



# “Dice que es bajo” (“She says he’s low”): Negotiating breaches of learner identity in two Mexican families

Meredith McConnochie\*, Ariana Mangual Figueroa

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, United States

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 13 April 2015

Received in revised form 10 February 2017

Accepted 15 February 2017

Available online 7 March 2017

### Keywords:

Breaches

Literacy

Figured worlds

Mexican families

Homework

## ABSTRACT

This article examines the ways in which elementary-aged children from two Mexican families were socialized to adopt figured worlds of literacy through breach-identifying interactions that took place in the home. By integrating theories of ethnomethodology and figured worlds, this article illustrates how the identification and repair of breaches involve the negotiation of identities in educational contexts. The analysis tracks how and when the mothers drew upon teacher discourse of children’s “low” academic status to identify and repair breaches of pace, neatness, and English reading fluency during the completion of homework. The article provides new insights into how mothers and children reproduce school-derived ideologies at home when attempting to resolve learner-identity breaches. The findings are significant because they extend an ongoing conversation in the field about home-school relationships and literacy development among language learners enrolled in public schools.

© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Conflicts emerge during interactions when interlocutors hold different assumptions about how to participate appropriately in the activity in which they are engaged. Garfinkel (1964) refers to these conflicts as breaches and suggests that interlocutors negotiate rules for future interactions as they attempt to repair a breach. In educational settings, the identification of a breach—or similarly, the correction of an error—serves as a mechanism for socializing individuals to express certain identities and ideologies (Baquedano-López, Solís, & Kattan, 2005; Fader, 2008; García Sánchez, 2010; García Sánchez & Orellana, 2006). New Literacy studies demonstrate how individuals’ assumptions about interactions are rooted in ideologies (Street, 1993, 2003) or figured worlds—informal theories about the ways in which certain behaviors serve as symbols of identity in a broader educational context (Bartlett & Holland, 2002; Holland, Lachichotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). By integrating ethnomethodological and figured worlds’ theories, this article aims to illustrate how breach-identifying interactions involve the negotiation of identities in educational contexts. The analysis specifically focuses on the ways in which elementary-aged children from Mexican families are socialized to adopt figured worlds of literacy as their mothers identify and repair breaches

pertaining to the expression of a competent learner identity. We call these conflicts *learner-identity breaches*, and we analyze the ways in which they are negotiated between children and their mothers during schooling activities that take place in the home. First, we review relevant theoretical contributions from New Literacy studies regarding figured worlds of literacy, empirical studies of socialization through breaches, and research on homework completion. We then provide a brief overview of the setting, participants, the first author’s role as researcher in the study, and the methodological approach we adopted for data collection and analysis. Next we provide an analysis of how children and their mothers socialized one another to construct figured worlds of literacy through breach-identifying interactions that took place in their home. This article concludes with a discussion of implications for researchers and educators working to support the literacy learning of young children by facilitating collaborative relationships between schools and Mexican families.

## 2. Background research

### 2.1. New literacy studies and figured worlds of literacy

Literacy learning has been widely recognized as a social and cultural practice accomplished through interactive patterns that vary across contexts. Ethnographic studies of literacy learning have demonstrated how differing patterns of literacy engagement and socialization between home and school can lead to the marginal-

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [mcm@gse.rutgers.edu](mailto:mcm@gse.rutgers.edu) (M. McConnochie).

ization of students from minoritized groups from classroom literacy practices (Au, 1980; Heath, 1982, 1983; Valdéz, 1992; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1992).<sup>1</sup> However, New Literacy Studies (NLS) show that the variability of out-of-school literacy does not need to be inherently conflictive within schools; this tension is the consequence of narrow definitions of literacy conveyed through traditional classroom pedagogy (Gee, 1991, 2010; Street, 1993). These studies demonstrate that the marginalization of minoritized groups from classroom participation can be attributed to circulating ideologies that equate the display of particular forms of literacy with academic and societal success, while devaluing others in schooling contexts.

Adopting an ideological model of literacy, NLS scholars recognize how power relations structure participation in literacy practices (Gee, 1991/2010; Street, 1993, 2003). Gee (1991/2010) explains that as people draw upon their own experiences and the stories they hear, they develop cultural models or informal theories about what is normal or typical in a given situation and who or what exemplifies normativity or deviance. Holland et al. (1998) define these theories as figured worlds and explain that individuals rely on them to interpret and project their sense of self within an interaction. They explain that “figured worlds take shape within and grant shape to the coproduction of activities, discourses, performances, and artifacts” (p. 51). An analytical focus on individuals’ figured worlds facilitates understanding of how individuals exert agency through processes of self and collective identification (Gee, 2010; Holland et al., 1998).

Studies of figured worlds in schools draw upon Vygotsky’s (1978) theories to highlight the interconnectedness between learning and identity production (Hatt, 2007, 2012; Rubin, 2007; Urrieta, 2007). Hatt (2012) demonstrates the ways in which teachers’ use of “the stoplight<sup>2</sup>” and “Shoe-Tyer’s Club<sup>3</sup>” excluded African American children from low socio-economic backgrounds from classroom categorizations of smartness (p. 447). Additionally, Rubin (2007) shows how students learned to position themselves and their peers as low achieving students based on the “figured worlds of learning” constructed in their schools (p. 218). Within the figured worlds they produced, teachers and students equated smartness with the speedy completion of purposeless tasks (See also Hatt, 2007; for figured worlds of smartness and Urrieta, 2007, for figured worlds of social activism). When applied to schools, figured worlds’ theories draw attention to the ways in which ideologies function to marginalize minoritized students.

An individuals’ figured worlds of literacy depends upon theories they have about what is “typical” in a community and how these notions shape their participation within literacy practices. Bartlett and Holland (2002) found that teachers in an adult literacy class in Brazil constructed “figured worlds of friendship” within which students actively participated in a supportive environment (p. 19). But as a result of previous experiences of “literacy shaming” in their community, students had learned to remain quiet in class in order to disguise what they did not know (p. 15). Thus, despite teachers’ effort to engage in friendly conversations that student elicit participation rather than correct their errors in a didactic way, the program was unable to help many students to overcome their experiencing of shaming outside of the program and identify as “educated” people (p. 14).

In another study, Dagenais, Day, and Toohey (2006) found that teachers constructed contrasting figured worlds of literacy in a French immersion program as they talked about a child, Sara, who remained quiet in large group discussions. One teacher equated Sara’s silence with the identity of a quiet person—an identity grounded in a figured world in which students develop at their own pace. In contrast, another teacher viewed Sara’s silence as a marker of an academically struggling student, thus indexing a figured world in which competence was displayed through talkativeness with teachers. Dagenais and her co-authors link the teachers’ discourse to broader ideologies that support or hinder the learning of multilingual students in educational settings. The present study builds on previous studies by examining not only *what* figured worlds of literacy Mexican families construct but also *how* they learn to do so through the report or identification of breaches pertaining to the expression of a competent learner identity.

## 2.2. Breaches and socialization in everyday activities

Interactional sociolinguistics offers useful analytical tools for identifying how figured worlds are co-constructed through the identification and resolution of breaches. Studies of interaction demonstrate how institutionalized distributions of power manifest themselves in interactional patterns of turn-taking, as well as grammatical and lexical items (Garfinkel, 1964; Goffman, 1974, 1981; Gumperz, 1999; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Gumperz (1999) argues that the ways in which individuals participate in interactions are inextricable from power dynamics within institutions. By directing attention to “production format units” and “participant frameworks,” Goffman (1981) reveals how individuals shift between certain participation roles linked to their social status (p. 226). Sacks et al. (1974) demonstrate how a focus on “turn-taking organization” illuminates the ways in which individuals make bids for, or allocate turns of talk in conversation (p. 696).

Research on interactional sociolinguistics shows that as individuals attempt to contribute to and interpret interactions during routine language and literacy practices, they rely on tacit understandings of the norms of participation that are available to them. The unspoken rules of interaction, and for whom they may apply in a given situation, reflect the social structures and organization of a society. As Garfinkel (1964) explains: “the expectancies that make up the attitude of everyday life are constitutive of the institutionalized common understandings of the practical every day organization and workings of society as it is seen ‘from within’” (p. 249). However, Garfinkel argues that the norms for participation assumed by one person during an event may not be shared by all participants in an interaction. Conflicts may arise in everyday activities when one person attempts to participate in a way that their interlocutor does not expect. Garfinkel refers to these conflicts as “breaches” and demonstrates how, as people identify and repair breaches in everyday talk, they reveal and modify their expectations for interaction.

Baquedano-López et al. (2005) demonstrate how teacher and student identification and resolution of breaches in an elementary science classroom facilitated pedagogical and social adaptations that became opportunities for meaningful discussion about academic content and cultural frames of reference. In this article, we adopt an analytical approach that draws on the theory of adaptation developed by Baquedano-López et al. (2005) to capture the dynamic and interactive process of learning through the identification and repair of breaches, and find that breaches can be seen as generative opportunities for change. We observe that breaches can also reproduce the ideologies and identities constructed in schools, building on the notion that “there is a relationship between talk and institutions in which social identities and knowledge are unequal and potentially reproducible” (Baquedano-López et al., 2005; p. 3).

<sup>1</sup> Following Teresa McCarty’s model, we use the term “minoritized” to “convey the power relations and processes by which certain groups are socially, economically, and politically marginalized within the larger society” (2002; p. xv).

<sup>2</sup> The “stoplight” is a classroom management strategy involving the use of green, red, and yellow symbols to evaluate and categorize student behavior.

<sup>3</sup> The “Shoe-Tyers Club” refers to the group of students who could tie their shoes independently.

Informed by figured worlds theory, we conceptualize breaches as conflicts that pertain to the expression of identity. By focusing on breaches in identity (issuing from breaches in behavior) we examine how the evaluation of literacy practices within the domestic context of the home links up to institutional school-based ideologies about what it means to be a “good” learner or parent during academic literacy practices.

### 2.3. Homework completion

The completion of homework is considered to be a significant routine learning event that may either support or impede the academic success of children (Corno, 2000; Cooper, Robinson, & Patall, 2006). The process of completing homework may have positive outcomes leading to the expansion of student knowledge and ability to confront academic tasks, or negative consequences resulting in parent and student disengagement (Corno, 2000). Previous ethnographic studies have shown that homework completion is a socially and culturally constructed literacy practice in which family members construct and express their understanding of school literacy. Portilla (2013) examines the ways in which parents, teachers, and children interact with one another and interpret homework assignments in homes and first- and second-grade classrooms located in rural Mexico. She conceptualizes homework as a cultural object that is mobilized by material resources and social actions, travels across home and school settings, and facilitates the transmission of school culture into students’ homes.

In a study of homework completion in Córdoba, Spain, LaCasa, Reina, and Albuquerque (2002) reveal how literacy engagement in homework completion is facilitated by the use of interactive scripts in which parents and children adopt roles that may be active or passive, directive or receptive, and oriented towards a goal of either the representation of knowledge through physical qualities or the production of meaning. They differentiate a “mechanical approach” to homework that focuses on finishing the task according to the rules with a “pedagogical approach,” oriented towards accomplishing a specific teaching goal, and the “shared recreation of the text” in which parent and child both express their ideas and opinions about the text (p. 48).

Drawing from data collected in a suburb of Sydney, Australia, White (2002) demonstrates how an imbalance of power between teachers and parents impacts homework literacy routines. She found that because schools expected parent participation in homework, parents came to view homework as an event upon which both their and their children’s competency would be evaluated. Consequently, parents often adopted interactional patterns that mirrored those of the school, even when they resulted in conflict and relational strain with their children (White, 2002). The works of LaCasa, Reina, and Albuquerque (2002) and White (2002) have made important contributions to the theorization of homework completion as a site of potential conflict within literacy socialization for middle-class families completing school tasks in the domestic space.

Few studies have examined the homework literacy practices of Mexican families residing in the US who draw upon different linguistic and cultural resources than Anglo middle-class families (Gonzalez, 1991; Moll, Neff, Amanti, & González, 1992; Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992). Important exceptions include the work of Gonzalez (1991) in highlighting Mexican parents’ active involvement in homework activities and the work of Vélez-Ibáñez and Greenberg (1992) in identifying the tensions produced by homework in one Mexican household. These studies highlight how homework impacts interactions between children and parents in the homes of Mexican families. Nonetheless, we know little about the figured worlds of literacy that shape the ways in which Mexican children and families participate in homework activities.

The small but growing literature on homework completion for Mexican families suggests that homework may be a uniquely significant activity for negotiating expectations within schools, home, and other community settings. During homework completion in Mexican households, families evoke broader socio-cultural and sociopolitical realities when making decisions about how to best support their children’s education (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). Through a study of mixed-status families of Mexican origin, Mangual Figueroa (2011) reveals how homework activities constituted a structured routine event, which she refers to as “Homework Completion Routines (HCRs)” (p. 263). During HCRs, families discussed and interpreted school-derived artifacts, monitored children’s school progress and linked the importance of academic success to their citizenship status and identities as immigrants. We have more to learn about how school-based literacy practices shape the ways in which children and their Mexican family members socialize one another to evaluate their own literacy behaviors during HCRs. This article, therefore, seeks to fill this gap through an examination of how members of Mexican families draw on school-derived discourse, artifacts, and ideologies about literacy as they identify and repair learner identity breaches during HCRs. Specifically, this study examines the following research questions: 1. How do parents and children identify, interpret, and resolve breaches pertaining to the expression of competent learner identity? 2. How does the process of breach identification inform the socialization of learner identities and corresponding figured worlds of literacy?

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Data collection

This study of Homework Completion Routines (HCRs) draws from data collected by the first author during a four-month study in the homes of two Mexican families. The first author recruited participants and collected data for this study. To begin the study, she recruited families with the help of a non-profit community organization that provides legal and educational services to immigrant families. She first became involved in the organization as a volunteer serving as an assistant teacher for the organization’s adult English class and facilitating the organization’s membership campaign. Upon finishing the English course, she continued to volunteer as a teacher for adult English classes. A snowball sampling method (Patton, 2005) was used to recruit families, relying on the assistance of a board member, Maria, and the English program director, Laura to introduce the first author to families with children in Kindergarten through second grade.<sup>4</sup> Maria introduced the first author to her friend, Karla, a mother of three children. At the time of the study, Karla had a two-year old child who had not yet begun school, and a child in first grade and fifth grade. Laura introduced the first author to a new English student, Frances, a mother of two children in Kindergarten and first grade. The study focuses on Karla’s and Frances’ families.

The data for this study include audio-recordings, field notes, and artifacts collected during twelve afternoon home visits in which the first author conducted brief informal interviews with family members and acted as participant observer during HCRs. Between February and June of 2014, the first author visited each family’s home on six occasions for 1–2 h each. During each visit, the family and the first author collaborated in HCRs and discussed the family’s experiences with language, school, and homework completion during informal interviews. The first author took photos of every document sent home from the school and/or discussed during vis-

<sup>4</sup> All proper nouns are pseudonyms.

**Table 1**  
The Romero and Morales Families.

Romero Family	Morales Family
Karla, mother	Frances, mother
Gilberto, father	Germán, father
Ricardo, eldest son, 11 years old, 5th grade	Angel, eldest son, 8 years old, 1st grade
Óscar, middle son, 7 years old, 1st grade	Ivan, youngest son, 6 years old, Kindergarten
Fernando, youngest son, 2 years old	

its, including letters, report cards, and homework sheets, and the first several pages of the books that they read in her presence.

### 3.2. Participants and setting

The participants of this study included members from the above mentioned families, both who resided in the same Northeastern Latino Diaspora community. According to 2010 census data, 42.9% of residents in the town identified as being Hispanic or Latino. The percentage of residents over 5-years-old that did not speak English was reported to be 27.3%. All participating children in this study attended Kindergarten or first grade at Warner Elementary School. During the 2013–2014 school year, approximately 69% of students were Hispanic, 20% White, 9% Black, 1% Asian, 0.3% Pacific Islander, and 0.3% were two or more races. Approximately 60% of students spoke Spanish in the home. Warner Elementary School was considered a Title 1 School that contains an English as a Second Language (ESL) program and a bilingual program. However, based on the school's English proficiency assessment, the participating children were not considered LEP students and thus did not qualify for the district's ESL or bilingual programs. Thus, the children in the study attended classes in which they were instructed to use English to develop and display knowledge in academic content areas, as would monolingual English students.

The Romero family was comprised of five people: Karla (mother), Gilberto (father), a two-year-old boy, Fernando, a seven-year-old boy, Óscar, and an eleven-year-old boy, Ricardo. Both parents were born in Puebla, Mexico and had been living in the US for thirteen years at the time of the study. All of the children were born in the United States. Karla and Gilberto could read, write, and speak in Spanish and communicated primarily through Spanish with their family. Fernando was just beginning to speak in Spanish. Óscar and Ricardo were learning to read and write in English in school, but communicated with their parents orally in Spanish. Karla and Óscar, who was in first grade at the time of the study, were the focal family members who participated in the study. However, Karla and Óscar also mentioned other family members during the discussions about school and HCRs (Table 1).

The Morales family included four members: Frances (mother), Germán (father), a six-year-old son, Ivan, and an eight-year old son, Angel. Ivan was currently in Kindergarten and Angel was attending first grade at the same school at the time of the study. Both of the parents were born in Oaxaca, Mexico. According to Frances, Germán had migrated to the United States twelve years prior to the time of the study and Frances joined him the following year. Frances could read, write, and speak in Spanish and had begun to take classes in adult English literacy. She frequently attended the English class that the first author taught at the non-profit community organization. The father, Germán could read, write, and speak in both English and Spanish. Ivan and Angel were learning to read, write, and speak in English at school, while learning to communicate with their mother orally in Spanish. Frances, Ivan, and Angel were the focal participants in the study.

### 3.3. Researcher role

As a participant observer during HCRs, the first author played an active role in the identification of and response to breaches. In the Romero family, the first author helped Óscar to read stories assigned for homework, while Karla watched or attended to Fernando in the other room. As reported by Óscar and Karla, the first author fulfilled the role that Óscar's older brother, Ricardo typically played when he arrived home in the late afternoon. During the completion of math and spelling worksheets, Karla frequently assisted Óscar. However, the first author helped Óscar with Math and Spelling homework if Karla needed to attend to Fernando or talk with a friend who often visited.

In the home of the Morales family, Frances, Angel, and Ivan sat together to complete all homework assignments. The first author provided help if any of the family members asked her a question or if she noticed an error that nobody else had noticed. During visits, the first author conducted brief informal interviews with the mothers about their children's academic progress and their experiences with teachers. These questions prompted mothers to identify teacher-reported breaches in academic progress. The role of the first author in the identification of and response to breaches will comprise a central part of the analysis. Rather than bracketing the first author's role by accounting for it solely in this section of the manuscript, we argue for the importance of including it throughout the analysis and considering it an integral part of the ethnographic account (Mangual Figueroa, 2014). We argue that the analysis of the researcher's role provides important insight into the negotiation of figured worlds of literacy in the home. The families in the study first encountered and viewed the first author as "*la maestra*" ("the teacher"). Consequently, we recognize that the first author's presence may have shaped the ways in which family members communicated in order to position themselves as "good" parents and learners. However, we argue that the data highlights the pressure that families felt to conform to school expectations for breach-identification and repair, which was only compounded by the presence of the researcher.

### 3.4. Data analyses

The first and second authors collaborated in the data analysis process. To analyze the data, we first examined the types of breaches reported through mothers' narratives about their children's literacy learning in school, as well as breaches identified by mothers and children during HCRs. The analysis process followed the three phases of coding outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1990) that include open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. We first coded field notes and audio logs to identify thematic breaches identified by participants. Three categories emerged as the most common breach type—the child's academic progress, the pace of the child's completion of an assignment, and English reading. In the analysis that follows, we examine how breach-identifying interactions function as a means of socializing and negotiating figured world of literacy and corresponding learner identities. In Section 4, we examine how mothers recounted breaches within narratives of past communication with teachers. In Sections 5 and 6, we then analyze the ways in which the mothers and children drew upon school-based figured worlds of literacy to identify and repair breaches in real time during HCRs. The transcript symbols in the analysis follow the conventions of conversation analysis outlined by Schegloff (2007<sup>5</sup>). We use conversation analysis tran-

<sup>5</sup> We use the following transcription conventions, noting that punctuation marks are used to communicate the social features of talk instead of the conventional rules of Spanish and English usage: (.) micropause, CAPS especially loud talk, . falling final

scription methods to examine the details of interactional sequences that occurred as participants identified and responded to breaches within and across turns of talk during informal interviews and HCRs.

#### 4. Mothers' uptake of learner identity breaches in school-based narratives

During informal interviews about their children's schooling, both mothers in this study—Karla and Frances—identified and discussed breaches of academic progress reported by teachers during parent-teacher conferences. By re-articulating teacher-reported breaches, the mothers demonstrated a desire to understand the school-based figured worlds of literacy that the breaches invoked. They tended to revoice but not express their own opinions about the school-based figured worlds of literacy. Given the imbalance of institutional power between teachers and mothers, we argue that the mothers sought to fulfill school-based expectations for literacy engagement and help their children succeed academically by animating institutional discourse in their homes. In the Romero household, Karla reported numerous breaches in Óscar's academic progress identified by his teachers. During the 6 visits the first author made to her home, Karla relayed 4 different breaches in Óscar's school progress—in reading, summarizing stories through writing, handwriting, and subtracting. The transcribed excerpt below represents a conversation between Karla and the first author on visit #2, in which Karla discussed a few of these breaches. At the very beginning of the visit Karla reported, “dice la maestra que necesita mucho ayuda en la lectura (the teacher says [he] needs a lot of help with reading).” The first author replied by asking Karla if the teacher had told her specifically with what Óscar needed help and Karla's response opens Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1<sup>6</sup>: Recounting “Low” Learner Narratives in the Home

1 Karla:	No (.) oh lo más cuando acaba de terminar la: el cuento preguntale
2	que lo que no entendió del cuento pero dice que necesita mucha ayuda
3	en la lectura porque es muy bajo muy bajo le dice que es muy bajo
	No (.) oh mostly when he finishes reading the: the story ask him what he did not understand of the story but she says that he needs a lot of help in reading because he is really low really low she says
4 Meredith:	Sí†
	Yes†
5 Karla:	Me enseñaron los niveles
	They taught me the levels
6 Meredith:	Sí:::
	Ye:::s
7 Karla:	Dicen que es bajo
	They say that he is low
8 Meredith:	Niveles† niveles de libro†
	Levels† book levels†
9 Karla:	No (.) a donde él tenía que estar (.) dice que tiene que ser en el medio y que está
10	muy bajo (.) y dice que en la lectura y la escritura dicen que escribe muy feo
11	((laughs))
	No (.) where he had to be (.) she says that he has to be in the middle and that he is really low (.) and she says that in reading and writing they say that he writes really ugly ((laughs))
12 Meredith:	((Laughs)) La escritura en como formar las letras
	The writing in like how to make the letters
13 Karla:	Uh huh porque como acá ((points to paper))
	Uh huh because like here
14 Meredith:	Ah sí me dijo antes
	Ah yes you told me before
15 Karla:	Lo hizo grande como que fueron mayúsculas y es minúsculo
	He made them big like they were upper case and it's lower case

intonation contour, ° talk following it was quiet or soft, ? rising intonation, † sharper intonation rises or falls, :: prolongation of the preceding sound, (( )) transcriber's description of events, - stress or emphasis, >< fast or rushed talk, [a point of overlap onset, = continuous utterance.

<sup>6</sup> Translations preserve false starts, pauses, grammatical structures and choices regarding the variety of Spanish spoken by the participants in real time.

As Karla identified breaches in Óscar's academic progress in lines 1–3, line 7, and lines 9–11, she animated a teacher discourse about her son's academic progress. Karla acknowledged the significance of school-based evaluations by introducing teacher assessments of competence without the first author's prompting. In lines 1–3, Karla relayed the teacher's evaluation of Óscar's reading ability by saying, “she says he is very low.” In line 10, Karla elaborated on this statement explaining that “he has to be in the middle and he is really low. Through these statements, Karla revealed how the teacher, as well as a school-based hierarchical system of ranking student ability, shaped the figured world she constructed. She articulated a school-authored discourse that implied an objective measure of reading ability and a linear trajectory of reading development and a goal of being in the ‘middle’ of the class. Through her narrative, she invoked a figured world of academic literacy within which a successful student performs “in the middle” of the class on literacy assessments. On lines 2–7, Karla introduced statements that, “he needs a lot of help” because “they taught me the levels” and “they say he is low.” Thus, through her report of teacher-identified breaches Karla suggested that each student could be objectively compared to others along a standardized trajectory of reading development marked by “the levels.” Furthermore, Karla indexed a school-based figured world of standardized literacy development that positioned Óscar as a “low” learner. The figured world of standardized literacy development she constructs parallels what Street (1984, 2003) refers to as an autonomous model of literacy, enacted through institutional discourse that obscures the ideological value applied to certain literacy skills by instead referring to a supposedly objective hierarchy of rating ability. By referring to reading levels as indicators of academic status, Karla demonstrates the central role of school reading assessments and developmental benchmarks in the construction of her understanding of her child's development.

We identified similar school-based evaluative discourse in the Morales home as Frances talked about her children's school progress. Frances rarely reported breaches because Ivan and Angel were currently “doing well” in school at the time. However, when the first author asked about her experiences with teachers on visit #2, Frances shared a narrative about how Angel was retained a year in Kindergarten due to a breach in reading progress and connected this experience to her ongoing concern about Ivan's reading development in Kindergarten. Excerpt 2 includes Frances' summary of the narrative that she shared when the first author asked for clarification.

Excerpt 2: Confronting “Low” Learner Status and Grade Retention

1 Frances:	Terminó el kinder normal un año supuestamente iba a pasar a primero
2	pero no era primero normal fue kinder primero (.) hace un año salió un
3	programa que si los niños no aprendieron a leer en kinder tuvieron que
4	quedar otra vez en kinder supuestamente por eso con Ivan estoy ((takes
5	a deep breath))
	He finished normal Kindergarten and supposedly he was going to pass to first grade but it wasn't normal it was kindergarten first grade (.) a year ago a program started that if the children didn't learn to read in Kindergarten they had to remain another time in Kindergarten supposedly (.) for that reason with Ivan I am ((takes a deep breath))
6 Meredith:	Para que no::
	So that it doesn't:
7 Frances:	Sí pasa lo mismo
	Yes happen again

Of significance in this exchange is Frances' description of a school program created for “the children who didn't learn to read in Kindergarten.” By doing so, Frances animated an evaluative discourse about reading and an expected reading trajectory authored by the school that outlined what children should be able to do in Kindergarten in order to pass to the next grade. Because Angel was placed in an intermediary class, Frances suggested that he did not

demonstrate typical reading behavior of a Kindergarten student. The school served a primary role in creating a figured world of literacy that revolved around standardized tests and that sorted children into categories of normal and abnormal development. By rearticulating the school's categorization of "children who didn't learn to read in Kindergarten," Frances accepted the school assessment of reading competency as an objective measure (she did not, for example, describe them as children that the school *thinks* could not read). Thus, like Karla, Frances represented a figured world of literacy in which success was measured along a standardized trajectory of reading development, and competent students as those who perform relatively high on literacy assessments and continue to the next academic grade. Later in our conversation she said that she would not have chosen this combined Kindergarten and First Grade class for him because "it's a lost year." Frances expressed anxiety over the possibility of Ivan's grade retention on lines 4–5 when she said, "that's why with Ivan I'm" and completed her sentence with a deep breath. On line 7, she then clarified that she feared it would "happen again," or that Ivan would be retained as Angel had been. In the following sections we demonstrate how breaches of academic progress reported in mothers' narratives are linked to the ways in which family members identified breaches at home during HCRs.

### 5. Socializing learner identities as test-takers through breaches of pace

During the completion of homework, both mothers identified breaches that pertained to the speed with which their children were working to complete their homework. Close examination of the discourse surrounding breaches in pace suggests that family members linked their beliefs about pace to students' performance on school literacy assessments. In the Romero family, Karla attributed Óscar's breach—sloppy penmanship—to the fast pace with which he was working and directed him to slow down so that he could write well. The transcribed excerpt below was extracted from a conversation between Karla, Óscar, and the first author on visit #2. During this exchange, Óscar was completing a worksheet that prompted him to write spelling words in blank spaces to complete sentences.

#### Excerpt 3: Learning to Slow Down

1 Karla:	<i>Ah chiquito (. ) bien así (. )</i> Little (. ) good like that
2 Óscar:	((Erases))
3 Karla:	<i>Tienes que escribir solo adentro (. ) a ver cómo puedes (. )</i> You have to write only inside (. ) see how you can
4 Meredith:	Si Yes
5 Karla:	((Looking at Meredith)) <i>Lo hace muy rápido (. ) por eso</i> He does it really fast (. ) because of that
6 Meredith:	<i>Cuando lo hace despacio lo hace bien</i> When he does it slow he does it well
7 Karla:	<i>Adentro (. ) no te salgas (. ) Practica hijo para que hagas bien en tus exámenes (. ) bonito adentro (. ) a ver (. ) si tú vas despacio puedes escribir bonito (. ) si lo hace rápido no puede no se puede</i>
8	Inside (. ) don't go out (. ) Practice child so that you do well on your exams (. ) pretty inside (. ) see (. ) if you go slowly you can write pretty (. ) if you do it fast you can't one can't
9	

Karla initiated this exchange as she critiqued Óscar's first attempt to write a word in the blank space, which led Óscar to erase and try again. Through her identification of the breach and subsequent socialization efforts, Karla constructed a figured world in which a good writer slowed down in order to write nicely inside the lines. In her statement on line 5, "he does it really fast (. ) because of that," Karla attributed Óscar's breach of "ugly" writing to the fast pace with which he worked. On lines 1–2, 6, and 7–9, Karla socialized Óscar to write slowly and to write inside the lines. Because Karla had reported earlier in the visit that "the teacher says that he

writes ugly" (Section 4, Excerpt 1), in this excerpt we can see how the teacher's belief likely influenced Karla's identification of literacy breaches during HCRs. On line 7, Karla told Óscar, "practice so that you do well on your exams." In this statement, Karla suggests that the purpose of homework is to prepare for performance on exams. In other words, Karla was socializing Óscar to demonstrate a test-taker identity through his speed and handwriting. By doing so, Karla revealed that the school played a role in shaping her evaluation of Óscar's literacy competency and the figured world of standardized time regulation and literacy production that she socialized Óscar to adopt.

In the Morales household, in contrast to socialization efforts to slow down made by Karla, Frances frequently directed her children to "hurry up," "make progress," or "get moving" when she believed they were not working fast enough to complete the task. The following transcribed excerpt represents an interaction that exemplifies this routine identification of and response to a breach in pace. The excerpt derives from an audio-recording produced as Ivan completed his math homework on visit #2.

#### Excerpt 4: Learning to Speed Up

1 Frances:	<i>Tú apúrate porque Angel ya ya escribió y leyó tú no haces nada (. ) así que avanzas porque-</i>
2	<i>Hurry up because Angel already already wrote and read and you aren't doing anything (. ) so hurry up because-</i>
3 Ivan:	He doesn't-
4 Frances:	Please (. ) avanza Please (. ) hurry up
5 Ivan:	<i>Yo hazo<sup>7</sup> una mas page (. ) ya estoy finished</i> <i>I do one more page (. ) I am already finished</i>
6 Frances:	<i>Pues entonces (. ) avanza porque no vas a terminar hoy</i> <i>Well then (. ) make progress because you aren't going to finish today</i>
7 Ivan:	((Makes noise with mouth)) okay
8 Frances:	<i>Ahora pues avanza</i> <i>Now hurry up</i>
9 Ivan:	<i>Voy al baño</i> <i>I'm going to the bathroom</i>
10 Frances:	<i>No no siéntate</i> <i>No no sit down</i>
11 Ivan:	<i>Ya sé que voy a lograrlo</i> <i>I already know that I am going to finish it</i>
12 Frances:	<i>No (. ) please está mirando la maestra (. ) la va a llamar a tu maestra</i> <i>No (. ) please the teacher is watching (. ) she is going to call your teacher</i>

In Excerpt 5, Frances continuously directed Ivan to move faster and to make progress on his math homework, signaling that he had made a breach in pace on the assigned task (on lines 1–2). She explained that his brother, Angel "already wrote and read and you aren't doing anything." With each utterance she expressed her belief that Ivan was not completing his homework at the rate of a competent student who progresses according to a rate of acceptable completion that can somehow be objectively defined. By articulating her belief, she produced a figured world of mechanized academic literacy in which the competent student steadily makes progress without taking breaks and, whereby quick task completion serves as the primary goal. By justifying the breach with a comparison to another figure—his brother, Angel—Frances implied that Angel's pace also shaped the figured world of standardized literacy that she was producing and socializing adopting Ivan to adopt.

However, Ivan invoked his own figured world on line 11, explaining that he didn't need to move so fast because "I already know that I am going to finish it." By doing so he associated competency in a task with a right to take a bathroom break and move slowly. The ideology invoked by Ivan depicted the inverse relationship of that represented by Karla, who associated a lack of competency with speed and a focus on the academic over the personal. To resolve the disagreement, Frances re-framed her rationale

<sup>7</sup> Hazo is presumably equivalent to hago (I do).

by arguing, “the teacher is watching (.) she is going to call your teacher” on line 12. Here, Frances attempted to persuade Ivan to work faster by calling attention to the fact that the first author—“the teacher”—was watching the interaction and suggesting that the first author would call his teacher to report on his progress. Frances suggested that Ivan’s teacher and the first author shared a view of literacy based on a standardized rate of literacy task completion that Ivan was not fulfilling. By aligning with the teacher and researcher, Frances indicated that the school played a role in her earlier identification of Ivan’s breach of pace, shaping the figured world of standardized academic literacy she was adopting and socializing Ivan to construct.

**6. Socializing learner and parent identities through English reading breaches**

During HCRs, parents and children also frequently identified breaches with regard to one another’s English reading. In the Morales home, Frances, Angel, and Ivan identified breaches with regard to the pronunciation of written English words. Frances, the mother, regularly corrected Ivan while quizzing him to read Sight Word Flashcards (Appendix A). Ivan’s school progress report (Appendix B) conveyed the significance placed on sight-word identification in the school. Frances initiated the flashcard routine as an extra homework-assignment to help Ivan improve on school reading assessments, in order to avoid his retention in school (a fear she expressed in Excerpt 2). Appendix B includes an image of the Flash cards that Frances used to quiz Ivan. The following excerpt derives from the beginning of visit #1 to the Morales home.

Excerpt 5: Breaches and the Dismissal of Affect

1 Frances:	Aquí? Here?
2 Ivan:	He
3 Frances:	No: no
4 Ivan:	Ha:ve
5 Frances:	NO: cómo dice aquí NO::what does it say here
6 Ivan:	No quiero I don’t want to
7 Frances:	No es que quiera (.) vamos muévete It’s not about wanting (.) let’s go move it

This exchange reveals how Frances quizzed Ivan to read the word ‘home’ correctly. Each time Ivan failed to accurately identify the word that matched the flash card, Frances expressed her frustration through the prolongation of ‘o’ in the word, “no:” on line 3 and by more loudly stating “NO:” on line 5. As the tension mounted, Ivan expressed on line 6 that he longer wanted to engage in the activity. But Frances rejected this idea, arguing that Ivan’s desire was not important and by continuing to quiz him. Thus, this exchange is important in that it highlights how Frances socialized Ivan to adopt two interrelated figured worlds of literacy. First, as Frances adopted a pedagogical approach to homework completion, she invoked an understanding in which competency involved the decoding of a standardized set of English words in isolation from meaningful context. Thus, the identity of a “good” student within a figured world of standardized academic literacy was interlinked to an English language identity. Analysis of Ivan’s school progress report suggests that the ideology of standardized academic literacy derives from school assessment practices and her expressed concern about potential negative consequences like grade retention. Second, Frances socialized Ivan to adopt a figured world of literacy in which interests or desires, such as terminating activities or going to the bathroom (see Section 5), are unimportant considerations for involvement. Within these understandings of literacy, she positioned herself as a tutor preparing Ivan for an English sight-

word test and Ivan as a test-taker needing to suppress desires or frustrations in the pursuit of academic success.

English reading breaches were also frequently identified during another homework routine—spelling test practice in the Morales home. Spelling test practice began when the first-grader, Angel gave his mother a list of spelling words that she would read and he would write down in preparation for his weekly exam. Appendix C displays the spelling words listed on the homework worksheet that Ivan was assigned in conjunction with the task of practicing for his test. In this routine, Frances regularly became the transgressor of accurate English reading. The following interaction transpired several minutes after the former exchange revolving around sight-word practice. The weekly spelling word list included several verbs in their infinitive and past tense forms. The exchange began as Frances read the word, “plan” and “planned” from the top of the spelling list.

Excerpt 6: Breach of Parent Identity as English Reading Tutor

19 Frances:	Plan
20 Angel:	¿Qué dijiste? What did you say?
21 Frances:	Plan
22 Angel:	What?
23 Frances:	Planet
24 Angel:	Oh wait dijiste you said
25 Frances:	Plan planet
26 Angel:	((Points at “planned” on spelling list)) eso no es PLANE:T that’s not PLANE:T
27 Frances:	Cómo es? How is it?
28 Angel:	((Grows and erases))
29 Ivan:	Yes
30 Angel:	No puede leer You (formal) can’t read
31 Frances:	(to Ivan reading flashcards) No dice yes That doesn’t say yes
32 Angel:	This is ↑PLAN empieza con ↑ESO it begins with ↑THAT
33 Frances:	Plan planet
34 Angel:	Eso no es ↑PLANET That isn’t ↑PLANET
35 Angel:	It’s plan and plan (.) ed
36 Angel:	Plann (.) ed

During this activity, Frances and Angel socialized one another to participate in a spelling test rehearsal—another routine homework activity that depended largely on the ability to read, write, and pronounce written English words. The spelling test rehearsal routine resembles the flash card practice in that participants were evaluated solely upon their knowledge of English orthography and phonology. The language and structure of the assignment, and the figured world of mechanical English literacy it invokes, are rooted in school policies of language education and classroom-based assessments that privilege the mechanics of written English over the production of meaning. But in this interaction, Angel—a child—played the role of identifying his mother’s breaches in reading in English. He expressed frustration as his mother read the word “planned” as “planet” on line 23 and again on line 25 by saying “that’s not ↑PLANET” and raising his voice to pronounce planet. He also accused his mother on line 30 of not knowing how to read. Through this accusation, Angel argued that his mother committed a breach of her expected identity as tutor by failing to recognize the correct pronunciation of English spelling words. In this inversion of roles, Frances attempted to position herself as a concerned parent, while Angel challenged his mother’s legitimacy to fulfill this role on the basis of her English fluency. Taking up the role of expert in critiquing his mother, Angel demonstrated how institutionalized English privilege can shift the parent-child power dynamics during literacy practices when children reach higher levels of English proficiency than their parents. Angel’s frustration about his mother’s pronunciation highlights the tension surrounding this inversion of

roles and raises questions about the potentially negative consequences that figured worlds of standardized English literacy can have on parent-child relationships.

## 7. Discussion

This article has examined how elementary-aged children from two Mexican families were socialized to adopt figured worlds of literacy through the identification and repair of learner breaches during HCRs. By sharing narratives of teacher-reported breaches pertaining to academic status, the immigrant mothers invoked school-based figured worlds of academic literacy in which competent students perform comparatively high along a standardized hierarchical trajectory of literacy development. While Karla relayed the numerous ways in which the teachers considered Óscar to be “low” and articulated a goal of being “*en el medio*” (“in the middle”), Frances explained that children who did not learn to “read” in Kindergarten would be retained. Additionally, as family members attempted to repair or prevent breaches pertaining to academic status, they adopted, and socialized one another to adopt roles during HCRs that revolved around test preparation. They enacted identities as test-taker and tutors to monitor breaches of pace, neatness, and English fluency, rather than engage with the meaning of texts. As tutors, mothers consistently drew upon school-derived discourse and artifacts to justify the figured worlds of standardized and mechanical academic literacy that they socialized their children to adopt. The mothers also participated in homework activities in ways that resembled what LaCasa et al. (2002) referred to as mechanical or pedagogical approaches to involvement. They adopted mechanical approaches by enforcing the completion of assignments and pedagogical approaches by seeking to repair behaviors they associated with low performance on school assessments.

The mothers’ narratives are significant because they reveal children’s and mother’s uptake of evaluative discourses based on standardization and autonomous models. The circulation of this discourse—and its reproduction in the home—is troubling in light of research showing that young bilingual children learn in cognitively, socially, and culturally unique settings from those Anglo middle class and monolingual peers upon which standardized practices are based (Genishi & Dyson, 2009; Valdéz, 1992, 2004; García & Frede, 2010; Heath, 1982, 1983). Moreover, school assignments functioned to reproduce “institutional legitimacy” (Urciuoli, 1996; p. 35) in the home through breach identification and repair during homework completion routines. By evaluating emergent bilinguals’ literacy practices as deficient in comparison to a monolingual English norm, schools perpetuate what Flores and Rosa (2015) refer to as “raciolinguistic ideologies,” which “conflate certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices” (p. 150). Moreover, these ideologies are reproduced through a socially-constructed system of assessment that gains its very legitimacy through hierarchies that obtain a veneer of objectivity through standardized assessments even though we know they are not valid or reliable (Abedi, 2004; Kieffer, Lesaux, & Snow, 2006). As we have shown, these ideologies become figured worlds as they are recounted and reproduced by parents and children in their homes.

By referring to language arts’ assessments and benchmarks during breach-identifying interactions, the mothers and children revealed a link between raciolinguistic ideologies, autonomous models of literacy, and the standardization of education assessment policies. We argue that the test-driven homework assignments, progress reports sent home by teachers displaying the results of testing, and teachers’ communication with parents about students’ academic progress served as mechanisms for extending the reach

of educational assessment policies and “language education policies” in the domestic space (Menken, 2008; Shohamy, 2003, 2007). Language education policies are decisions about how, which, and when languages will be used or taught in schools; they gain institutional power through practices such as assessment (Menken, 2008; Shohamy, 2003, 2007). In attempt to comply with school-based expectations for academic success, the mothers reinforced school-based raciolinguistic ideologies and autonomous models of literacy that privileged mechanical written English literacy, even as they participated actively in their children’s learning. While these academic literacy ideologies render family members’ Mexican heritage and Spanish proficiencies irrelevant, the children and parents implicitly contradicted these ideologies by drawing upon multilingual resources as they sought to fulfill teachers’ expectations during HCRs.

In an era marked by standardized testing, the extension of the school into the home through learner breaches is troubling for immigrant children for two reasons: first, by delegitimizing forms of communicating in homes that are not sanctioned by the school, and second, by restricting the ways in which parents and children interact with one another and, subsequently, decreasing opportunities for meaningful engagement in literacy practices. As noted by Warriner (2008), “one striking material consequence of this kind of constant monitoring of ‘progress’ through standardized testing is that, because certain literacies are valued at the expense of other types of literacies and literacy practices, students are actually not adequately prepared for the world beyond the classroom” (p. 320). This article suggests that mothers and their children learn to value English production and pronunciation at the expense of Spanish, when the latter is not considered a resource for academic learning and assessment in school.

The findings of this study also extend understanding of time socialization during routine interactions between parent and child (Wingard, 2007). While Wingard (2007) demonstrates how middle class families negotiated time to plan and prioritize *across* activities, the present study demonstrates the way that two Mexican immigrant families negotiated time *within* one particular household activity—HCRs. The analysis illustrates that the immigrant mothers and their children negotiated an acceptable pace for completing literacy tasks within the figured worlds of academic literacy they invoked. While Karla socialized Óscar to construct a figured world in which competency on tests depends on slow careful writing, Frances socialized Angel and Ivan to construct a figured world in which a competent student progresses through his work without taking a break. Yet children also rejected the figured world of literacy that their mothers socialized them to adopt. In Ivan’s case, he constructed a figured world of academic literacy in which his right to adopt a slow relaxed pace was dependent upon, and indexical of, his confidence in completing the assignment. The link that family members’ made between speed and competence suggests the need for continuing examinations of how time is negotiated and evaluated during home and school activities, as well as how it relates to the academic labels students are given in schools. Notably, Ivan also challenged his mother’s authority with regard to an appropriate pace of homework completion; highlighting children’s agency in the adoption of figured worlds of literacy and the reproduction of school-based evaluations of their own parents.

The exchange between Ivan and his mother, Frances, also raises new questions about the relationship between breaches, affect, and learning. While Frances was socializing Ivan to express a learner identity as test-taker and prevent breaches in academic status, she dismissed the significance of Ivan’s feelings about the flashcard routine. By framing a relaxed pace and the expression of affect as breaches, Frances suggested that individual desire should come second to the standardization of learning. It is also noteworthy that Ivan did not express disinterest in the activity until after his mother



repeatedly identified breaches in his reading. These findings suggest that the process of repairing learner identity breaches have the potential to elicit children's negative stances towards an activity. As shown by [García Sánchez \(2010\)](#), error correction, which resembles breach-identification with the goal of altering language use, may stigmatize certain forms of communication.

Through breach-identification in narratives and interactions during HCRs, these two Mexican families also highlighted the interconnectedness between parents' and learners' social identities. In their examination of social and moral identities through narratives-in-translation during parent-teacher conferences, [García Sánchez and Orellana \(2006\)](#) highlighted how parents, children, and teachers negotiated responsibility for the resolution of problems related to academic development. This study expands the work of [García Sánchez and Orellana \(2006\)](#) by demonstrating how family members may continue to negotiate roles for resolving academic issues in the home. In the Morales and Romero homes, mothers served as tutors or homework assistants responsible for addressing and preventing teacher-reported breaches of academic progress. But when homework and tests prioritize English reading fluency over meaningful engagement, the role of tutor is difficult for Spanish-speaking mothers to fulfill. As a result, school reliance on normative literacy benchmarks to identify breaches in academic progress privileges students of literate English speaking parents whose reading and pronunciation more closely resemble that of teachers. Homework assignments and tests whose completion requires English may disadvantage children with parents who do not feel comfortable reading and writing in English. Moreover, Spanish-speaking parents' attempts to assist with English assignments poses a risk to parents' authority and linguistic legitimacy when children's English proficiency is stronger than their own. As a result, we share concerns regarding educational equity when traditional school approaches to parent involvement expect that parents function as teachers who implement language education policy and the standardization of learning with fidelity in their homes. This is especially disheartening since the "parents as teachers" trope has endured over time despite the fact that it actually disadvantages children from immigrant families from achieving 'academic success' ([Baquedano-López, Alexander, & Hernandez, 2013](#)).

## 8. Conclusion

This article has demonstrated the ways in which academic labels regarding literacy and learning are taken up in the home as family members draw on them during their participation in homework routines. The findings suggest that immigrant parents work to align their home literacy practices with school expectations regarding homework so that they can prepare their children for school tasks and mitigate against negative academic consequences such as low test scores or retention in a grade. In so doing, they may socialize their children to privilege mechanical English literacy competency over meaningful bilingual interactions with family members and texts. Understanding the influence of teacher discourse on families' participation in homework activities can inform educators' decisions about the language and purposes of homework. We call for more research that explores which academic tasks may foster more authentic interactions with family and community members, where the joint meaning-making and multilingual cultural production that can arise from shared readings of texts proves to be more positive and productive than test-preparation activities.

This article also highlights a need for educational researchers and educators to reconsider the ways in which they communicate with immigrant families about the meaning and consequences of school evaluations. We argue that educational stakeholders have a responsibility to convey the limitations of standardized

measures of academic literacy competency to parents, teachers, and administrators and instead prioritize meaningful literacy engagement over mechanical test-taking practices.<sup>8</sup> We need to continue learning from immigrant parents about the many ways in which they support their children's social, emotional, and intellectual growth—activities that often remain outside the purview of school officials. Children and immigrant parents are constantly co-constructing beliefs about literacy, language, and their own self-worth across home and school setting and, as researchers and educators, we are all implicated in the propagation of ideologies that value or devalue the knowledge of immigrant families. It is our hope that educational researchers, along with school administrators and teachers, can work to create new interactive structures for parent-teacher communication that support the development of figured worlds that do not reduce students to points on a rating scale.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to the families who participated in the study for warmly opening their homes and graciously sharing their experiences. We would like thank our colleagues at the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University for their support and feedback on the study's methodological design and the writing of the manuscript.

## Appendix A. Ivan's Progress Report

**Progress Report For** Use initial & return

I am so proud of the progress that your child has shown. I just wanted to update you on the results of our assessments. Keep up the good work!

Letter Recognition:	Sept: 50/54	March: 84/54
Letter Sounds:	Sept: 12/26	March: 25/26
Words:	Sept: 5/26	March: 26/26
Number Recognition: <small>(includes counting to 100 by 1 &amp; 10s)</small>	Sept: 19/26	March: 26/26
Sight Word Identification:	Sept: 6/55	March: 46/55
DRA Score: <small>level 3 is the end of kindergarten level 16 is the beginning of 2nd grade</small>	Jan: 2	May: n/a
Writing Score: <small>Our goal is for students to be at a 3 or 4 by the end of kindergarten. 4 point scale</small>	Jan: 2	May: n/a
Math Cumulative Test: <small>covers a sample of all the skills to be taught in kindergarten</small>	Oct: 6/22	March: 19/22

<sup>8</sup> See [García and Wei's \(2014\)](#) work on translanguaging as a model for engaging multilingual learners meaningfully in academic content.

## Appendix B. Flash Cards: Sight Words Level 1



## Appendix C Angel's Spelling Words and Worksheet on Visit #1

**Words with -ed**  
Read the base word. Write the -ed word in the puzzle.

**Across**  
2. drop      4. call  
5. help

**Down**  
1. ask  
3. plan

**Spelling Words**  
ask  
asked  
plan  
planned  
help  
helped  
drop  
dropped  
call  
called

Circle the word that is spelled correctly.

6. plan      plann      7. asc      ask  
8. cal      call      9. help      halp  
10. drop      dropp

**School Home** Home Activity Your child has been learning to add -ed to base words. Have your child write the words in the puzzle. Then have your child cross out the ending (-ed or consonant + -ed) to find the base word.

Spelling Words

## References

- Abedi, J. (2004). The no child left behind act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4–14.
- Au, K. H. P. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event? *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11(2), 91–115.
- Baquedano-López, P., Solís, J., & Kattan, S. (2005). Adaptation: The language of classroom learning? *Linguistics and Education*, 16(1), 1–26.
- Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernandez, S. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of Research in Education*, 37, 149–182.
- Bartlett, L., & Holland, D. (2002). Theorizing the space of literacy practices. *Ways of Knowing Journal*, 2(1), 10–22.
- Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does homework improve academic achievement? A synthesis of research, 1987–2003. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 1–62.
- Corno, L. (2000). Looking at homework differently. *The Elementary School Journal*, 529–548.
- Dagenais, D., Day, E., & Toohey, K. (2006). A multilingual child's literacy practices and contrasting identities in the figured worlds of French immersion classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 205–218.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1992). School matters in the Mexican-American home: Socializing children to education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 495–513.
- Fader, A. (2008). Reading Jewish signs: The socialization of multilingual literacies among Hasidic women and girls in Brooklyn New York. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 28(5), 621–641.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171.
- García Sánchez, I., & Orellana, M. (2006). The construction of moral and social identity in immigrant children's narratives-in-translation. *Linguistics and Education*, 17(3), 209–239.
- García Sánchez, I. (2010). The politics of Arabic language education: Moroccan immigrant children's language socialization into ethnic and religious identities. *Linguistics and Education*, 21(3), 171–196.
- García, E., & Frede, E. C. (Eds.). (2010). *Young English Language Learners: Current Research and Emerging Directions for Practice and Policy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging, bilingualism, and bilingual education. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 223–240). UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. *Social Problems*, 11(3), 225–250.
- Gee, J. (1991/2012). *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses*. Fourth edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Genishi, C., & Dyson, A. H. (2009). *Children, language, and literacy: Diverse learners in diverse times*. Teachers College Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gonzalez, N. (1991). *I am my language. Discourses of women and children in the borderlands*. University of Arizona Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1999). On interactional sociolinguistic method. In C. Roberts, & S. Sarangi (Eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation, and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hatt, B. (2007). Street smarts vs. book smarts: The figured world of smartness in the lives of marginalized, urban youth. *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 145–166.
- Hatt, B. (2012). Smartness as a cultural practice in schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(3), 438–460.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, D., Lachichotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kieffer, M., Lesaux, N., & Snow, C. (2006). Promises and pitfalls: implications of no child left behind for assessing, and serving English language learners. In *Key reforms under the No child left behind act: the civil rights perspective*. <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/NCLB.ELLs.Final.pdf> Accessed 30 January 2016
- LaCasa, P., Reina, A., & Alburquerque, M. (2002). Adults and children share literacy practices: The case of homework? *Linguistics and Education*, 13(1), 39–64.
- Mangual Figueroa, A. (2011). Citizenship and education in the homework completion routine. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 42(3), 263–280.
- McCarty, T. L. (2002). *A place to be Navajo: Rough rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Routledge.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms? *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Portilla, M. (2013). Maneras en que transita la tarea escolar del aula hacia el hogar. *Papeles de Trabajo sobre Cultura, Educación, y Desarrollo Humano*, 9(1), 1–15.
- Rubin, B. C. (2007). Learner identity amid figured worlds: Constructing (in) competence at an urban high school? *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 217–249.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis vol. 1*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2003). Implications of language education policies for language study in schools and universities? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 278–286.
- Shohamy, E. (2007). Language tests as language policy tools? *Assessment in Education*, 14(1), 117–130.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Street, B. V. (Ed.). (1993). (Vol. 23). Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (2003). What's new in new literacy studies: Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice? *Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77–91.
- Urciuoli, B. (1996). *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race and class*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Urrieta, L., Jr. (2007). Identity production in figured worlds: How some Mexican Americans become Chicana/o activist educators. *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 117–144.
- Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G., & Greenberg, J. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S. Mexican households. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 23(4), 313–335.
- Valdéz, G. (1992). Bilingual minorities and language issues in writing. *Written Communication*, 9, 85–136.

- Valdéz, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2–3), 102–132.
- Warriner, D. S. (2008). It's just the nature of the beast: Re-imagining the literacies of schooling in adult ESL education? *Linguistics and Education*, 18(3), 305–324.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1992). Schooling, knowledge, and power: Social transformation in the Solomon Islands. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 10–29.
- White, N. L. (2002). Discourses of Power: An analysis of homework events. *Linguistics and Education*, 13(1), 89–135.
- Wingard, L. (2007). Constructing time and prioritizing activities in interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 75–91.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34–41.