and their encounters with the educators. Their stories indicated that
respondents were keenly aware that educators in the ECCE settings envisioned the family member’s role as hastening their children’s grasp of the culture of the school, especially in attaining a command of English essential for meeting academic expectations. Moreover, each of the six research participants described the ways in which their encounters with their children’s teachers placed them in the role of a listener, where the teacher primarily shared his or her expertise. In each of the six respondents’ narratives, there was an absence of descriptions of instances when they either were invited or decided on their own to interject with strategies and insights that they had about their children. There was also an absence of exchanges of ideas and expertise between the research participants and their children’s teachers, characterized by an equitable collaboration or instances when the school inquired about areas of competence in the home that they could build upon at school. Even in the instance of the two respondents, who were pleased to share that they had frequent encounters with the ECCE settings, there were no examples offered in regard to having comprehensive two-way exchanges with their children’s teachers. On the contrary, each of the six research participants described the ways in which their interactions with educators in the ECCE settings, both in-person and through school assignments, were predominately one-way communications.

The prevailing one-way communication described by the research participants has implications for ECCE educational administrators and learning practitioners who are developing and implementing family and intergenerational programs. The current educational policy measures of the Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) requires each state to develop and bridge conversations and collaboration between schools and parents. Family and intergenerational literacy programs have been identified as an opportunity to meet this objective. While the policy provides the mandate, the actual implementation of effective and responsive family and
intergenerational literacy programs in ECCE settings will occur with the follow-through and insight of educational administrators and learning practitioners. With regard to these matters, it is easy to focus primarily on the quantity of interactions between learning practitioners and families. Deserving more focused attention are the qualities that need to be present in those interactions.

In order to develop effective relationships and partnerships between the various participants in the school community, there must be a commitment to fostering relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Bryk and Schneider (2002) posited that “relational trust constitutes the connective tissue that binds [the school community] together” (p. 144). This foundation creates the ability for the school, families, and broader community to express concerns, develop shared standards, and hold each other accountable in working together to facilitate the educational growth of children. The development of reciprocal communication is critical to ensuring that respect is exhibited through listening genuinely and acknowledging varied opinions (Lencioni, 2002). Extant research has revealed that the transition times at the beginning and end of the school day, which are when parents leave their children and pick their children up from the educational setting, provide a crucial opportunity for developing a familiarity between families and educators. Four of the research participants in this study shared that these transition times, in addition to parent-teacher conferences, were the main opportunities where they encountered their child’s ECCE teachers in-person. The communication between teachers and family members during transition times is limited by its brevity. Endsley and Minish (1991) conducted a study in 16 daycare centers that served infant/toddler and pre-school aged children. These centers represented 70% of all the childcare settings serving this specific age group in a city of 65,000 residents (Endsley & Minish, 1991, p. 6). The analysis of data collected over a two-week period
at each setting allowed the researchers to conclude that the median length of communication between parents and educators during transition times was only 12 seconds long, and 63% of these exchanges were inundated with social etiquette, such as greetings. In addition, Endsley and Minish revealed that parents and educators did not acknowledge each other in approximately half of these encounters. Despite the brevity of these transition times, they have the potential to be reframed as intentional opportunities for connection and exchange.

The importance of transition times and parent-teacher conferences has implications for ECCE educational administrators and learning practitioners as they develop family and intergenerational programs. The transition times and parent-teacher conferences can be optimized to provide more substantive contact and to intentionally develop a repertoire and trust with immigrant families. Such a change in approach would display the ECCE settings’ understanding of the challenges facing immigrant families that can hinder their ability to be physically present at all school events.

The findings suggest potential benefits if ECCE educational administrators and learning practitioners foster environments where children and families can bring their whole selves to the implementation of family and intergenerational literacy programming. Trust can be developed through quality interactions that are not predicated on the educator presenting a list of expectations or a one-sided report on the child with little to no input from the families. Instead, there must be an environment that fosters opportunities for families to state who they are, who their children are, and what their language abilities are. This process, which makes visible to educators the family background and language capabilities at home, is possible when the educational administrators and learning practitioners adopt an asset perspective so that the differences identified in African-born immigrant families and their children are not seen as
detrimental to their children’s growth. This can be accomplished through the education and training provided to prepare the ECCE settings to cultivate family and intergenerational programs that are more inclusive learning environments for culturally and linguistically diverse families and their children.

ECCE administrators and learning practitioners can adopt expansive measures to include linguistically and culturally diverse families by implementing initiatives like those advocated through “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 2005). The concept of funds of knowledge asserts that everyone has “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household and individual functioning and wellbeing” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González 1992, p. 133). Diverse populations of people are viewed as competent, capable, and connected because of their cultural practices, distinctive life experiences, and community capital. Funds of knowledge operates with the underlying assumption that the knowledge, dispositions, and lived experiences of others can be incorporated by learning practitioners to create an environment that is relevant and responsive (Moll et al., 2005). Learning practitioners analyze “social histories, methods of thinking and learning, practical skills related to a community’s everyday life, especially their labor and language, and attempt to derive instructional innovations and insights from their analysis” (Genzuk, 1999, p. 9). Incorporating funds of knowledge asks educators to begin with curiosity, to accept themselves as learners, and to listen deeply. Learning practitioners can find themselves faced with discomfort as they encounter perspectives, ideas, experiences, history, and ways of making meaning that encompass unfamiliar features, employ an unrecognizable nature of relationship building, and enact belonging to socially and historically identities, which are known as “big ‘D’ discourses” (Gee, 1996, 2001, 2014). There is a critical opportunity here for learning practitioners to recognize that the language and literacy
features and expectations of the academic environment and of the home environment are in “conversation” through “language-in-use,” “little ‘d’ discourse” (Gee, 1996, 2001, 2014). There is negotiation, contention, and compromise that exists in “little ‘d’ discourse” between learning practitioners and families that can further disadvantage culturally and linguistically diverse families without equitable exchanges and changes to pedagogy and practice. Moreover, recognition of funds of knowledge reaffirms the humanity of diverse groups of people and asserts that these historically marginalized groups have full and complete experiences and knowledge that can be overlooked by educators without intentional action.

An awareness of the immigrant family experience can be perplexing to educators in ECCE programs as they employ family and intergenerational literacy programs. “Funds of knowledge” provides a blueprint on how to delve into active research and understanding of diverse families and students (Moll et al., 2005). Learning practitioners could also develop strategic measures that incorporate families in a meaningful fashion in the learning processes of their children. The creation of additive models of family and intergenerational literacy programs are possible in ECCE programs when administrators and learning practitioners focus on acknowledging and incorporating the identities and experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse family members and students into their pedagogy.
FINDING 1
During childhoods immersed in oral traditions, Francophone African-born parents were introduced to common understandings, values, and history integral to their identities and their families’ identities, and these traditions are apparent when they narrate their lives as adults.

Implications for Practice
- Expanded culturally relevant pedagogy training

"Equity literacy" development

Implications for Policy
- Robust understanding of both dissimilarities and commonalities of African-born immigrants
- Recognition of complex identities, multinational migration patterns and multilingual backgrounds
- Two-way communication

FINDING 2
Multilingualism was common throughout participants’ upbringing, and facility in functioning in multiple language communities and contexts shaped and became part of their identities.

Implications for Practice
- "Equity literacy" development

FINDING 3
According to Francophone African-born parents, their childrearing decisions have included intentional actions in their home life to sustain their heritage languages while simultaneously supporting English language development, but their narratives indicate a tension resulting from striving to satisfy both aims.

Implications for Policy
- Recognition of complex identities, multinational migration patterns and multilingual backgrounds

FINDING 4
Francophone African-born parents characterize their interactions with educators in ECCE settings as predominately one-way and prescriptive. Furthermore, they had interchanges with ECCE setting educators that ignored their multicultural heritage and bi/multilingualism.

Implications for Practice and Scholarship
- Reciprocal partnerships
- Substantial analysis of African-born immigrants

Figure 4. Implications for Policy, Practice and Scholarship
Limitations and Delimitations

In this section, I reflect on the various limitations and delimitations for this particular study. One limitation was facilitated by the current hostile climate for immigrants in the United States, which I did not anticipate as I engaged in this research study in 2016. Immigrants are currently facing an unwelcoming political climate in the United States, which presents them as a detrimental addition to the country (Fryberg et al., 2011). At the time of my study, there were a great deal of challenges that I encountered in gaining trust from ECCE settings in Little Senegal and from one of the major community centers in that area. The African-born immigrant community in New York City communicated a feeling of lack of safety and uncertainty about their status in the country. This climate limited my ability to secure participation from a larger group of respondents. I secured the participation of six research participants and two respondents for the pilot study. This was a lesson learned as a researcher: The intentions of engaging in such a study to provide visibility to an underrepresented language community could be met with hesitation because of the current sociopolitical climate. While I explained earlier that the sociopolitical conditions concerning immigrant populations did affect my recruitment of participants, I am not fully aware of the ultimate effect those conditions had on the composition of my sample.

The term Francophone African-born immigrant is a limitation that does not fully encapsulate the diversity of experiences, heritage, ideologies, and languages of the research participants. Even with the six research participants in this study who were raised in the same country, there were nuances in their identities and experiences. In addition, this research study was limited to respondents who resided and who had children that attended ECCE settings in one geographic area, the Little Senegal section of Harlem in New York City. The family narratives in this research study only include those of the six research participants in regard to the early
language and literacy development of their children. Family literacy policies and teacher narratives were not included.

An additional limitation to this study was that each of the research participants was a biological parent to a pre-school-aged child. The respondents each had a partner to whom they were married. This study did not include extended family members or the older siblings, who also shared the childrearing duties.

Two of the research participants were unable to commit to a second in-depth interview because of the demands of their service jobs over their time. In order to address this limitation, I implemented a process of constantly checking with the participants throughout each of the interviews to ensure that I was understanding the information that they were sharing with me the way that they meant it to be communicated. For the remaining four participants, I was able to speak with them during a second in-depth interview.

I acknowledge that my own background created limitations. I am a first-generation American who attended schools in the United States and could relate to some of the experiences narrated by the family members. I grew up speaking a heritage language with my close-knit family and community, which also informs my perspective.

The study was delimitated in several ways. The research participants were Francophone African-born parents. I sought a sample of people who were from a specific region in Africa that shared a linguistic identity. The respondents each resided in the Little Senegal section of New York City. This is a West African enclave in the central portion of Harlem. They had a pre-school aged child who attended ECCE programs in Little Senegal. Each of the respondents lived in the United States for less than 10 years. I determined the participant exclusion criteria prior to
the start of the research study. With regards to the delimitations, they appear to have been appropriate for this study and reflected in the data.

**Future Research**

There is a need for research studies to provide more insight into the various ways that African-born immigrant families experience the efforts of schooling and how their children are performing. Future research can examine more closely the intersection of linguistic identity and cultural identity as African-born immigrants navigate their transition to the United States and their children’s acquisition of an American identity and the English language. In this study, the research participants’ narratives did not reveal the extent to which they viewed their race as a factor in their encounters with the ECCE settings. This is an area that requires further exploration. There is the potential for research that considers African-born immigrants in other locations throughout the United States, including urban, rural, and suburban environments. Research that examines the differences in the socio-economic status of the African-born immigrants, their transitions to the United States, and their engagement in the schooling process can be considered. There is a need for future research that combines the perspectives and insights from narrations that include each of the stakeholders in a young child’s development: the child, the parents, extended family, siblings, community partners, educators, and administrators. In addition, research that is based on direct observation of interactions between families and educators and critical discourse analysis of the transcripts of conferences, transitions, and other encounters could examine more directly the asymmetrical power relationships indicated by the participants’ narratives (Gee, 1996, 2001, 2014).
Final Thoughts

This study adds to the limited number of empirical studies on African-born immigrants by presenting their perspectives and thoughts on their own backgrounds and their families’ interactions with ECCE programs. This research study depicts the variances in perspectives and experiences of the six immigrant family members who contributed to the study in regard to their own language and literacy development and that of their young pre-school aged children. The sense of identity and collective identity constantly resonated through the narrations of the research participants. They want their children to have a deeper collective sense that extends beyond their children’s current lived experiences in New York City. The connections made both locally and globally through the knowledge and use of language are not reflected in the current reality and knowledge of whom the schools understand these parents to be. There is a complexity that needs to be considered, especially as identity is rooted in language use and development. In encounters within schools, these research participants did not even imagine finding the space to speak to educators about the complexities of their culture and language. There are many important variables affecting the work of the family’s sense of identity and their desire to sustain their heritage languages, and they are far more complicated than how they initially appear to personnel in ECCE settings. Family and intergenerational literacy programs can be created to be more inclusive to the lived experiences and negotiation of identity faced by African-born immigrants.

During my dissertation journey, I realized that I was answering a question that was sown within me as a young girl. I found myself navigating and negotiating my own identity as a child of immigrants whose first language was English patois. I faced my own uncertainty, dissonance, and sometimes shame in not knowing American culture and schooling the way that many of my
peers and teachers did. This research study provided me with insight into the ways in which my own experience converges and diverges from the ones that I was able to delve so deeply into through the narratives of the research participants. I found this dissertation journey healing, as I found the language to express and emphasize, not only through the extant research but through the voices of African-born immigrants, that diverse lived experiences and perspectives on American schooling exist and must be considered.

I expanded my knowledge of this group of African-born immigrants and their experiences. There is so much that I learned about ways of being, using language to connect, and negotiating affiliation through each of the narrations that were shared with me. This dissertation journey has ignited my continued desire to work with and on behalf of African-born families as a gatekeeper who can direct teacher education programs, ECCE administrators, and learning professionals to develop appropriate and dynamic family and intergenerational literacy programs that meet the needs of these families. I want to bring together other researchers of African-born immigrants through conferences in order to share what we know and create a climate and space of spurring others to begin empirical studies to illuminate the richness of identities and experiences of this particular population. My hope is that through this particular research study, I can work closely with other African-born immigrants, community members, politicians, and educators to expand and reframe their approach to educating children of this underrepresented language community so that it is centered in equity and social justice.

While this process of engaging in research was complex, it was extremely rewarding to me. This study revealed so many subtleties in the lived experiences and identities of the respondents that had a profound impact on the ways in which they were experiencing the efforts of schools. I realized through the process of conducting this research study that I enjoyed not
only learning about the complexities that exist between immigrant families and ECCE settings but also writing about it so that I have now contributed to the research in this field, especially regarding how to attend to and learn from the ways these immigrant family members relate the stories of their lives. This research study has compelled me to expand what I have learned about the process of conducting research in order to lead additional studies that can further inform scholarship that explores the experiences of African-born immigrants in ECCE settings.

This research study affirms that an expanded conception and application of school readiness that encompasses children, schools, and families is needed in policy, practice, and scholarship. Historically, these understandings and conversations regarding school readiness have primarily focused on the development of academic competencies, knowledge, and behavior in children that align with the European/American, middle class expectations of educational institutions. The concept of school readiness is multidimensional and addresses children’s learning and development, the creation of school policies and practices that support learning for all children, and the acknowledgment of the influence of parents’ and caregivers’ attitudes and involvement in their children’s lives. The complexity of the notion of school readiness has the ability to influence individual and societal development, which must be acknowledged and underscored in the creation of equitable policies and practices for children and families who are racially, socioeconomically, culturally, and linguistically diverse.

This research study intends to challenge the anti-immigration, xenophobic discourse and environment that currently pervades U.S. politics. It debunks stereotypes about historically marginalized groups of people, including racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse people. In my stance as both a researcher and an educator, I affirm that there are strengths, community wealth, social capital, and rich histories that exist within diverse populations of people that
should be acknowledged within the U.S. educational system in order to create a more equitable experience for the children of these families. There is also a cultural resistance that is evident within immigrant families as they negotiate their own and their children’s identities, ideologies, and connections.

The debates involving politicians, researchers, educators, administrators, and families about who should determine how culturally and linguistically diverse families and their children are engaged through literacy programs are constantly evolving. It is urgent to create programs that are imbued by equity and inclusivity, as compulsory schooling influences children younger and younger. Currently, New York City is taking the lead in the United States by employing extensive pre-kindergarten programming for children who are three, four, and five years old. It is crucial for politicians, researchers, learning practitioners, and administrators to remember that early childhood policies, practices, and scholarship do not influence a nebulous data set. Instead, they influence a child, a family, and a community. As the U.S. schooling system continues to reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of the families who reside here, there is a moral obligation to uphold the humanity of the people and ensure that the children remain whole as they navigate this academic environment.

My hope is that this research study serves as a counternarrative to the deficit perspective of immigrant families and solidifies that there is so much more that must be understood about these groups of people and how they experience the efforts of schooling, with the commitment that the way to that understanding begins with close attention to their voices.
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APPENDIX A: LETTER TO EARLY CHILHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE CENTERS

Study Title: An Examination of Francophone African-born Immigrant Adult Family Members’ Narratives Regarding Their Children’s Early Language and Literacy Development

Dear __________________:

My name is Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Graduate School of Education at Lesley University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my Ph.D. in Educational Leadership, and I am seeking your permission to recruit parents or guardians to participate in my study. I am investigating the perspectives of adult family members on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition. I am interested in the personal accounts that these family members share about their interactions with school on this topic, and their knowledge and social relationships that stimulate early English language development of their children.

This research study will not evaluate your particular early childhood program, instead it will describe the meaning and way of understanding that specific parents have on early English language development.

I am requesting your assistance with identifying parents or guardians who fill the following criteria, and I am requesting that you distribute the attached flyers to them:

- African-born immigrant
- French speaking
- Has a pre-school age child

Ideally, I would like to distribute flyers advertising this study at arrival, dismissal, or school event. When I am present to hand out the flyers I will able to describe the study to parents, address their questions and concerns and collect contact information if they are interested in enrolling.

I am interested in gaining more insight from parents and guardians who are French-speaking African-born immigrants because of the limited research on this group of people who have made a presence in Harlem, and the potential to learn more that can inform how schools and community organizations create meaningful partnerships with these families. I am requesting that you distribute the attached flyers informing French speaking African immigrant families about this study. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for families to return their interest forms. Family members who have indicated an interest in the study will be contacted to participate in 2 interviews that will last for 60-90 minutes. A convenient meeting location will be chosen based on the family member’s preference. Please note that none of the research activities will take place on your school property.

All responses will be confidential. I will make every effort to preserve anonymity of the participants by assigning each person with an identification number so that their names do not
appear on any of the documents. All documents associated with this study will also be kept in secure data files and locations.

If you would like more information, I would be happy to discuss this with you by email, phone, or a meeting in person. I can be reached at 347------- or kjoyce2@lesley.edu.

Regards,

Kimberly Joyce-Bernard
Researcher
Ph.D. Candidate in Educational Leadership, Lesley University
M.Ed.
APPENDIX B: INVITATION TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS
RESEARCH STUDY INVITATION TO FRENCH SPEAKING AFRICAN-BORN PARENTS AND GUARDIANS

Doctoral Student Invites French Speaking African Born Families to Speak with Her

Introduction
My name is Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Graduate School of Education at Lesley University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. I would like to invite French speaking African-born families to have a conversation with me as part of my Ph.D. research in Educational Leadership degree.

Purpose
I want to learn parent and guardian stories and viewpoints on your children’s early English language, reading, and writing development. I want to better understand how family conditions, life circumstances, the home environment, and relationship with school affect your children’s growth as English speakers, readers, and writers.

Participants
This study will include adult family members who are:
African-born immigrant
French speaking with limited skill in English language
Has a 4-5-year-old child who is attending preschool

Parts of the Study
This research study has 2 meetings in person which will last about 60-90 minutes. These interviews will take place at a location that works for you.

Confidentiality
All responses will be confidential. I will make every effort to ensure that your specific ideas and thoughts are not attributed to you by keeping data files in secure locations, and changing the names on responses.

Choice
Taking part in the study is your decision. You may also stop participating in this study at any time or decide not to answer any question you are not comfortable answering.

Contact
If you have any questions about the study please contact:
Kimberly Joyce-Bernard -Researcher ------- or kjoyce2@lesley.edu
Dr. Paul Naso, Ed.D. -Senior Faculty Advisor pnaso@lesley.edu

Next Steps? Return the next page to the researcher in the self-addressed envelope.
Doctoral Student Invites French Speaking African Born Families to Speak with Her Please return this page in self-addressed envelope

Take a quick look at these items to determine if your family is eligible to participate:

* You are an African-born immigrant

* You are French speaking

* You have a 4-5-year-old child who is attending preschool

Please answer the following:

* Do you live in the Little Senegal section of Harlem? If unsure, please provide your home address

* Gender: Male or Female

* How many years have you lived in the United States?

If you are interested in participating, please provide your contact information:

Parent or Guardian Name: __________________________________ Telephone Number: ________________________________

________________________________________________________ Email Address: ___________________________________

Questions? Contact the researcher for the study: Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, ----------, kjoyce2@lesley.edu
Etudiante en doctorat invite les familles d’origine Africaine francophones à parler avec elle

**Introduction**  Je me prénomme Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, je suis une étudiante en Doctorat à l’Université de Lesley à Cambridge, Massachusetts. Je souhaiterais inviter des familles francophones nées en Afrique à discuter avec moi dans le cadre de mon doctorat qui est en recherche en éducation et “Leadership”.

**Objectif**  Mon objectif est d’apprendre, des parents et tuteurs, et d’avoir leurs points de vue sur l’apprentissage de l’anglais écrit, oral et parlé de leurs enfants. Je souhaiterais comprendre comment les différentes circonstance de la vie, de l’environnement familial et des les relations avec l’école affectent vos enfants dans leurs progression en Anglais.

**Participant**  Cette étude comprendra des membres adultes de la famille qui sont:
- Originaire d’Afrique
- Parlant Français avec des compétences limitées en langue anglaise
- A un enfant de 4 à 5 ans, qui est allé à préscolaire

**Parties de l’étude**  Cette étude se compose de 2 entretiens qui dureront entre 60 à 90 minutes chacun. Celles-ci se dérouleront au lieu qui vous convient le mieux.

**Confidentialité**  Toutes les réponses de l’entretien seront confidentielles. Je ferai tous ce qui est en mon pouvoir pour garder les fichiers dans un endroit sécurisé et en changeant les noms des parents et enfants sur chaque questionnaire.

**Choix**  Participer à l’étude est une décision personnelle, vous pouvez cesser l’étude à tout moment ou décider de ne pas répondre aux questions auxquelles vous ne vous sentez pas à l’aise de répondre.

**Contact**  Si vous avez des questions au sujet de l’étude, veuillez contacter : Kimberly Joyce-Bernard -Researcher --------- or kjoyce2@lesley.edu Dr. Paul Naso, Ed.D. -Senior Faculty Advisor pnaso@lesley.edu

**Prochaines étapes ?** Redonner la page suivante au chercheur dans l’enveloppe pré-adressée
Une étudiante en doctorat invite les familles d’origine Africaine francophone à parler avec elle

Veuillez retourner cette page dans une enveloppe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jetez un coup d’œil à ces éléments pour déterminer si votre famille est éligible pour participer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vous êtes un immigrant d’origine africaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vous parlez Français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vous avez un enfant de 4 à 5 ans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S’il vous plaît répondez aux questions suivantes:

Vous habitez dans le “Petit Sénégal” à Harlem ? En cas de doute, veuillez fournir votre adresse de domicile
Sexe : Masculin ou Féminin
Depuis combien d’années vivez-vous aux États-Unis ?

Si vous êtes intéressés à participer, veuillez fournir vos coordonnées :
nom du/des parent(s) ou du tuteur: ________________________________ Numéro de téléphone: ____________________
moment pour appeler: ________________________________ Adresse de Email: ________________________________

Questions? Contactez le chercheur de l’étude: Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, ---------- ou kjoyce2@lesley.edu
APPENDIX D: AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Responsible Researcher: Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, Ph.D. Candidate in Educational Leadership, Lesley University and Dr. Paul Naso, Ed.D., Faculty Advisor

Title of Study: An Examination of Francophone African-born Immigrant Adult Family Members’ Narratives Regarding Their Children’s Early Language and Literacy Development

1. You have been asked to participate in the research study that aims at investigating: a) your early language, writing, and reading experiences, b) the early language, writing, and reading experiences of your children, c) the exchanges you have about early language, writing, and reading with your child’s early childhood education center

2. You will be asked to participate in 2 interviews that will last 60-90 minutes. No preparation is required to participate.

3. Completing the interviews involves no risk to you.

4. This research has the potential to inform early childhood education and care programs in New York City how they can find ways to enhance the relationships they build with families who are culturally and linguistically diverse.

5. Although the results of this study may be published, no information that could identify you will be included.

6. Questions about this research should be addressed to Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, kjoyce2@lesley.edu or to Dr. Paul Naso at pnaso@lesley.edu. Complaints about the research may be presented to Robyn Falum Cruz, Ph.D., rcruz@lesley.edu or Terrence Keeney, Ph.D., tkeeney@lesley.edu. There is a Standing Committee for Human Subjects in Research at Lesley University to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Contact the Committee Chairperson at irb@lesley.edu

7. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to “not participate” in the study.

8. Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the interviews. If you decide to participate in the interviews, you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative effect on your relations with the early childhood education center.

9. You will receive a copy of this letter for your records.
Thank you for participating in the interviews!
Warm Regards,
Kimberly Joyce-Bernard
Researcher
Ph.D. Candidate in Educational Leadership, Lesley University
M.Ed.

________________________________________________________________________
Participant First and Last Name and Date

________________________________________________________________________
Participant Signature of Agreement

________________________________________________________________________
Researcher First and Last Name and Date

________________________________________________________________________
Researcher Signature of Agreement
APPENDIX E: FRENCH AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Enquêteurs chargés: Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, Ph.D. Candidate in Educational Leadership, Lesley University and Dr. Paul Naso, Ed.D., Faculty Advisor
Titre de l’étude: Un examen des récits des immigrants d’origine africaine Francophone adultes membres de la famille sur l’apprentissage de l’alphabétisation de leurs enfants dans la maison et l’école
Vous avez été invité à participer à l’étude de recherche qui a pour but d’étudier: a) votre précoce des langues, écriture et la lecture des expériences, b) le précoce des langues, écriture et la lecture des expériences de vos enfants, c) les échanges que vous avez concernant précoce des langues, écriture et la lecture avec le centre d’éducation de la petite enfance de votre enfant

1. Vous avez été invité à participer à l’étude de recherche qui a pour but d’étudier : a) votre précoce des langues, écriture et la lecture des expériences, b) le précoce des langues, l’écriture et des expériences de lecture de vos enfants, c) les échanges que vous avez concernant précoce des langues, écriture et la lecture avec le centre d’éducation de la petite enfance de votre enfant

2. On vous demandera de participer à des entrevues de 2 qui durera 60-90 minutes. Aucune préparation n’est nécessaire pour participer.

3. Comment remplir les entrevues ne comporte aucun risque pour vous.

4. Cette recherche a le potentiel pour informer l’éducation et des programmes de soins à New York, comment ils peuvent trouver des moyens de renforcer les relations qu’ils construisent avec les familles qui sont culturellement et linguistiquement diverses.

5. Bien que les résultats de cette étude puissent être publiés, aucune information permettant de vous identifier ne seront inclue.

6. Questions au sujet de cette recherche doivent être adressées au Kimberly Joyce-Bernard, kjoyce2@lesley.edu or to Dr. Paul Naso at pnaso@lesley.edu. Plaintes au sujet de la recherche peuvent être présentées to Robyn Falum Cruz, Ph.D., rrcruz@lesley.edu or Terrence Keeney, Ph.D., tkeeney@lesley.edu. 
Il y a un Comité permanent pour les sujets humains en étude à Lesley University pour les plaintes ou problèmes concernant tout projet de recherche peut et, indiquer si elles surviennent. Contacter le Président de la Commission à irb@lesley.edu

7. Aucun service d’aucune sorte, à laquelle vous êtes autrement intitulé, sera perdu ou compromise si vous choisissez de “ne pas participer” à l’étude.
8. Votre consentement est donnée volontairement. Vous pouvez refuser de participer à des entrevues. Si vous décidez de participer à des entrevues, vous êtes libre de retirer à tout moment sans aucun effet négatif sur vos relations avec le centre d’éducation de la petite enfance.

Vous recevrez une copie de cette lettre dans vos dossiers. **Je vous remercie pour votre participation aux entrevues !**

Meilleures salutations,

Kimberly Joyce-Bernard
Researcher
Ph.D. Candidate in Educational Leadership, Lesley University
M.Ed.

______________________________________________
Premier participant et prénom et la date

______________________________________________
Participant Signature de la Convention

______________________________________________
Chercheur premier et dernier nom et Date

______________________________________________
Chercheur Signature de la Convention
APPENDIX F: FRENCH INTERPRETOR COMPENSATION AND AGREEMENT

Title of Study: An Examination of Francophone African-born Immigrant Adult Family Members’ Narratives Regarding Their Children’s Early Language and Literacy Development

I, __________________________ [name of interpreter], do hereby agree to maintain full confidentiality when serving as an interpreter for this research project.

I will be performing the following translation services (check all that apply)

__ Transcribing recordings or other raw data into English from French
__ Verbally translating information from English into French and French to English
__ I verify that I possess the qualifications to accurately perform the translations
__ I agree to be compensated at $20/hour for my translation services. The hourly time will be formally logged in and out on a time sheet.

Specifically, I agree to:

1. keep all research information shared with me confidential by not discussing or sharing the information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) with anyone other than the researchers on this study;

2. hold in strictest confidence the identification of any individual revealed during the transcription of recordings, during a live oral interview, or in any other raw data;

3. not make copies of any raw data in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts), unless specifically requested to do so by the primary researcher;

4. keep all raw data that contains identifying information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) secure while it is in my possession. This includes:
   
   • keeping all digitized raw data in computer password-protected files and other raw data in a locked file;
   
   • closing any computer programs and documents of the raw data when temporarily away from the computer;
   
   • permanently deleting any e-mail communication containing the data; and

   • using closed headphones if transcribing recordings
5. give, all raw data in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) to the primary researcher when I have completed the translation tasks.

6. destroy all research information in any form or format that is not returnable to the primary researcher (e.g., information stored on my computer hard drive or any backup device) upon completion of the translation tasks.

Provide the following contact information for the interpreter:

Printed name of interpreter_____________________________

Address:_________________________

Telephone number:______________________

Signature of interpreter_____________________________

Date_________

Printed name of primary researcher_____________________________

Signature of primary researcher_____________________________

Date_________
## APPENDIX G: INITIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

**Internal Use Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male or Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the United States:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in Little Senegal, Harlem:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participant’s Children, Ages, and Early Childhood Education Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics Discussed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______ Participant Early Language and Literacy Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ Participant’s Child’s Early Language and Literacy Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ Participant’s Interaction with Early Childhood Education and Care Center around Early Language and Literacy Experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Topics Discussed:

### Post Interview Comments or Leads:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher (in French)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for joining us today. I am looking forward to our time together. My name is Kimberly Joyce-Bernard and I am the researcher. This is _________ and she is the French Interpreter. Before we proceed can you confirm which language you would find most comfortable to speak in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Interpreter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be translating for both of you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher (in English)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher will introduce herself, her work with families who were Francophone African-born immigrants, her interest in early language and literacy, and her interest in family members’ roles in supporting their children’s education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Interpreter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restate in French.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductory Protocol (Consent Form Needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher (in English)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have planned this interview to last no longer than 60 minutes. There will be a second interview at convenient time and location for you. During our time together, I have an interest in understanding your experience of learning language and your child’s experience of learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Interpreter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restate in French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher (in English)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be sure that I am accurate about what you have to say, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only researchers on the project will have access to the recordings which will be used for research purposes only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Interpreter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restate in French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher (in English)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, I am obligated to have you sign a consent form so that I can verify for my university that you have been informed of the purpose of the research and that you agree to participate. Let us read through this form together. Please feel free to stop me at any time to ask questions, which I will be sure to answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French Interpreter</th>
<th>Restate in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>The participant can add, elaborate, question, or disagree with the operating norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Interpreter</td>
<td>Restate in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Introduction</th>
<th>Researcher (in English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to take a moment for the French interpreter to introduce herself briefly and I am interested in learning who you are.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French Interpreter</th>
<th>Restate in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| French Interpreter | The French interpreter will introduce herself again and reiterate that her role will be to translate exactly what is said between the researcher and the participant. Ask the participant to introduce himself/herself (Name, child, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher (in English)</td>
<td>You have responded to an opportunity to participate in this study because you are Francophone African-born immigrant that lives in Little Senegal and has a child who is attending preschool. The research project that I am conducting is focused on understanding your thoughts on early language, reading and writing experiences that your child is involved with. My study does not aim to judge your experiences and knowledge, instead I want to learn from you. I want to learn about your experiences and your interaction with the school as your child learns to speak, listen, read, and write English. Do you have any questions about the purpose of the study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Interpreter</td>
<td>Restate in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>The participant is provided an opportunity to add, question, and/or elaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher (in English)</td>
<td>Clarify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Interpreter</td>
<td>Restate in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Indicates that he/she is ready to move on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: The semi-structured queries are to be used as a guide to illuminate the broader research question. The Researcher will pose the question with the French Interpreter providing the explanation. The participant will respond. The French interpreter provide explanation. Clarifying questions or questions that delve deeper will be posed by the Researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question #1</th>
<th>What do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members report about their own early language and literacy practices, experiences, and histories at home and at school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What are the places you lived before living here in Little Senegal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1a What were you like as a child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1b What sort of things did you do with your family?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 If I were there with you and your family, what would I see happening and what would I hear you talking about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What are examples of stories, lessons, or books that adults shared with you when you were a child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3a And what did that teach you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Please tell me about school and what you most remember about your time in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #2: How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members explain their roles in their children's early English language and literacy acquisition?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Please tell me about your child’s experiences learning English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1a What have you noticed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1b Is he/she interested?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1c Does he/she enjoy the process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are there any games that you play with your child or things that you do with your child that involves speaking or using books?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2a Do any of those things involve the use of English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In school your child will be learning to be an English speaker, reader, and writer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do you think your child will respond or is responding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research Question #3

How do Francophone African-born adult parents and family members describe their encounters in early childhood care and education settings that center on their children’s early English language and literacy acquisition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Please tell me about your discussions (French: entretiens) with your child’s teacher about his/her language learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1a Where does that happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1b If I were there, what would I hear you and the teachers saying to each other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Have you received any advice from your child’s teachers or anyone else about your child learning to read, write, and speak in English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2a What was it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2b Do you receive advice from anyone else?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Please tell me about growing up in ________ and growing up in the US.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3a Are there any ways that they are different?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3b Are there any ways that they are similar?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In research question #3, participants may believe that the researcher is attempting to evaluate their specific ECCE program. They may be inclined to state that they are satisfied with the school and that everything is going well. Reiterate through questioning that this is an opportunity for the researcher to understand the meaning and way of understanding the participants have.*
APPENDIX H: SUBSEQUENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ヴィー・ムーヴメント

➢ First I want to start with discussing your experiences as a child. You mentioned moving from ____________ as a child to ______________.
  ▪ What do you remember about that experience?
  ▪ Are there ways those places were similar?
  ▪ Are there ways those places were different?
  ▪ How did you feel about those experiences?
  ▪ So when you were in ______________ what language did you speak? Who did you interact with?
  ▪ And when you were in ______________ what language did you speak? Who did you interact with?
  ▪ When you recall speaking, reading, writing, playing, and singing in these languages what examples come to mind?
  ▪ What was it like to make this adjustment?
  ▪ Are there good things about having had this experience?
  ▪ Are there difficulties?

ヴィー・エクステンデッド・ファミリー・アンド・コミュニティ

➢ Based on the experiences that you have mentioned...
  ▪ What are some examples of what your child has learned at home or with family/community members in his/her use of English? And in his/her use of your home language?
  ▪ How are you interacting when you use English? And when you use your home language?
  ▪ What are the times that you use English? What are the times that you use your home language?

ヴィー・アカデミック・リーニング・アンド・カルチャーリーニング

➢ Parents express what they are hearing from the school
  ▪ Based on discussions that you have had with your child’s teachers, what have you learned about what your child is learning in school?
  ▪ Does your child’s teacher say what your child is able to do in school?
  ▪ Has the teacher shared a plan for your child in school?...for your child’s ability to read, speak, and write in English?
  ▪ Do you know why the teacher has made these decisions?

➢ Parents express what they think is happening in the school (Perceptions)
  ▪ Do you notice growth in your child’s ability to do well in school and in your child’s English growth?
What are some examples of what your child has learned at school that shows their English language development?

Is there anything about your child’s English language, reading, speaking, writing and playing that you wish that your child’s teacher understood better?

Do you notice any difference between how your child uses English at home in comparison to his/her use of English at school? What are those differences?

- **American schooling (what does it take to become familiar with schooling)**
  - What advice would you give to another family from (the participant’s country of origin) who is enrolling your child’s school?
  - What would be important for them to know?

- **Western orientation of increasing academic attainment**
  - As you notice your child learning to speak, read, and write in English…
  - How does that help your child?
    - If the participant doesn’t mention school (How does that help them in school?)
    - If the participant doesn’t mention community (How does that help them in their community?)