

From Family Literacy to Literacies in the Context of Newcomer Family Relationships: Mapping Literacies with Home Visitors from Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)

Maria Bastien

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree in Education

Society, Culture, and Literacies Concentration
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

© Maria Bastien, Ottawa, Canada, 2017

Dedication

For many years, degrees, and jobs, I managed not to follow in my parents' footsteps, studiously avoiding the field of education, but here is a dissertation from a Faculty of Education. I dedicate this writing to their years of service in elementary education, and to their community. I'm thankful to have my father to see this accomplishment; I'm proud that in his retirement he seems to volunteer at schools just about as many hours as he ever worked in them. My mother wished she could have seen the end of this project, but cancer does not particularly care about our plans. My mother's legacy lies in the many young children that she introduced to the joys of reading. It is my hope that this dissertation and future work may also have even a small percentage of the impact that my parents' time in the classroom has had.

Acknowledgements

The first group of individuals that I would like to acknowledge must unfortunately remain anonymous – the home visitors, parents, and other associates of my research site. I will always be grateful for their gifts of time and kindness. Without their participation, there would be no dissertation. My life is so much richer having spent the year with them, learning from them. The home visitors in particular do amazing work and I greatly admire them and the impact they make every time they step into a home. They change lives daily, including my own.

I am thankful for Professor Diana Masny who invited me on a rhizomatic journey with her through Deleuze and Guattari. I'm thankful for her continual support throughout the PhD, as being my supervisor turned out to involve far more adventures than originally planned. I know that my ability to complete this process and dissertation is due to her capabilities as a supervisor, carefully balancing support and challenge and helping me think differently about the world around me. It is my belief that through her students, her writing, and Multiple Literacies Theory she greatly enriches the field of education.

I thank my committee members, Richard Barwell, Ruth Kane, and Chris Suurtamm, for their willingness to engage with my work, that for each in one way or another, took them out of their comfort zone. I appreciated their thoughtful comments and questions that pushed me harder. I must thank Richard Barwell especially for all of our conversations on commas. I also gratefully acknowledge the thoughtful comments from external examiner Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw, and thank her for her willingness to participate. In addition to my committee members I thank Professors Taylor and Fleming for the variety of research and learning opportunities provided over the years as well as their encouragement as I completed my thesis. Finally, I am very grateful for the tutelage of Monica Waterhouse as I began the program; Monica was generous with her time and patience as she, too, introduced me to the world of Deleuzian concepts. I am very much in her debt.

For my doctoral colleagues, I know over the years we have all faced numerous challenges, ups and downs common to adult life, but all the more difficult when taken during the PhD endeavor. I am grateful for their friendship and am proud of the different and exciting work that each one does, making important contributions to our varying

fields. If I name too many names, that will be the end of any space I have for acknowledgements, but I do want to specifically thank Joanne Lalonde and Jessica Isenor for the many hours spent together both on the academic and personal sides of our lives. You both make the world a better place. I would also like to thank Maia Giesbrecht and Everett Palmer for their support. Without your friendship (and Wilbur's daily supervision), there would not have been a dissertation needing an acknowledgement.

I also take this opportunity to thank previous professors and colleagues that put me on this path. Dale Jacobs and Suzanne Matheson from the English Department at the University of Windsor encouraged my continued graduate studies and provided opportunities in courses for me to explore future directions. Erika Kustra, Michael Potter, and Pierre Boulos with the Centre for Teaching and Learning were instrumental in my decision to pursue graduate work in Education, and I'm thankful for all that I learned from their courses and mentorship. Additionally, my University of Windsor colleagues Melanie Santarossa and Jenny Ferguson continue to help me grow personally and professionally. I am thankful for the continued friendships we share and excited for the new opportunities that present themselves in our lives.

A special thank you to my two best friends: the biped that for more than a decade has never been so far away that a text or email couldn't reach; and the quadruped, who came into my life just in time to take credit for "helping" me complete this piece of writing.

Finally, I would be remiss not to address the part of my life that sustained me throughout the entire process -- my faith. I want to publically thank God for the strength to complete this despite some challenging circumstances. It is my prayer that this dissertation and my future work will benefit many families and their young children.

Maria Bastien
Windsor, Ontario
July 27, 2017

Abstract

This qualitative research project reconceptualizes conventional and prescriptive views of family literacy as literacies in the context of family relationships, experimenting with data from the home visitor participants of one international family literacy intervention program (FLIP): Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY). Participants of the HIPPY program in Canada primarily include newcomer families. While the program targets conventional forms of literacy and education relating to children's school readiness, in practice their work with these families goes far beyond this initial focus further engaging with issues related to settlement. For example, after completing HIPPY's two-year program successfully with their own children, parents can be hired to become home visitors, receive professional development and guide newcomer families through the HIPPY materials they will use with their children. Using the theoretical and practical lens of Multiple Literacy Theory (Masny, 2006, 2009, 2013) this project asks what literacy practices home visitors engage in with newcomer parents, how these practices function in the relationship, and what these practices produce in these interactions. Lombard (1981) recognized the need for further research on home visitor experiences after program coordinators noted the "highly visible changes in home visitors' level of understanding and performance" (p. 89). Since then, however, parents and children continued to be the main focus of research. This project seeks to illuminate the under-researched experiences of HIPPY home visitors.

Using the theoretical and practical lens of Multiple Literacy Theory (Masny, 2006, 2009, 2013) and the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), qualitative observation and interview data were collected and analyzed through the process of rhizoanalysis, creating four mappings. The first mapping experiments with HIPPY not as an isolated program, but as part of a much larger assemblage of programs and services focused on newcomers in a Canadian community. The second mapping looks closely at HIPPY and English language acquisition. Mapping three experiments with conceptualizations of HIPPY home visitors as instructors of "Canadian culture", and the fourth and final mapping delves into a more specific cultural focus on home and school connections. The final chapter of the dissertation is not a conclusion, but a look forward. This chapter introduces the concept of literacies in the context of family relationships as an integral part of not only early learning, but public and community health.

Keywords: family literacy, family literacy intervention programs, literacies, immigration, newcomers, assemblage, rhizome, Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
Responding to Problems With Concept Creation	3
Contextualizing the Problem	4
From Family Literacies to Family Literacy Intervention Programs	4
Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters	6
Connecting with Multiple Literacies Theory	6
Connecting with Deleuze, Multiple Literacies Theory and HIPPY	7
Researching and Writing a Rhizome	8
Looking Forward	9
CHAPTER 2: Conceptual Framework: Writing and Researching With	
Deleuze and Multiple Literacies Theory	12
What's in a Name: Poststructuralism/Postmodernism	12
Deleuze, Deleuze and Guattari	15
Key Ideas: Concept Creation, The Rhizome, and other Key Concepts	17
Conceptualizing the Concept	17
Becoming and the Assemblage, Percepts and Affects	17
The Rhizome according to Deleuze, Lines and	
De/Re/Territorialization	19
The Rhizome	19
Lines, and De/Re/Territorialization	21
De/Re/Territorialization	22
Rhizoanalysis and the Lens of Multiple Literacies Theory	23
Rhizoanalysis	23
Multiple Literacies Theory	24
Multiple Literacies Theory and Rhizoanalysis	26
CHAPTER 3: Literature Review: From(Family) Literacy, to (Family)	
Literacies in the Context of Newcomer Families with Young Children	29

Theories of Literacy: From Literacy to Literacies	29
Multiliteracies	29
New Literacy Studies	34
Multiple Literacies Theory	37
ML, NLS, and Multiple Literacies Theory	39
Family Literacy, Interventions, and Newcomer Families in Canada	41
Family Literacy	42
Family Literacy Interventions	57
CHAPTER 4: Research Design: Researching in a Rhizome	68
Research Questions	68
Working in Post-Qualitatively: Deleuze, Multiple Literacies Theory, and Rhizoanalysis	70
Deleuzian Philosophy and Multiple Literacies Theory	69
Multiple Literacies Theory	70
Rhizoanalysis	70
Researching a Rhizome	71
Site and Program Components	71
Participants	71
Participation	74
Observations and Semi-Structured Interviews	76
Data Experimentation	82
CHAPTER 5: Mapping HIPPY Springfield: Experiments in Concept Creation	86
Key Concepts: Becoming, Assemblage and Rhizome	87
Section 1: HIPPY, the State, and Power	89
Mapping 1: HIPPY and the State	93
Section 2: Concept Creation and Experimentation with HIPPY and the Rhizome	107
Intermezzo – HIPPY and the Rhizome	107
Mapping 2: HIPPY Home Visitors as Language Instructors	

Rhizocurriculum and Rhizoteaching At Work	109
Mapping 3: HIPPY Home Visitors, Newcomers and “Canadian Culture”	129
Mapping 4: HIPPY Home Visitors Negotiating Home and School Expectations	137
CHAPTER 6: Putting the Tracing Back on the Map	149
Challenges in Settlement	150
Access to Services	152
Language Acquisition and Use	153
Home and School: Expectations and Connections	154
Intermezzo	156
CHAPTER 7: Lines of Flight: Family Literacies and Community Health	157
Rhizome, Rupture, Flight	157
From Mappings and Tracings to Rupture	158
HIPPY, Springfield and Community Health	160
Thinking With Deleuze: How Might Things Be Different If...?	166
REFERENCES	168
APPENDICES	183
Appendix A: Ethics Certificate	183
Appendix B: Home Visitor Recruitment Letter	184
Appendix C: Home Visitor Consent Form	186
Appendix D: Parent Interest Form & Recruitment Letter	188
Appendix E: Parent Consent Form	191
Appendix F: Program Coordinator Recruitment Letter & Consent Form	193
Appendix G: Semi-structured Interview Protocols	197

List of Tables

Table 1.	Observation Schedule.	77
Table 2.	Participant and Interview Types.	78
Table 3.	Interview Schedule.	78

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the middle of my doctoral coursework I found myself in a course focused on marginalized youth. Based on my research interests, I thought at the time that my dissertation research would most likely engage with this demographic. As the semester went on, I found the readings increasingly disturbing and resisted engagement with materials I felt pathologized the struggles of an entire group (which in and of itself is quite diverse) as if they had a medical condition that could be cured, while simultaneously suggesting that most interventions with youth took place too late to have an effect. I wondered, if so-called marginalized youth were so far along in their “medical condition” that an intervention was considered “too little, too late,” then what would be the point of any intervention?

It was at this time in the semester that students were required to submit a proposal for a class assignment that included researching a local organization that provided some kind of assistance or intervention for youth. Rather disillusioned I struggled to come up with an organization to study. Looking through education websites favoured on my computer, I came across Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPPY). I had been briefly introduced to HIPPPY the previous semester when another graduate student, had told our class about the program in which her friend was a participant. Although the HIPPPY program is for children aged 3-5, I reasoned that if it is too late for an intervention to work on a teenager, then I should be able to study a program that might prevent the child from ever becoming “marginalized youth”. The instructor accepted my arguments for the suitability of the program for the assignment and I dove into the world of HIPPPY, family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs), and family literacy.

HIPPPY, as its name indicates, is a program where parents of pre-school aged children (ages 3-5) are provided with instruction on how to teach school readiness skills to their children. This is accomplished through weekly home visits where a home visitor, often through role-play, teaches the parent how to do a packet of activities. Throughout the week the parent will complete each day’s packet, approximately 15 minutes daily. To participate in HIPPPY, families must meet certain criteria, such as being considered a low-

income family by the standards of their region. Home visitors are parents who have completed the program themselves, thus extending their participation in the program as paid employees.

My original class assignment focused on the HIPPPY program as an intervention promoting school success for children that might otherwise struggle and become so-called “at risk” students in high school. HIPPPY applies a category of family in need as “low-literacy” and low-income, not unlike the way marginalized youth are often described as “at risk” or vulnerable. However, HIPPPY operates with the belief that early intervention can place children in a position for school success. As I delved deeper into HIPPPY, I became aware that the program was not just about the academic success of the children involved. Through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizome, I began exploring the connected nature of the parents, children, home visitors, program materials, community and other interacting elements. The rhizome continuously establishes a multiplicity of connections and constantly changes as it ruptures and branches off in new and unexpected directions. In terms of research, the rhizome creates a map of potentialities that can be used as a site in which to explore multiplicities (Honan & Sellers, 2008). What multiplicities might be explored in the HIPPPY program when viewed through the lens of rhizomic research?

This chapter serves the function of a conventional introduction to a thesis, but as any research project conducted and written with Deleuzian thought and the concept of the rhizome, the introduction is not a linear beginning; we enter in the middle. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the rhizome is not a metaphor but like the biological rhizome, it branches out in multiple directions, splitting and taking off in new directions. The rhizome itself does not have a beginning or an end, therefore “it is impossible to provide a linear description of the journey taken through and across a rhizome” (Honan, 2007, p. 533). When it comes to researching and writing a rhizome, we find that “a bloc of data has no beginning, no ending. A researcher enters in the middle” (Masny, 2013c, p. 341). The reader enters in the middle also, joining in the exploration of the data. In this introduction, entry points to the project are presented, including an overview of the conceptual framework, context, a more specific problem, and a preview of chapters to come.

Responding to Problems with Concept Creation

Deleuze and Guattari (1994) consider the work of the philosopher to have moved from the handling of preexisting concepts to the, creating, and presenting of their own concepts as well as viewing the concepts created by others critically. These concepts are both created and arise to respond to problems in the world around us. I take this to apply to the work of the researcher as well; therefore, the first element of the conceptual framework is that the work of a researcher is not the handling of preexisting or predetermined ideas but rather the presenting of new concepts and new ways of thinking. Researchers are also tasked with engaging critically with the work of other researchers. This project seeks to problematize conventional conceptualizations of family literacy and family literacy intervention programs by exploring the literate practices of adult home visitors as they engage in home visits with parents. Research on FLIPs is primarily geared toward child outcomes (i.e. so-called “school-readiness”), while bypassing the context of the adults’ participation. This project engages in concept creation to respond to the problem of a conventional view of family literacy and FLIPs to think differently about the experiences and literacy practices of the adult participants through the conceptualization of literacies in the context of family relationships.

Another element of the conceptual framework for this project is Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2006; 2011; 2013; 2014; 2016), a theory that explores literacies as 1) multiple and 2) as process. This means that unlike literacy that most often is defined as the ability to read and write, or engage with printed text, *literacies* are multiple and fluid (Masny, 2013c). Literacies consist of, but are not limited to “words, gestures, attitudes, sounds, ways of listening, speaking, writing, that is, human, animal and vegetal ways of relating to the world” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). These literacies are texts: “music, visual arts...physics, mathematics, digital remixes” (Masny, 2011, p. 495) that “fuse with religion, gender, race, culture, and power,” producing communicators and communities (Masny, 2012, p.116). Literacies are also explored as process as opposed to product. Like the rhizome briefly described above, they are not considered linear, but rather branching out in multiple and unexpected directions, constantly changing, without a beginning or end. The consideration of literacies as multiple and as process provides an

avenue to think differently about family literacy, programs such as HIPPPY, and the literate practices that a home visitor may engage in with participating parents.

Linked to Deleuzian philosophy, Multiple Literacies Theory also engages in concept work. Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2013c), as both theory and practice, focuses on concept creation to transform and “respond to problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies” (p. 342). As Coleman and Ringrose (2014) explain, “Deleuzian concepts take us to other concepts, they encourage us to make maps of connections, and to take care in the connections (and cuts) that we make” (p. 13). Working with and creating concepts provides space to problematize received forms of literacy as the only forms. For example, how might the concept of home visiting for school readiness be transformed considering literacies as multiple and as process? Perhaps new concepts might emerge with regard to the problematization of school-based literacies and the adult participants of family literacy intervention programs if we considered family literacy as literacies in the context of family relationships that include all family members.

Contextualizing the Problem

This section provides context for exploration of the HIPPPY program in two ways: first, by providing brief background information on family literacy, intervention programs, and the HIPPPY program¹; second, by connecting with Multiple Literacies Theory and Deleuzian thought to consider how one might think differently about family literacy, FLIPs such as HIPPPY, and the literacy practices of home visitors engaged in the program.

From Family Literacy to Family Literacy Intervention Programs

Family literacy and family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs) at first glance might be assumed to be straightforward terms. However, over time and with different threads of scholarship relating to families and associated literacy practices as well as programming, the terms in some research literature (further discussed in Chapter 3) have become intertwined. For the purposes of clarity, this dissertation, maintains a clear distinction between the descriptive and prescriptive aspects of family literacy and family literacy intervention programs. The key differences between the terms follow. Building

¹ A detailed literature review of family literacy, FLIPs and the HIPPPY program is provided in chapter 3. The brief information provided here is for the purpose of exploring the context of the project and is not intended as a thorough review of the literature.

on the previous work of McGee and Morrow (2005), Crawford and Zygouris-Coe (2006) present family literacy as “a concept that encompasses the ways that people learn and use literacy in their home and community lives” (p. 261). Multiple Literacies Theory might consider this strand to be about literacies in the context of family relationships, recognizing that literacies are, as Masny (2013c) describes, a multiplicity of fluid texts. Family literacy intervention programs are what I consider the prescriptive side of the field, and in many ways their programming aligns with conventional conceptualizations of literacy as relating to the ability to work with printed texts; FLIP programming is designed to support adults as they develop as their child’s first teacher. However, Letouzé, writing for the Coalition francophone pour l’alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario, considers “cultural, academic and community literacies” (as cited and translated in Masny, 2008, p. 12) as part of the mandate of FLIPs. Looking at these two strands of scholarship, I conceptualize family literacy (or perhaps, more accurately, literacies in the context of family relationships) as descriptive, exploring *what is*, as opposed to FLIPs as prescriptive, promoting what interventions believe *should be*.

Family literacy interventions primarily fall into the prescriptive area of family literacy study. FLIPs have a large body of research, but studies generally focus on evaluating children’s success in the school environment after having been a part of an intervention program (i.e. BarHava-Monteith, Harré & Field, 2003; Bradley & Gilkey, 2003; Fantuzzo, McWayne, Melhuish & Phan, 2008; Perry & Childs, 2004; Turney & Kao, 2009). These primarily quantitative studies found positive academic and social effects for the participating children that in many cases, persisted for several years after intervention programs had been completed (BarHava-Monteith, Harré, & Field, 1999; Love et al., 2005; Masny, 2008; Melhuish et al., 2008; Padak & Rasinski, 2003). Research also reveals that FLIPs can have positive outcomes for the adults involved. Some parents reported increased self-sufficiency (Keels, 2009). Others noted a newfound confidence to transmit family and cultural values (MacDonald, Moore, Stone, & Buse, 2010) and experienced healthier parent-child relationships (Le Mare & Audet, 2003). Researchers also found that participating parents had an increased enrollment in adult education classes (BarHava-Monteith et al., 2003).

Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters

This project focuses on literacies in the context of family relationships and the role of home visitors within one international FLIP, Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPO). More specifically, this research project seeks to explore the ways in which HIPPO home visitors engage in a variety of literacy practices with newcomer families enrolled in HIPPO. The target population of HIPPO Canada is related to income and conventional literacy ability, but HIPPO Canada sites often further narrow their focus to newcomer families. This means that in terms of HIPPO Canada participants the label of “low-literacy” required to engage in the program is related to level of fluency in the language in which they are participating in the program (English or French in Canada) as opposed to the actual received view of ability in reading and writing. The HIPPO program includes activity packets for ages 3-5 that are presented to parents by home visitors through role-play during a weekly home visit. Parents also have the option of participating in enrichment activities as a group, such as bi-weekly parent meetings or seasonal outings to cultural events.

After completing the HIPPO program successfully with their own children, parents can be hired to become home visitors themselves, receive professional development and guide newcomer families through the HIPPO materials they will use with their children. Home visitors at the beginning of their time with HIPPO would have been considered “low literate”, and they are newcomers themselves. The label of low literate, however, belongs to a deficit model of literacy. In order to explore the variety of literacy practices home visitors engage in with newcomer families this study elects to use a theory of literacies that embraces the multiple in a non-hierarchical fashion and does not overlay value judgments and interpretation, such as the literate/illiterate binary.

Connecting with Multiple Literacies Theory

What might Multiple Literacies Theory bring to the table in the exploration of the literacy practices of Home Visitors in HIPPO? First, Multiple Literacies Theory, as presented earlier in the introduction provides a view of literacies as multiple and beyond reading and writing texts. This moves conceptualizations of literacy in this project away from binaries such as literate/illiterate to literacies as multiple and varied. Second, as will be further discussed in the next paragraphs, Multiple Literacies Theory deploys a toolbox

from which concepts can be created in response to questions, which can then be used to open up possibilities for experimentation. This experimentation happens through the conceptualization of literacies as multiple and process asking: 1) how they function, and 2) what is produced in their becomings (Masny, 2011). What might this mean in terms of the literacy practices of HIPPY home visitors?

Experimenting with how literacies might function is related to the Deleuzian conceptualization of continuous transformation, hence Multiple Literacies Theory's position of literacies as a continually ongoing process. An example of such would be the rhizome described earlier in this chapter, always transforming, branching out in new and unexpected directions. Multiple Literacies Theory explores how literacies function in relation to literacies-as-process whereby interactions continuously disrupt preconceived notions, making connections and thinking in novel ways leading to continuous transformation (Masny, 2009b; 2012). In terms of HIPPY home visitors, asking how literacies function might lead to explorations of transformations of practice in response to a world disrupted by literacies.

Asking what literacies might produce refers to what might emerge from the interaction of elements, and how these might link back to continuous transformation. In this project, the exploration of how literacies function and what they produce refers to exploring continuous transformation as connected elements disrupt, transform, and spill over into something new, and perhaps unexpected. In exploring the literacy practices of home visitors, asking what literacies might produce asks the researcher (and the reader) to think differently.

Connecting with Deleuze, Multiple Literacies Theory and HIPPY

Deleuze asks that rather than turning to answers, we turn to questions, questions dealing with the problems that arise in the world. Waterhouse (2011), introducing her own doctoral research, writes that with Deleuze, "problems are not pre-existing gaps in our knowledge; they are immanent to the worlds in which we live" (p. 3). Connecting with Deleuze means following disruptions and turning to concept creation and experimentation. Connecting with Deleuze AND Multiple Literacies Theory includes reading intensively and immanently, or put differently, exploring literacies and literacy

practices critically and disruptively, asking how they function, what they produce, and what future becomings might happen (Masny, 2009; 2016).

This project is an apprenticeship in Deleuzian philosophy; May (2005) states that philosophers having swum in the water before us, “ease us into the water, teach us some of the strokes, so we don’t drown before we get started” (p. 112). With Deleuze, I experiment with data, asking questions relating to the literacy practices of HIPPI home visitors, engaging critically and disruptively, asking how these literacy practices function and what they produce. At this point, as May (2005) states, I “must push off from the shore and conjugate things for [myself]” (p. 112). In this project, problematizing concepts arising from what might be produced in the interaction of the literacy practices a home visitor uses with a parent during a home visit provides an opportunity “swim alone”, rendering the invisible home visitor experiences visible.

Researching and Writing a Rhizome

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, this research project takes place through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizome. The rhizome, as conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), continuously establishes a multiplicity of connections and is constantly changing as it ruptures and branches off in new and unexpected directions. The very nature of the rhizome disrupts linear thinking (Honan, 2007) creating a map of potentialities that can be used as a site in which to explore multiplicities (Honan & Sellers, 2008). Rhizoanalysis itself is the product of the disruption and transformation of methodology (Masny, 2013c). This dissertation is intended as a disruption of linear thinking, a space of experimentation of potentialities for home visitors, the researcher and readers. Rhizoanalysis coupled with Multiple Literacies Theory provides the conceptual space to explore data, asking questions about what the different new relations in an assemblage might produce.

While this dissertation does have traditional chapters, they are not disconnected pieces of writing. Throughout the chapters the rhizome connects, ruptures, and branches off in new and unexpected ways. This connection work takes places with the Deleuzian concept of the assemblage. Livesay (2010) describes Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of an assemblage as a space of interconnected multiplicities. In an assemblage, “objects, bodies, expressions, qualities, and territories,” productive networks of objects,

spaces and ideas, come together for periods of time to create new ways of functioning (Livesey, 2010). It is through the interaction of elements in an assemblage that continuous transformation can take place as elements bump into each other and, like the rhizome, disrupt and go off in a new direction. This dissertation is also an assemblage. I, the researcher and decentred subject myself, am one element responding to other connections. Other elements might include research participants, the buildings in which we met, the activity packets from HIPPY, and many more, perhaps even the computer with which I write this. Presenting myself as one part of the assemblage is a recognition that I am part of the dissertation, becoming/transforming with other elements in an assemblage.

As perhaps this introductory chapter has demonstrated, Deleuzian thought and Multiple Literacies Theory are unique in their ontological perspective. Going forward, items such as the literature review and research design require constant rhizomatic engagement with this ontology. For the ease of the reader's engagement with these topics, the conceptual framework is presented as chapter 2. This is to provide context for the connections to Deleuzian thought and Multiple Literacies Theory that will be made throughout the entire dissertation.

Looking Forward

“Ontology itself has strange adventures in store for us, if only we can think differently about how it might be conceived. If we stop searching for the true, stop asking the world to allow us to recognize it, stop knowing what everybody knows, then we can set off on a new thought, a thought that is both ontological and foreign, an experiment in ontology, rather than an exercise in dogmatism” (May, 2005, p. 81).

This is an invitation to you, the reader, to continue with me on this strange adventure through the following chapters:

Chapter 2, *Conceptual Framework: Writing and Researching With Deleuze and Multiple Literacies Theory*, explores the elements constituting the conceptual framework of this project. It begins with a description of the historical and greater philosophical context in which Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari write. Next, an overview of the ontology with which Deleuze and Guattari worked is provided, followed by some of the key terms and concepts that will regularly appear in the dissertation. A description of the

rhizome is included in this section in preparation for its links to rhizoanalysis, mapping, and a deeper exploration of Multiple Literacies Theory.

Chapter 3, *Literature Review: From(Family) Literacy, to (Family) Literacies in the Context of Newcomer Families with Young Children*, provides a literature review of the variety of topics that intersect in this project, divided into two major parts: the field of literacy/ies theory, and the world of family literacy and family literacy intervention programming, particularly as it relates to newcomer families with young children. This chapter unusually comes after the conceptual framework, as it is necessary to differentiate between received conceptualizations of the topic. An example of this necessity is in the very term, family literacy, as opposed to family literacies, or literacies in the context of the family. The chapter opens with a discussion of the shift in literacy theories and research from literacy in the received view of singular and referring solely to the ability to read and write, to literacies with the potential to be multiple. In this section the contributions of two major literacies theories are presented: New Literacy Studies (e.g. Gee, 1999) and Multiliteracies (e.g. New London Group, 2000). This is done in the context of recent work related to issues found in this thesis, such as immigration, language acquisition, and plurilingualism. This is followed by a review of Multiple Literacies Theory. The second part of this chapter shifts to conceptualizations of family literacy, FLIP literature, as well as the context of early learning in Canada and the Province of Ontario, where this project takes place. This necessitates the inclusion of information about the specific challenges faced by the primary recipients of FLIP programming in Canada – newcomer families with young children. The chapter ends with a more detailed description of the HIPPY program in Canada, Ontario, and the local HIPPY site where this project took place, followed by a review of literature related to family literacy programming.

Chapter 4, *Research Design: Researching in a Rhizome*, provides a rationale for the project and states the formal research questions. To assist the reader, a short review of the conceptual framework is provided, followed by details on data collection, participants, and analysis.

Chapter 5, *Mapping HIPPY Springfield: Experiments in Concept Creation*, presents research data in the form of four interconnected mappings, inviting the reader to

follow the linear path the pages force while we explore the decidedly non-linear interconnected lines of HIPPY the program, the experiences of HIPPY home visitors, and the literacy practices used by home visitors as they work with newcomer families in Canada with young children. Mapping 1 takes a macro view of HIPPY, positioning it as part of a much larger assemblage of programs and services focused on newcomers in a Canadian community. Mappings 2 and 3 connect with Waterhouse's (2011) conceptualization of rhizocurriculum, with mapping 2 focusing on the HIPPY program and English language acquisition, and mapping 3 tying HIPPY and home visitors to "Canadian culture" and State interests in settlement. The final mapping 4 continues to explore Canadian culture, but focuses specifically on home and school connections and expectations.

Chapter 6, *Putting the Tracing Back on the Map*, brings together the mappings of Chapter 5, and the literature review in Chapter 3, through Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) conceptualization of tracing. The chapter presents the connections between rhizomic experimentations with concept creation and a tracing's organization of multiplicities through conventional literature review

Chapter 7, *Lines of Flight: Family Literacies and Community Health*, is a rupture in the assemblage that makes up this dissertation, a line escaping off in another direction that could not have been predicted when this project was first proposed in December 2013. Not a conclusion, but a look forward, and to use these pages to ask, how might things be different if we conceptualized family literacy not only as tied to education, but as a part of overall community health?

CHAPTER 2

Conceptual Framework:

Writing and Researching With Deleuze and Multiple Literacies Theory

Where are you going? Where are you coming from?... Kleist, Lenz, and Büchner have another way of traveling and moving: proceeding from the middle, through the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing.
(Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 25)

One of the most difficult aspects of working with philosophers such as Deleuze and Guattari is the question of how to meet linear expectations when philosophically one views the operation of the world not as an arborescent structure, but a rhizomic one. It means that to try and start a paragraph or a section it starts not at a perceived bottom or beginning, such as the roots of a tree, but somewhere in and through a middle of a rhizome, “coming and going rather than starting and finishing” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 25). That said, there are external obligations, such as the presentation of a conceptual framework and the context from which this comes. This chapter enters in the middle of a portrait of the larger and more general concepts of postmodernism and poststructuralism, following lines to the philosophies of Deleuze and Guattari as well as entries conceptualizing key ideas related to this project, such as concept creation. Further entries lead to Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of the rhizome and the move to rhizoanalysis, followed by an introduction of Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2015) and the connections between Multiple Literacies Theory and Rhizoanalysis.

What’s in a Name? Poststructuralism/Postmodernism

In this section, I introduce the ontological positions of poststructuralism and postmodernism and their relationship to one another, not as a linear way to lead up to Deleuze and Guattari’s work, but to set the context in which their work exists. Poststructuralism and postmodernism are often conflated in literature, likely due to a number of philosophers ending up labeled as both. Peters and Burbules (2004) also link the effect of poststructuralist thought on the development of postmodernism. Strictly speaking, however, postmodernism is defined as a response to modernism, and poststructuralism to structuralism (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Structuralism, Peters and Burbules (2004) explain, looks at wholeness, a system and the elements that make up a

system, while still standing against linear conceptualizations of causality.

Poststructuralism refers more to “a mode of thinking, a style of philosophizing, and a kind of writing,” and should not be used as a blanket term to create theoretical unity among poststructural philosophy (Peters and Burbules, 2004). This is an important point, that while we are briefly exploring the big picture of poststructuralism and postmodernism, it does not mean that in this general term for a worldview, the thinkers associated with these terms are in any way unified philosophically.

Going on to modernism, we find that it makes different assumptions and can be defined as “a movement sustained by a belief in the advancement of knowledge and human progress, made on the basis of experience and scientific method” (Peters and Burbules, 2004, p. 9). Postmodernism then represents a value shift in which “grand narratives” are treated with suspicion and defined as “stories that cultures tell themselves about their own practices and beliefs in order to legitimate them” (Peters & Burbules, 2004, p. 12). Crotty (1998) positions this shift breaking down boundaries and distinctions between elite and popular culture, art and life.

The terms postmodern and poststructural are also linked to research community geography. Crotty (1998) explains that poststructuralism, rooted in French structuralism, might be a more French endeavor which in turn heavily influenced American postmodernism. Stone (2005) suggests that this conflation is geographic and linguistically specific to Anglo-American postmodern scholarship, which might explain why individual theorists used by postmodern and poststructural thinkers could on some occasions be classified as postmodern as these French theorists were translated into English and moved fluidly across and through disciplines. Working in North America, it is likely that much of the Anglo-North American research I might read would be influenced by this mixing as well.

Working with Deleuze and Guattari, I consider their work to align more with post-structuralism, while recognizing there are legitimate reasons for a blurred area between post-modernist and post-structuralist thought and recognize utility in Stone’s (2005) conclusion that postmodern and poststructural theorists belong to the same postmodern/poststructural family. That said, this is still a family of which Deleuze himself would likely not have labeled himself a member. The ontology of this

postmodern/poststructural family moves beyond concepts of the multiple or real to abandon and challenge claims to universal truth (Crotty, 1998; Peters & Burbules, 2004). Instead, it “commits itself to ambiguity, relativity, fragmentation, particularity and discontinuity” (Crotty, 1998, p. 185) moving toward “a new freedom of thought, action, and interpretation” (Peter & Burbules, 2004, p. 81). It is in this sense of multiplicity that the blurred and undecided genres of the poststructural/postmodern circumvent foundations and provide opportunities to shake perceptions of the “real” (Lather, 2007).

An aspect of import for postmodern and poststructural ontology is the subject. As will become evident shortly in explorations of Deleuze and Guattari’s work, post-structural/post-modern ontology radically decentres the subject by removing subject agency, focusing instead on how the subject is built (Crotty, 1998; Stone, 2005). Stone (2005) clarifies this position stating “of course people act in the world, but thoughts, actions, and their results are not simply desired, conscious, intentional, and consequential. The subject comes to be constituted; how this occurs variously matters to each member of the family” (p. 86). Deleuzian scholars, for example, might use the terms “becoming” and “assemblage” (conceptualized later in this chapter) to describe the transformation of the subject in relation to experiences and the world around them (Masny, 2009b). Poststructural/postmodern scholars look at the practices included in the constitution of the subject to see what actually happens, understanding these happenings as having a life of their own (Stone, 2005).

Deleuze, Deleuze and Guattari

In this section, I provide further background information on Deleuzian philosophy and introduce some of the intertwined ideas conceptualized and reconceptualized in Deleuze and Guattari’s work, including some of the key concepts that inform this project. Deleuze and Guattari’s meeting was as a result of the May 1968 student protests in France, even though they did not actually meet until the next year. Dosse states that “their first common publication, *Anti-Oedipus*, was rooted in the May movement and bore the stamp of the intellectual ferment of the period” (Dosse, 2010, p. 179). The May 1968 student protests, which later included worker protests, were what Steinfels (2008) calls “an examination of conscience...of its [France’s] fundamental values.” The Independent (2008) described it as “a revolt against the stifling papa-knows-best conservatism, and

dullness, of General Charles de Gaulle's economically booming 1960s France.” In early 1969 a mutual friend introduced Deleuze and Guattari, and according to Dosse (2010), “Guattari and Deleuze immediately connected” (p. 3).

The work of Deleuze and Guattari, according to Dosse, was:
 an experimental counterpoint. They planned to use the social sciences—
 anthropology, semiotics, psychoanalysis, and history— to contest and undo the
 structuralist paradigm, by rereading the latest work in these disciplines,
 particularly when they took approaches that were not structuralist. The issue was
 to have the two of them use the method of “perversion” that Deleuze had defined
 to get out of the structural enclosure. (Dosse, 2010, p. 231)

The work of Deleuze and Guattari, and the work of this thesis, is an experiment in order to undo traditional ways of doing qualitative research and think differently, or outside of the enclosure.

I would like to note that while much of the Deleuzian philosophy in this dissertation comes from the collaborative works of Deleuze and Guattari, I often refer to concepts as Deleuzian. Waterhouse (2011) notes in her own dissertation that the use of the adjective Deleuzian is not without recognition of the contributions of Guattari, “but rather acknowledges that Guattari’s solo work, as a practicing psychotherapist with an interest in using philosophy and semiotics to reconceptualize subjectivity and reinvent Freudian psychoanalysis, develops in unique directions that are not directly informing this research” (p. 4, Footnote 3).

Deleuze and Guattari’s overarching ontological stance is a natural starting point to introduce key concepts at work in this project. Colebrook (2002), referring to Deleuze’s concept of transcendental empiricism, states that: “Deleuze described his own philosophy as an ethics of amor fati: as love of what is (and not as the search for some truth, justification or foundation beyond, outside or transcendent to what is)” (p. 71). The work of Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari look to what is, as opposed to an interpretation:

Actually, there is no longer any need to interpret, but that is because the best interpretation, the weightiest and most radical one, is an eminently significant silence. . . . In truth, significance and interpretosis are the two diseases of the earth

or the skin, in other words, humankind's fundamental neurosis. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 114).

Deleuze and Guattari reject interpretation and the pre-given (1987, 1984), instead looking to continuous connections, disruptions and rupture, and continuous transformation.

All of this takes place in the context of the decentred subject that is produced by these characteristics with unlimited potentiality. The decentred subject refers to the subject) "not in subject position actively controlling. The subject becomes an effect of events in life" (Masny, 2013c, p. 341). As Masny (2013c) states:

Deleuze (1994) moves away from the foundation of the subject who thinks and represents. Rather, it is the subject who is the product of events in life. An event, according to Deleuze (1990), refers to life that produces deterritorializations, moments that create ruptures and differences that allows for creation to take off along various unpredicted directions, a rhizome... (p. 341)

In the coming sections, these characteristics will appear again, intertwined through the concepts presented, including that of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) conceptualization of the rhizome.

Key Ideas: Concept Creation, The Rhizome, and other Key Concepts

The philosopher is expert in concepts and in the lack of them. He knows which of them are not viable, which are arbitrary or inconsistent, which ones do not hold up for an instant. On the other hand, he also knows which are well formed and attest to a creation, however disturbing or dangerous it may be. – Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 3 (What is Philosophy)

In the introductory chapter of *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari (1994) quote Nietzsche's alteration of the role of the philosopher, moving from the handling of preexisting concepts to the making, creating, and presenting of their own concepts, as well as viewing the concepts created by others critically. Taking this as part of a conceptual framework that includes with Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2013c), which, as theory and practice, focuses on concept creation to transform and "respond to problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies" (p. 342), this project must therefore engage in concept creation. In this section, several key concepts from Deleuze and Guattari will be explored, beginning with their conceptualization of the concept itself.

Conceptualizing the Concept

What then are the characteristics of concepts and their creation? Deleuze and Guattari (1994) conceptualize and reconceptualize the characteristics of the concept throughout their work in multiple entries. First, the concept is put forth as a philosophical idea (p. 8); concepts are not given, but created (p. 11), and arise to meet problems (p. 16). Another important element is that concepts themselves experience becomings, or continuous transformation, not unlike the multiple entries exploring the concept; “A concept requires not only a problem through which it recasts or replaces earlier concepts but a junction of problems where it combines with other coexisting concepts” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 18). Deleuze and Guattari further present the concept in four characteristics:

- 1) every concept is related to, and connects with other concepts;
- 2) the components of concepts are inseparable;
- 3) concepts are coincidental productions of their own components, and;
- 4) not discursive.

In review, making connections between these explorations of the concept, Deleuze and Guattari (1994) summarize that concepts are relationship, connective, linking and consistent.

Why is the concept so important? Deleuze and Guattari (1994) note that “The creation of concepts in itself calls for a future form, for a new earth and people that do not yet exist” (p. 108). Masny and Bastien (2016) state:

Concepts are not given. If another problem arises, then a solution calls for a different concept to be created. Moreover, what is important is that a concept is always in becoming; it is in the process of relating to other concepts. They do not operate in isolation” (p. 2).

Working with concepts that arise rather than those that are pre-given, through the constant connections of the heterogeneous and continuous transformation to meet problems creates the opportunity to look forward, to ask what might be.

Becoming and the Assemblage, Percepts and Affects

Becoming or becomings, continuous transformations, happen in what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe as an assemblage, a space of interconnected multiplicities.

Productive networks of objects, spaces and ideas that come together for periods of time to create new ways of functioning (Livesey, 2010). When asking the question of what might be produced in an interaction, the question is referring to what might occur in the productive network of an assemblage; as elements in assemblages disrupt and transform, becomings occur (Masny, Bastien, & Hashi, 2013). Jackson (2013) considers Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of becoming and difference² "their response to Western philosophy's reliance on becoming as a transcendent, linear process being diluted to difference-from-the-same, which relies on a stable identity (or sameness) for external comparisons and relations, as in grouping" (p. 115). Deleuze and Guattari's becoming is about rejecting the linear for non-hierarchical connections.

These becomings are related to the concepts of percepts and affects. When considering a postmodern/poststructuralist position of a decentered subject, the idea of what might be produced as separate from creator or observer, what is left is the created itself, that Deleuze and Guattari (1994) identify as "*a bloc of sensations, ... a compound of percepts and affects*" (p. 164), perceptions and affections or feelings. In a worldview with a decentered subject, percepts and affects both are "independent... of those that experience them... *beings* whose validity lies in themselves and exceeds any lived" (p. 164). A Deleuzian conceptualization of production comes in terms of the concepts affect and becoming; "Affects are becomings that spill over beyond whoever lives through them (thereby becoming someone else)" (Deleuze 1995, p. 137). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) explain:

We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body. (p. 257)

Exploring what might be produced refers to the affect produced in the relationship between the elements of an assemblage; the power of affect created by these interactions

² With regards to difference, Jackson (2013) states: "difference does not exist in opposition to sameness; rather, difference is immanent to sameness" (p. 115). Difference is not different from as in a binary, but simply different.

connects with the continuous transformations of becoming (Masny, 2013ac). This project includes the exploration of how literacies function and what they produce, referring then to the continuous transformation as the elements within an assemblage disrupt, transform, and spill over into something new, and perhaps unexpected.

The Rhizome according to Deleuze, Lines and De/Re/Territorialization

The Rhizome

A rhizome in the biological sense, such as a ginger or strawberry plant, has roots and shoots that branch out in multiple directions, splitting and taking off in new directions. The rhizome, as conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), continuously establishes a multiplicity of connections and is constantly changing as it ruptures and branches off in new and unexpected directions; rupture refers to a rhizome breaking, or shattering “at a given spot, but... start[ing] up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines” (p. 9). The rhizome itself does not have a beginning or an end, therefore “it is impossible to provide a linear description of the journey taken through and across a rhizome” (Honan, 2007, p. 533). The very nature of the rhizome disrupts linear thinking (Honan, 2007) creating a map of potentialities that can be used as a site in which to explore multiplicities (Honan & Sellers, 2008).

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) put forward six characteristics of the rhizome, some presented in pairs: 1 and 2) connection and heterogeneity; 3) multiplicity; 4) asignifying rupture; 5 and 6) cartography and decalcomania. Connection and heterogeneity refers to the way a rhizome makes continuous connections; anything that can connect must connect. This relates to the concept of the rhizome as opposed to the concept of a tree; the rhizome is not bound by binary or linear order and decentres any subject.

The third characteristic, multiplicity, can be conceptualized as “a complex structure that does not reference a prior unity” (Roffe, 2010, p. 181). Rhizomes are always in the middle, there is not beginning or end; “there are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or root. There are only lines” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 8). Deleuze and Guattari relate this characteristic to the concept of the assemblage, stating that a multiplicity “cannot increase in number without... changing in nature”, further linking this to the assemblage stating “An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it

expands its connections” (p. 8). It is the expansion of these connections as the multiplicity increases, changing, expanding, and spilling over into becomings.

The fourth characteristic, asignifying rupture refers to the concept that a rhizome is always in motion, traveling along lines; “A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 9). Lines break, and rupture, and flee, but the rhizome simply starts up again in the middle on a new line or along an old one (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 9).

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discuss the last two characteristics together: cartography and decalcomania. For Deleuze and Guattari, “[a]ll of tree logic is a logic of tracing and reproduction,” whereas “[t]he rhizome is altogether different, a *map and not a tracing*....What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real” (p. 12). The map does not reproduce, it constructs and fosters connections. A rhizome is a mapping focused on experimentation, however, the tracing can (and should) be placed back on the map allowing a view of “blockages...or points of structuration” (p. 13). With Deleuze and Guattari, there is never “OR” but rather “AND”... the map AND the tracing AND...

It is important not to confuse the concept of the rhizome and its characteristics with metaphor. While using the rhizome metaphorically might be useful in attempts to concretize theory and practice, Gregoriou (2008) explains it was never intended to create “normative statements on resistance or pedagogy” which can become new microfacisms (p. 101). In Sellers (2015) article, readers are explicitly invited “to cast aside the notion of rhizome as metaphor, which is a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is transferred to an object or action so that something is regarded as representative, suggestive or symbolic of something else” (p. 7). Sellers states that another reading of the rhizome is that it is not explained in metaphorical terms, but rather as part of a concept.

Researching rhizomatically is a transformative exercise (Honan & Sellers, 2008) allowing researchers to map new connections and look to possibilities of what these connections might produce rather than reproduce preexisting structures. For researchers, the rhizome creates an opportunity to experiment with a multiplicity of unexpected relationships and transformations (Leander & Rowe, 2006). Some examples of recent research using the rhizome include Masny and Waterhouse (2016) and Zhang and Guo

(2017). Masny and Waterhouse (2016) use rhizoanalysis to discuss issues emerging from an assemblage of immigration policy, language and literacy in Australia and Canada. Zhang and Guo (2017), in their engagement with Chinese children in a Mandarin-English bilingual program in Alberta, Canada, use Multiple Literacies Theory and the “rhizome to map Chinese children’s dynamic and unpredictable connections in literacies, which opens up new avenues for language and literacy research and thinking” (p. 54). In a later section of this chapter the rhizome connects with Multiple Literacies Theory, an opportunity in and of itself to experiment with relationships and transformations.

Lines, and De/Re/Territorialization

“we are traversed by lines, ... we are composed of lines, ... bundles of lines, for each kind is multiple.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 202)

In discussion of the rhizome itself, we come across the concept of lines, but have not yet explored the concept of lines itself. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) propose three kinds of lines, lines that are not solitary, but that “continually intermingle” (p. 198). The three kinds of lines are identified as molar lines, molecular lines, and lines of flight.

The molar line is described as a “*rigid line of segmentarity*” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 195). Deleuze and Guattari are quick to say that this does not mean that the line is dead, as “it occupies and pervades our life, and always seems to prevail in the end” (p. 195). It is also not “bad”, as it is everywhere, and intermingled with the other lines. It is associated with the concept of the State apparatus, reterritorializing, and with the concept of overcoding or forcing something ready-made (p. 3), forcing a “centering, unification, totalization, integration, hierarchization, and finalization” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 41).

The second line, the molecular, is considered more supple. It is described as “a *line of molecular or supple segmentation* the segments of which are link quanta of deterritorialization” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 196). In contrast to the molar line, it is associated with a more “primitive segmentarity,” one where the State apparatus does not function in the same organized and organizing manner (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 222). It is important to return to the concept that there are no good or bad lines and note that the addition of suppleness to the molecular line does not make things “better,” only different (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 215).

The final type of line, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state is “a kind of *line of flight* that is just as real as the others even if it occurs in place: this line no longer tolerates segments; rather it is like an exploding of the two segmentary series” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 197). Other words to describe the movement include “rupture”, “clean break” (p. 199) and “[a]bsolute deterritorialization” (p. 200). These lines are not “running away from the world but rather in causing runoffs” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 204); like the overflow of affect creating becomings, a line of flight creates runoff. Deleuze and Guattari also note that a line of flight isn’t something that happens afterward, in fact “it is there from the beginning, even if it awaits its hour, and waits for the others to explode” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, 205).

De/Re/Territorialization

The terms deterritorialization and reterritorialization have been mentioned without further explication in the above entries. The concept is tied not only to lines and the rhizome, but also back to the assemblage. The assemblage is described by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) as having “both *territorial sides*, or reterritorialized sides, which stabilize it, and *cutting edges of deterritorialization*, which carries it away” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 88). Parr (2010) described deterritorialization as “a movement producing change”; “to deterritorialise is to free up the fixed relations that contain a body all the while exposing it to new organisations” (p. 69). A territory is disrupted, deterritorialization and exposure to the new happens which is then followed by reterritorialization. When exploring de/re/territorialization in terms of philosophy and the concept, Deleuze and Guattari (1994) write that “philosophical thought does not bring its concepts together in friendship without again being traversed by a fissure that leads them back to hatred or disperses them in the coexisting chaos where it is necessary to take them up again, to seek them out, to make a leap” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 203); concepts come together and interact, are deterritorialized, and reterritorialized to set out again.

Rhizoanalysis and the Lens of Multiple Literacies Theory

Rhizoanalysis

Sellers (2015) states: “In various rhizo mo(ve)ments any of these – data, methodology, analysis, literature, theory, practice – or any relationship among these may be foregrounded, each always already becoming (an)other” (p. 10).

Rhizoanalysis itself is the product of the disruption and reconceptualization of methodology. It is an emerging and diverse exploration in transcendental empirical qualitative research (Masny, 2013c) or even post-qualitative research (Masny, 2016). Researchers using rhizoanalysis conceptualize what it might be and how it might work without creating a linear research structure as there is no one “correct” way to do rhizoanalysis. Honan and Sellers (2008), however, provide three commonalities between the various uses. First, the rhizome allows the inclusion of the researcher’s voice through tentative and transgressive writing (Honan & Sellers, 2008). This is an important distinction as rhizoanalysis sees relationality between the elements of the research assemblage; the researcher is only one element of the assemblage (not in the participatory sense, but in the sense that an assemblage has multiple elements functioning in relationships). Second, it does not consider data for analysis as linear, but follows lines moving across the rhizome and identifies connections between systems (Honan & Sellers, 2008). Third, the rhizome allows for the analysis of diverse bodies of data, which Honan and Sellers suggest “enables (e)merging~(im)plausible readings and connections” (p. 111). These connections provide space to focus on relationality as opposed to interpretation, crisscrossing the “threshold of past conventions and new territories of research” (Eakle, 2007, p. 483).

The question of how this data is collected is open and requires a look at how researchers are actually “doing” rhizome work. Honan (2007), performing discourse analysis on selected curriculum documents, used the rhizome to make connections which led to conceptualizing discursive systems as plateaus that are interconnected and inform each other. Through rhizoanalysis, Honan was able to make connections such as linking document analysis to the teachers who used the curriculum documents, through interview and observation data. Eakle (2007) explored literacy and power structures in a Christian school in the United States. Using data from observations, interviews, and collected

documents, Eakle focused on power structures and used the rhizome to map how participants crisscross social structures. Waterhouse (2009), exploring literacies in adult immigrant language classrooms in Canada, collected video, audio and interview data, and used the rhizome to juxtapose participant vignettes with Masny's (2009, 2013, 2014, 2015) Multiple Literacies Theory in order to explore the possibilities such a conceptual lens affords. For Eakle (2007) and Waterhouse (2011) the process involves making actual maps of data. Honan and Sellers (2008) describe it as the constant and continuous making of connections. Rhizoanalysis gives researchers the freedom to collect a variety of data through qualitative practices and map their connections in novel ways that cross and blur boundaries of mainstream research.

Multiple Literacies Theory

Multiple Literacies Theory, as theory and practice, steps away from literacy as a synthetic term used to define the ability to work with a printed text, to conceptualize literacies as a multiplicity of fluid texts (Masny, 2013c). Masny and Bastien (2016) state that the “movement from literacy to literacies is a conceptual shift” (p. 2); “Literacy is a concept, a bounded stable territory. Deterritorialization undoes a territory, only to configure a different territory (reterritorialization). Literacy becomes unstable in order to create a different concept, multiple literacies” (Masny, 2013c, p. 340). Literacies are “heterogeneous, nonhierarchical and multiple” (p. 2). Literacies in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory consist of, but are not limited to “words, gestures, attitudes, sounds, ways of listening, speaking, writing, that is, human, animal and vegetal ways of relating to the world” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). These literacies are texts: “music, visual arts...physics, mathematics, digital remixes” (Masny, 2011, p. 495). As texts, literacies “fuse with religion, gender, race, culture, and power” producing communicators and communities (Masny, 2012, p. 116).

Focusing on the nonlinear interaction of literacies, Multiple Literacies Theory creates an environment in which the question of *What might these interactions produce?* can be explored (e.g. the interaction between the parent and HIPPIY materials, the paraprofessional and a training session) (Masny, 2011). When looking at the interactions of, for example, (but not limited to) home visitor, curriculum, parent, and community, I ask if these interactions might produce opportunities for language acquisition. As both

theory and practice, Multiple Literacies Theory promotes multiple literacies as a way to stimulate equity and access (Masny, 2009a); exploring the multiple and what it might produce creates opportunities to explore conceptualizations of normativity, potentially giving way to more open-ended practices in education.

Multiple Literacies Theory engages in concept creation to guide and experiment with new ideas. Multiple Literacies Theory creates a toolbox that can be used to question and explore two interconnected aspects of literacies, 1) how they function, and 2) what they produce (Masny, 2011). Exploring how literacies might function is related to the concept of becoming, a key concept for use in this project. Multiple Literacies Theory uses becoming to explore literacies-as-process, whereby interactions continuously disrupt preconceived notions and make connections with different ideas in novel ways leading to continuous transformation (Masny, 2009b, 2012). For example, interactions of mother, child and curriculum might produce connections leading to transformation – mother and child, mother as teacher and child.

When exploring what literacies might produce, Multiple Literacies Theory refers to a Deleuzian description of production in terms of the concepts affect and becoming presented above; asking what literacies might produce refers to the affect that is produced in the relationship between the elements of an assemblage; the power of affect created by these interactions links back to the continuous transformations of becoming (Masny, 2013ac). In this project, the exploration of how literacies function and what they produce refers to exploring continuous transformation as the elements within an assemblage disrupt, transform, and spill over into something new, and perhaps unexpected.

Shared in more detail in Chapter 3, Multiple Literacies Theory has been put into practice by multiple researchers in recent years. For example, Waterhouse (2011) explored newcomer experiences in a second language acquisition program. Riddle (2014) used Multiple Literacies Theory to engage with literacies in the context of music. Østern (2016) discussed “Multiple Literacies Theory Reading, Reading the World and Self in Multiple Environments” and the “doing” of literacies. Furthermore, Hussein et al. (2016) focused on putting Multiple Literacies Theory to work in interdisciplinary research. Multiple Literacies Theory is theory and practice; it must be put to work as has been done with the aforementioned research.

Multiple Literacies Theory AND Rhizoanalysis

In this project, rhizoanalysis couples with the conceptual framework of Multiple Literacies Theory, which, as theory and practice, focuses on concept creation to transform and “respond to problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). Positioning the research event as an assemblage itself, this iteration of rhizoanalysis avoids fixed processes such as coding by focusing on the affective; “intense affective passages...disrupt as connections happen in the mind of the researcher and thought is produced” (Masny, 2013c, p. 343). Additionally, taking a “rhizomatic approach counters the arborescent nature of conventional literacy” (Masny & Bastien, 2016, p. 2). I link conventional literacy with arborescence because of its focus on particular kinds and ways of doing literacy; for example, a focus on working with printed text in predetermined ways in order for the end product to be valued. Working with a rhizomatic approach disrupts a focus on the end result of a “literacy activity”, instead experimenting with what might be produced in the interaction in which the activity took place.

Rhizoanalysis in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory and this project can be characterized by four key components. First, ontologically, rhizoanalysis positions individuals as a decentred subject; the individual is part of the assemblage, not directing it (Masny, 2013c). Second, data are non-hierarchical, without a beginning or end; the researcher can interact with the data in a non-linear, non-hierarchical manner (Masny, 2013c). Third, there is no explanation or interpretation of the data as any interpretation assumes that there is indeed some deep meaning that can be interpreted (Masny, Bastien & Hashi, 2013). Finally, rhizoanalysis is anti-representation. Representation “limits experience to the world as we know it, not as a world that could be” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). As Masny (2016) states, representation suggests an original and a copy.

Furthermore:

Representation limits experience to the world as we know it. It is not a world posited out there that needs representation; rather it is a world that is real and a world yet to come. It is a world of production, invention, and experimentation. (Masny, 2016, p. 2)

Considering data as non-representational opens research up to questions of what might be.

With rhizoanalysis in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory, the “analysis” comes through the creation of vignettes, a de- and reterritorialization of conventional forms of observation (Masny, 2015). The researcher explores emerging concepts indirectly through purposeful questioning (Masny, 2013c). In purposeful questioning, the researcher introduces concepts indirectly in question form to encourage a variety of ways of thinking about the vignette, as there is no one way to look at it (Masny, 2013c, 2015, 2016). The vignette and its creation take place in an assemblage that includes the researcher “in a relationality of affect with the differential elements in the assemblage” (Masny & Bastien, 2016, p. 4); e.g. the assemblage may include an interview transcript, the researcher, and the computer. Masny and Bastien (2016) note, “While it may appear putting pen to paper in a conventional manner, transcripts are part of a nonhierarchical rhizomatic research assemblage” (p. 4). Sellers (2015) considers rhizoanalysis “a way of processing through an assemblage involving research methodology, generation of data and analytical possibilities entwined within”(p. 6-7). Vignettes from data are created as the researcher works with the data and disruptions occur in the assemblage (Masny, 2013c). Masny & Bastien (2016) state:

connections happen in the mind but are not controlled or decided by the researcher. The mind is not responsible for selecting vignettes even though the experience of connectivity takes place in the mind. Rather, it is in a research assemblage that content and expression de- and reterritorialize, that is, the power of affect flows through the relationality of differential elements in the assemblage and vignettes emerge. (p. 4)

Rhizoanalysis provides the conceptual space to explore the research event and data, asking questions about what the different new relations in the assemblage produce. Sellers (2015) states: “In various rhizo mo(ve)ments any of these – data, methodology, analysis, literature, theory, practice – or any relationship among these may be foregrounded, each always already becoming (an)other” (p. 10).

Rhizoanalysis coupled with Multiple Literacies Theory connects with reading intensively and immanently. Masny (2016) states that a rhizoanalytic reading intensive of

an assemblage can lead to an “untimely disruption that creates a rupture” (p. 4). Relatedly, “Reading immanently consists of what might happen (potentiality) in reading, reading the world and self in an assemblage” (Masny, 2016, p. 4). The reading of self refers to the connections in an assemblage and their de- and reterritorializations; “Reading an assemblage in rhizoanalysis consists [of] reading the interaction between bodies, expression, and affect” (p. 4).

In this research project, Multiple Literacies Theory and its recognition of multiple literacies and their interactions with one another allows for a rich discussion of the interactions of HIPPY, paraprofessionals, and parents, and what transformations or becomings these literacies might produce. Multiple Literacies Theory celebrates these interactions as opportunities to produce in an assemblage, what Livesey (2010) describes as a productive space of innovation. Masny (2009b) asks, “If we can conceive understandings that permit and encourage different ways of living in the world, can we consider the case of multiple literacies as ways to provide different and differing educational opportunities?” (p. 13). If Multiple Literacies Theory is the proposed theoretical framework to explore what the HIPPY-paraprofessional-parent assemblage might produce, how could the relations in this assemblage function? What might they produce?

CHAPTER 3

Literature Review:

From (Family) Literacy, to (Family) Literacies in the Context of Newcomer Families with Young Children

“Thinking does not need to be a solitary activity, and it surely does not take place in a world we do not share with others. The next step, then, might be to consider our place among others in the world. To think about it, or with it, or in it.” (May, 2005, p, 113.

The following literature review is divided into two main topics: literacies theories and family literacy interventions. The first section focuses on on literacies theories, first providing an overview of two important theories of literacies, multiliteracies and New Literacy Studies focusing its review through the context of immigration and second language learners. The first section further includes a review of and rationale for the use of Multiple Literacies Theory in this project. The second section on family literacy interventions discusses challenges immigrant families face, family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs), and Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY).

Theories of Literacy: From Literacy to Literacies

With the linguistic turn from literacy to literacies in recent years, multiple conceptualizations of literacies have developed. According to Masny (2009b, 2012) there are two key theories of literacies in addition to Multiple Literacies Theory that have advanced more open conceptualizations of literacy through their movement from literacy (commonly defined at the ability to read and write) to literacies (presented as multiple) – multiliteracies and New Literacy Studies. In the following pages the basic tenets of these theories are presented, followed by connections between work done in this mode that may relate to the topics emerging in this thesis, ending with points of theoretical critique leading the way forward for this project to plug in to Multiple Literacies Theory.

Multiliteracies

The New London Group (NLG), made up of primarily Australian and American literacy experts, formed in 1994 with the purpose of improving how language and

literacies were taught in schools (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). This meeting resulted in a manifesto, published in 1996, signaling the emergence of multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). Literacy pedagogy, according to the NLG (2000), plays an important role in the mission of education: “to ensure that all students benefit from learning in ways that allow them to participate fully in public, community, and economic life” (p. 9). They further suggest that this full participation necessitates the ability to negotiate multiple discourses. This does not mean attempting to change a society’s conceptualization of literacy, but to provide the skills with which to access multiple spheres of society that in past times may have been limited to a privileged few. For the NLG (2000), education’s mission of access is intended to create readiness for the rapidly changing demands of the workplace, as well as for the increasingly multi-layered public and private community spaces. Literacies, in this perspective consist of the negotiation of a multiplicity of texts from diverse societies and cultures, and a multiplicity of types of texts in a variety of mediums and technologies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; NLG, 2000).

In order to provide access to multiple discourses, the NLG developed a pedagogy to teach language and literacy skills (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). A pedagogy of multiliteracies provides overt instruction in multimodality and multiliteracies, such as the development of audio, spatial, visual, linguistic and gestural design (NLG, 2000). Multiliteracies sets out a specific system of literacies to be taught through structured and scaffolded activities. These “pedagogical moves” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; NLG, 2000) are rooted in the change in language from words like grammar or cannon to “design” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). Available design is used to describe current conventions and designing becomes the act of working with available designs to communicate (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). For example the way texts and images are arranged on a billboard could be considered current convention and therefore available design. Working with texts and images to create a new billboard following these preexisting conventions becomes the act of designing to communicate. Pedagogical moves to teach this have shifted over the years; the NLG (2000) used four connected but not necessarily linear steps: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing and transformed practice. Cope & Kalantzis (2009), in consultation with the NLG, have updated these to experiencing, conceptualizing, analyzing and applying respectively.

Although the NLG (2000) and Cope and Kalantzis (2009) do not suggest the development of multiliterate skills is as simple as the acquisition of design knowledge, they do imply that the “grammars” of a variety of design elements can be taught through a series of steps that include overt instruction. While the NLG attempts to disrupt the master-apprentice dichotomy through the presentation of multiliteracies instruction as a part of a community of practice, ultimately the instructor is responsible for intervention and scaffolding as well as assessment so that students can demonstrate implementation of what they have learned through instruction.

Mills (2009) summarizes the foundational position behind multiliteracies, stating: Despite the competing discourses concerning multiliteracies, literacy scholars are united in their view that global trends call for multiliteracies approaches that incorporate a broadened range of hybrid literacies and new pedagogies...The proliferation of powerful, multimodal literacies demands that educators transform literacy programmes to teach new forms of communication, which are necessary to participate fully in our dynamic and culturally diverse society. (p. 111).

Multiliteracies arose from recognition that in our dynamic society, multiple modes of communication are growing, shifting, yet the ability to work with these texts is required in order to participate fully in all aspects of society. It should be noted, however, that Mills also raises the question of what happens to conventional approaches to literacy; might it be displaced by a focus on teaching “emerging modes of communication” (p. 111)?

With the focus of multiple modes of communication in mind, we can turn to Lotherington’s (2013) exploration of the concept of plurilingualism with multiliteracies. Lotherington recognizes a shift to a more post-structural world that moves away from the rigidity of concepts like bi- and multilingualism with strict definitions of language use, instead opting to use the concept of plurilingualism. Lotherington (2013) positions the emergence of plurilingualism as “a radical proposition for language education, moving pedagogical designs beyond language, structurally defined, as the basis of second language, foreign language, and bilingual education towards models accommodating customized, plural, and hybridized language learning” (p. 619). In the Canadian context where teachers are no stranger to classes where students speak a variety of languages,

Lotherington's example of "a kindergarten class of 23 children who speak 16 different languages" is characteristic of diverse classrooms in metropolitan areas such as Toronto, Ontario (p. 621). How then might conceptualizations of multiple modes of communication interact with multiple languages of communication? In this context beyond rigid definitions of bi- and multilingualism, "Translating plurilingualism into pedagogical design brings teachers face to face with political recognition and regulation of languages, language acquisition, and language use. Languages are not social equals" (p. 619). Using the combined lens of multiliteracies and the concept of plurilingualism, Lotherington's work explores what might happen if rather than a focus on what one should teach, we instead turned to how it might happen.

Burke and Hardware (2015) consider multiliteracies a way to responding to the needs of immigrant language learner youth through multiliteracies-based pedagogical practices. They state: "Multiliteracies pedagogy can be described as a metalanguage that is used to question the prominence of language and communication in relation to the dominant ways of knowing" (p. 145). As Lotherington (2013) is quoted just above, "Languages are not social equals" (p. 619); working with language learners through the lens of multiliteracies pedagogy provides the opportunity to question power dynamics in language and community. That said, Burke and Hardware (2015) note in their study that even their participating teacher who was considered "open to digital media" still allowed "written language forms ... to dominate mainstream curriculum" (p. 150). Perhaps an awareness and openness to a theory or pedagogy does not necessarily translate to complete adherence.

Multiliteracies has also been put to work in specifically English language learner (ELL) classrooms. Takeuchi (2015) writes about newcomer students in Canada, for whom the language of instruction is not their first language, suggesting that multiliteracies is particularly useful in the context of literacy in mathematics classrooms because "Multiliteracies theory can highlight teachers' and students' effective use of multimodal resources and multiple languages, which have not been the primary focus in classroom learning" (p. 164). Takeuchi states that the "instructional contexts highlighted by the situated, multiliteracies approach led to the successful participation of ELLs" (p. 172), a desirable goal in any ELL classroom; because of multiliteracies focus on

engaging in multiple modalities more opportunities are provided for ELLs to actively engage in classroom activities.

As indicated by the above examples, multiliteracies provides opportunities specifically for newcomers and language learners to engage differently, particularly in the context of education. With multiple modalities valued by multiliteracies, there are more opportunities for a language learner to engage with materials, even more so when in a plurilingual context. One cannot ignore the contribution of the NLG and multiliteracies as their work was key to the shift from literacy to literacies, as well as a move from passive consumption to the enactment of literacy practices (Leander & Boldt, 2012).

While the concept of literacies as multiple is quite progressive and the contributions of multiliteracies important, the pedagogical implementation of multiliteracies has become nearly as entrenched as previous iterations of literacy. Leander and Boldt refer to this as the domestication of literacies. This is likely because of an obvious, yet often ignored point about the NLG's work – it is a *pedagogy* of multiliteracies. Leander and Boldt remind that multiliteracies was originally designed as pedagogy, not research theory; it is a pedagogy that has been used to reframe research thought, which it was not designed to do. In Leander and Boldt's paper, they perform two readings of a day's observation of a 10-year-old boy demonstrating how the structure of multiliteracies, when used in the context of research, tends to privilege text and miss emerging literacies such as those associated with the body. In Jacobs' (2013) response to Leander and Boldt's critique she agrees with the concept that "Multiliteracies...has become limited in how it describes the multiple aspects of literacies and has instead become almost synonymous with digital technology use and the use of popular media" (p. 271). For a theory that purports to open up literacies and provide equity in some way to the variety of literate practices in societies and cultures, multiliteracies fossilizes its preferred form of literacies.

According to Leander and Boldt (2012), multiliteracies was also found to be looking for intentionality where it may not, in fact, exist. For example, a multiliteracies reading of the boy's play looks to goal-directed practices that are planned and enacted as opposed to spontaneous actions (Leander & Boldt, 2012). It would seem that in order to fulfill a mission of access to multiple discourses, the NLG must subscribe to the belief

that literacies can be systematized and taught. Jacobs (2013) takes issue with this part of the critique suggesting that Leander and Boldt's issue is not so much with conceptualizations of multiliteracies but schooling; "Schooling, as currently conceptualized, lacks playfulness and exploration, and movement is discouraged as children are taught to remain at their desks and on task" (p. 272). However, Jacobs (2013) does end with questions that border on a more Deleuzian approach in noting the unpredictability of the results of a different way of teaching and learning, stating: "Given the realities of today's educational milieu, making multiliteracies work involves a reconceptualization of schooling so that it incorporates fun, play, and the recognition that the result cannot and maybe should not be predicted" (p. 272).

Collier and Rowsell (2014) revisit the New London Group's original manifesto in order to explore the perceived original goals of multiliteracies and how it is in used at present. Collier and Rowsell (2014) state: "It would seem from the multiliteracies charter that the New London Group's overall goals were twofold: 1) to change what counts as literacy; and, 2) an acknowledgement of the multimodal nature of literacy practice" (p. 14). They acknowledge critiques such as that of Leander and Boldt (2013), which they note is related to "the slippery and watered-down ways in which the original intentions have been taken up by classroom teachers and researchers alike" (Collier & Rowsell, 2014, p. 25). However, they find that multiliteracies pedagogy still has a strong following, explaining that "It has come dressed in many clothes and not all of them consistent with the original mission" (p. 25) but also in line with Jacobs (2012) noting that "We might ask ourselves if an exact alignment with the original vision or principles or tenets is even necessary or desirable" (Collier & Rowsell, 2014, p. 25). Future reconceptualizations of multiliteracies such as those of Collier and Rowsell (2014) and Jacobs (2013) may provide interesting ways of thinking differently.

New Literacy Studies

New Literacy Studies (NLS), originating in the early 1990s, is a shift from traditional literacy as a set of ideals to achieve, to literacy practices and events situated as, and within, social practice (Gee, 1999; Lankshear & Knobel, 2011; Street, 2003). NLS encompasses literacies that are both ontologically new (for example digital as opposed to typographic) and those that are new by virtue of chronology (Lankshear &

Knobel, 2011). Lankshear and Knobel (2012) note that the ontologically new comes from a shift to the “post-” explaining:

The ‘post-’ concept...reminds us that we are not talking of absolute alternatives, complete breaks, or binary distinctions. Postmodernity is not a *displacement* of modernity, a move to something completely different....Ideas and practices evolve rather than become displaced... (p. 47)

Lankshear and Knobel (2012) further state from an NLS perspective that as ontological components are revamped “...these changes ‘show up’ in the things we do and how we do them – including the literacies we enact and how we perform them” (p. 50).

New literacy practices are situated in sites where we engage daily –school, work and the community (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011), although in recent years there has been a focus on digital texts (Lankshear, Knobel, & Curran, 2013). Gee (1999) presents this situatedness as a part of Discourse, where “the idea that reading, writing, knowledge, work, meaning and ‘value’ are inextricably embedded in the local, social, and material processes of worksites, work practices, and work groups” (p. 8). NLS positions literacy practices as multiple and intertwined in social context. Recent work in NLS includes in this context “contemporary media conditions” (Lankshear, Knobel, & Curran, 2013, p. 1). Positioning literacies in relation to social practice problematizes “what counts as literacy at any time and place” by asking “‘whose literacies’ are dominant and whose are marginalized or resistant,” evoking a social justice element (Street, 2003, p. 77).

NLS is interested in what it calls local forms of literacy. It recognizes that literacy practices vary “from one context to another and from one culture to another and so, therefore, do the effects of the different literacies in different conditions” (Street, 2003, p. 77). Street differentiates between types of literacies, using the autonomous to represent the imposition of dominant forms of traditional literacy onto others, and the ideological as literacy practices embedded social practices. Mills (2010) uses these concepts to suggest that literacies are “a repertoire of changing practices for communicating purposefully in multiple social and cultural contexts” (p. 247). Street (2003) suggests that the localization of the ideological model allows literacy to become a social practice, as opposed to a discrete skill, which disrupts the assumed position of literacy as neutral and something that can be taught outside of the social. NLS does not assume all things

originate in the local, but looks at how distant or new forms of literacy are taken up uniquely in local communities (Street, 2003). This continues the move away from individual literacy events to continued literacy practices. Although NLS ask what counts for literacy in what situation in relationship to social practice and power dynamics, it is problematic that it does not question the concept of literacy. This is difficult to address because NLS does not use standardized terminology, making the body of NLS research appear less coherent (Kim, 2003). For example, while one might suggest that literacy is social practice according to NLS, Street (2003) separates literacy and social practice, positioning literacy itself as situated in, or associated with, social practice. NLS does not have a framework to map the definitions and relationships of these different elements.

The dichotomy presented by the division of local and distant literacy practices, too, is problematic. Street (2003) presents the distant as a discourse of power encroaching on local literacy practices, as well as being the replication and reshaping of local social practice. It would seem that the local and distant are only labeled as such depending on their position in social structure. Salvatori (2013) considers much of the NLS theoretical framework as dichotomous, such as school-based and other literacies. Salvatori uses the phrase “cross-pollination” to describe what others discuss as the blending of literacy practices and suggests that NLS’ future lies in the exploration of this hybridity (p. 67).

The final critique of NLS identifies just how different it is from pedagogy-focused multiliteracies: practitioners find it challenging to put into practice (Kim, 2003; Mills, 2010). This is likely connected with the ethnographic focus of NLS-based research. As Street (2003) aptly describes: “The more...ethnographers explain the ‘complexity’ of literacy practices, the more policy makers find it impossible to design programs that can take account of all that complexity” (p. 85). When it comes to the classroom application, Street (2003) does not offer a prescriptive pedagogy; instead, he suggests that the application of NLS in the classroom could only come through a dynamic dialogue between researchers and practitioners, perhaps such as that taking place in Prins (2016) exploration of an adult education digital storytelling course. Lankshear, Knobel, & Curran (2013) however begin to advocate for what begins to look very much like an aspect of multiliteracies when they include in their practical examples of new digital literacies the suggestion of “acquiring grammars of visual and multimodal design for

reading and writing hybrid text types comprising linguistics and nonlinguistic signs...” (p. 2). Mills’ (2010) meta-analysis found that teachers find NLS difficult to teach with because there is not enough structure for them to use in their programs. Kim (2003) explains that without concrete suggestions for practitioners, using NLS can be challenging when one needs to work in a structured school system that asks teachers to guide students through often high-stakes standardized testing. Perhaps the new grammars Lankshear, Knobel, & Curran (2013) note might be of assistance in this area.

Multiple Literacies Theory³

Multiple Literacies Theory, as detailed previously in Chapter 2, positions literacies as multiple, process, and non-hierarchical. The focus of Multiple Literacies Theory, as theory and practice, is what might be produced in the non-linear interactions of literacies. Concept creation is used to create a toolbox that can be used to question and explore how literacies might function, and what literacies may produce (Masny, 2011).

In recent years, Multiple Literacies Theory has been put to work as theory and practice by a variety of researchers, often connecting with second language acquisition and immigration issues. Cole (2013) used Multiple Literacies Theory to experiment with case study data from Sudanese families in Australia. From this experimentation a series of literacies forms that might be used to engage differently with Sudanese students in the education system was suggested. For example, thinking differently about what Cole terms “oral literacies” and how this mode might be important to Sudanese students’ engagement with learning. Cole (2012) also used Multiple Literacies Theory with data from Latino families who had immigrated to Australia, again describing different characteristics of literacies found in his case study.

Other researchers working with Multiple Literacies Theory include Bylund and Björk-Willén (2015). Bylund and Björk-Willén use Multiple Literacies Theory to experiment with data on young multilingual language learners. They position Multiple Literacies Theory as analyzing “the reading process as a collective and productive affair with no endpoint” (p. 81). Reading and experimenting with multilingualism through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory raised questions such as “What difference does it

³ See Chapter 2, Conceptual Framework for a more detailed discussion of Multiple Literacies Theory.

make to know or not to know a language? What does (linguistic) knowledge produce? And how is (linguistic) knowledge produced?” (p. 88). Bylund and Björk-Willén (2015) further question what it might mean to learn a language in the context of the rhizome:

What can we conclude about the possibilities for learning languages if we consider language a heterogeneous reality with endless connections? What is the significance of a multilingual becoming! If language is a heterogeneous reality, the answers to what it means to know or learn a language are multiple. There is no starting point and no endpoint, but there are multiple points of connections to be made and unmade. (p. 89)

Additional work comes from Zhang and Guo (2017), who experiment with data from Chinese children in a Mandarin-English bilingual program using Multiple Literacies Theory paired with conceptualizations of translanguaging. Questions emerge about the blurring of boundaries in a minority language bilingual environment. Their research uses Deleuzian concepts emerging through Multiple Literacies Theory, such as becoming, to experiment with children’s use of multiple languages and literacies. Waterhouse and Arnott (2016) use Multiple Literacies Theory to read vignettes intensely and immanently; their work engages with students studying one of Canada’s two official languages as a second language. Waterhouse (2011) also used Multiple Literacies Theory to experiment with data from participants in a language acquisition program for newcomers to Canada. Her work considers the settlement aspect of “teaching peaceful, multicultural values as part of being/becoming Canadian” (p. ii) that she questions in relation to tensions around peace and violence.

As noted in Chapter 2, Multiple Literacies Theory has also been put into practice through work such as Riddle’s (2014) engagement with literacies in the context of music, Østern’s (2016) discussion of the “doing” of literacies and Hussein et al.’s (2016) focus on putting Multiple Literacies Theory to work in interdisciplinary research.

Although a relatively recent theory of literacies, Multiple Literacies Theory is not without critique. In a book chapter, Masny (2013a) explores anonymous reviews received from a number of peer-reviewed publishing experiences. Comments centre on a focus of traditional methodologies and analysis/interpretation; Multiple Literacies Theory’s links to rhizoanalytic practice focus critiques on the “how” of research rather than the “what”.

For example, rhizoanalysis is described as a non-method that disrupts methodology (Masny, 2013a). Reviewer critiques question the purpose and usefulness of such a disruption. The absence of interpretation in analysis is also pointed out; Masny's reviewers understand that an analysis within Multiple Literacies Theory does not use traditional qualitative moves like coding, but then attempt to read Multiple Literacies Theory analysis as a new form of coding. Perhaps the key to these reviewer comments is that in an analysis that eschews interpretation, there is no judgment and no interpretation (Masny, 2013a). Critiques of Multiple Literacies Theory research seem to equate judgment and analysis, assuming that an analysis has not happened without making judgment (Masny, 2013a). Furthermore, the practice of thought-provoking questioning without answering makes some readers uncomfortable. The main answer to these critiques and the function of Multiple Literacies Theory in this research project is the same; the purpose of such research is to explore data with purposeful questioning, providing the opportunity to think differently in novel and unpredictable directions (Masny, 2013a).

Multiliteracies, NLS, and Multiple Literacies Theory

Multiple Literacies Theory has points of commonality with multiliteracies and NLS. However, there are key areas distinguishing between these theories. Most importantly, the three theories differ in terms of their ontological roots. Multiple Literacies Theory works with a post-structural Deleuzian ontology that includes conceptualizing the subject as decentred and produced through interactions in a rhizomatic assemblage. Multiliteracies and NLS both espouse post-modern conceptualizations of the multiple, but continue to do so in the context of an acting subject.

The second distinguishing area is the manner in which their conceptualizations of literacies interact with each other and the world around them. Multiliteracies positions literacies as skillsets; the interactions of literacies become forms of multimodality. NLS and Multiple Literacies Theory are less restrictive in their conceptualizations of literacies. NLS looks at literacies as the continuous reshaping and reimaginings of literacies through social context. With its positioning of the local and the distant, NLS appears to have created a dichotomy when many local practices are reshaping and reimaginings of

what was once the distant. In the future, NLS might treat the relationship between these types of literacy much like Multiple Literacies Theory looks at disruption; there is no room for dichotomies in a process of constant transformation. Multiple Literacies Theory positions this transformation as productive, through Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concept of assemblage and what it might produce.

Multiliteracies, NLS, and Multiple Literacies Theory also further diverge in pedagogical implications. Multiliteracies, focused on skills necessary to have equal access to society, advocates explicit instruction of predetermined literacies skills. NLS takes a more flexible approach, avoiding direct pedagogical advice and advocating dialogue that could extend into the classroom. NLS's awareness of the local allows practitioners to draw on local literacy practices as they maintain the curriculum and system demands of the distant. Multiple Literacies Theory, rooted in Deleuzian philosophy, encourages researchers to "plug-in" to concept creation (Masny, 2013b). Deleuze encouraged this practice, suggesting that his students use only what was productive to them, stating, "Nobody took in everything, but everyone took what they needed or wanted, what they could use, even if it was far removed from their own discipline" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 139). Multiple Literacies Theory does not suggest an overarching pedagogy but embraces experimentation to discover what works and what might be produced taken into the classroom, Multiple Literacies Theory allows practitioners the freedom to explore the forms of literacies developing in their students.

Multiple Literacies Theory shares some very surface similarities with multiliteracies and NLS, but the conceptual toolbox that Multiple Literacies Theory creates sets it apart from other theories of literacies and aligns it with the needs of this research project, particularly in its exploration and mapping of transformation. multiliteracies and NLS have greatly contributed to the shift from literacy to literacies. However, I find that Multiple Literacies Theory aligns more closely with the goals of this project.

Family Literacy, Interventions, and Newcomer Families in Canada⁴

The focus of this section of the chapter is the links between topics connected to the care and education of young learners. The first of these is the conventional conceptualizations of family literacy as described by ongoing research on family literacy practices as related to home, school, and community, and the interventions that have come about as a result of this research. This includes a section exploring why literacies in the context of family relationships is an important topic for research and discussion, connecting the current state of care and education services in Canada, and more narrowly Ontario, with both the emergence and purpose of family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs) and newcomers who use them. Tied to this are the unique challenges that newcomers to Canada, and other countries, commonly face as well as how family literacy intervention programs make efforts to assist these families in meeting challenges. Next is a more detailed explication of FLIPs including models and potential outcomes of participation. This is followed by a narrowing in order to fully describe the FLIP that participated in this project, Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY), detailing its origins, the program structure, and how it functions in Canada.

As noted in the introductory chapter, the conceptual framework was unusually placed before this literature review. A great deal of the literature in family literacy comes from a different conceptual space than this dissertation, but having discussed Deleuzian thought and Multiple Literacies Theory already allows us (including you, the reader) to explore the content of this literature review differently. For example, although the theories in the first section of this chapter consider literacies as multiple, the field of family literacy continues to work with conventional forms of literacy. Proceeding together through the context of the move from literacy to literacies, this dissertation asks how through Deleuze and Multiple Literacies Theory we might think differently about family literacy/ies, programs, and their participants.

⁴ Some parts of this literature review were published in: Bastien, M. & Masny, D. (2015). Family literacy interventions in Canada: Meeting the needs of newcomer parents with young children. *Education Review*, 4(2).

Family Literacy

What is family literacy? First, it is important to note that in discussions of family literacy, the term “literacy” is most often used in a conventional sense – the ability to read and write, sometimes with the addition of what we might more specifically call numeracy. The origins of the term family literacy are generally attributed to Denny Taylor in her 1981 doctoral dissertation (Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis, 2012; Purcell-Gates, 2007; Taylor, 1993). Purcell-Gates (2007) notes that Taylor was not the only person interested in the topic, but others used phrases such as emergent literacy, and more recently, early literacy. Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis (2012) conceptualize family literacy scholarship as “a loosely defined group of scholars, researchers, and educators who have attended to literacy-related beliefs and practices in families” (p. 34). In their review of family literacy scholarship, they note that when discussing literacy that takes place in the home “most use the term *family literacy*, but many do not” (p. 34). Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis (2012) use a broad definition of family literacy from Crawford and Zygouris-Coe (2006) that was originally proposed by McGee and Morrow (2005): “the ways that family members use literacy at home and in their community...[occurring] naturally during the routines of daily living and helps adults and children ‘get things done’” (p. 139). Based on this previous definition, Crawford and Zygouris-Coe (2006) present family literacy as “a concept that encompasses the ways that people learn and use literacy in their home and community lives” (p. 261). For Purcell-Gates (2007), family literacy is more tied to conceptualizations of literacy that focus on reading and writing, suggesting family literacy “refers to all the ways that people read and write, including what they read and write and why they do so, within family groups” (p. 123). Writing in the context of multiple literacies theory, I reconceptualize family literacy as literacies in the context of family relationships, explicitly including the ways families engage with the world around them, reading, reading the world and self. This considers the concept of literacies as much more than the ability to work with a printed text, but rather as a multiplicity of engagements in the world around us, including the multiple ways one might engage with this world. Considering through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory that literacies are multiple and non-hierarchical, I find it more appropriate to engage with this topic as literacies in the context of family relationships; this linguistic distinction is

an attempt to avoid assumptions about what activities fit into some kind of pre-determined set of literacies, rather exploring any and all literacy activities that take place in the context of family relationships and the home.

Returning to the conventional term of family literacy found in much of the literature, I note that it is often coopted to refer not to what families do, but what it is said they *should* do, or be taught to do with their children. Crawford and Zygouris-Coe (2006) note the difference in perspective on the term, whether it is descriptive as conceptualized in the above paragraph, or prescriptive, describing “any number of pedagogical practices related to home-based literacy learning” (p. 262). Purcell-Gates (2007) explains that after engagement with simple statistics on items like parental involvement and links between reading at home and school success, there was a call by professionals and legislators to create policy that would develop programs to teach parents “how to become more involved with their children’s education and support their children with their learning in school” (p. 124-125). In the 1980s family literacy programs arose (Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis, 2012), and with them, the shift from family literacy as a descriptive term to a prescriptive pedagogy (Purcell-Gates, 2007). Like the resistant scholars described by Crawford and Zygouris-Coe (2006) conceptualizations of literacies in the context of family relationships will remain as a descriptor and family literacy interventions as prescriptive conventional practices. Considering Multiple Literacies Theory’s conceptualization of literacies, a distinction between the descriptive and prescriptive is important. Multiple Literacies Theory does not eschew what might be considered more traditional forms of literacies, but it places all forms on equal footing with equal value.

Despite the complicated history of the term, one point does remain. For better or for worse, current discourse around descriptions of family literacy promotes conventional forms of literacy “as a cure for social and economic disparities” (Compton-Lilly, Rogers, & Lewis, 2012, p. 35). This may explain the popularity of family literacy interventions and programs around the globe. From celebrities like LeVar Burton of Reading Rainbow to Dolly Parton and her Imagination Library, family literacy is widely promoted and supported. Dolly Parton’s Imagination Library started in her home county in 1995, but by 2000 expanded to include the entire U.S. followed by Canada and the U.K. and provides

one age-appropriate book to preschool children each month (Dolly Parton's Imagination Library, 2016). Reading Rainbow, originally a popular children's television show, has now been transformed into a literacy application for devices like the iPad. The Kickstarter campaign for Burton's project had the most donors for any single project and was the 5th most funded (Chowdry, July 2014). Through the funding raised it became a free resource for classroom teachers and will eventually be followed by a resource for the home (Chowdhry, July 2014). Prior to the 2014 Kickstarter, I attended FanExpo⁵ 2012 in Toronto, Ontario. During a panel including Levar Burton, multiple fans focused not on his Star Trek character Geordi La Forge, but rather, on their experiences with Reading Rainbow as children, leading to discussion focused on the importance of early reading experiences. Whether or not FLIPs are "one effective strategy to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty" (OECD, 2006b, p. 11), celebrity involvement demonstrates popular public interest in the topic of literacy/ies and in what can be done to assist families. This public interest may also provide the opportunity for further discussion of new conceptualizations of family literacy and literacies.

Early learning in Canada today. The OECD (2006a) finds that in Canada, "care and education...coverage is low compared to other OECD countries" (p. 6). The OECD states that "it is clear that national and provincial policy for the early education and care of young people in Canada is still in its initial stages," and notes that care and education in Canada "are still treated separately" (2006a). Pascal (2009) explains that this divide is influenced by separate systems of legislation, funding, and delivery. While some changes have been made since Pascal's (2009) report and the OECD's (2006) statements, Ferns and Friendly (2014) note that as of yet, Canada still lacks a national strategy for care and education in early childhood education. This is related to the fact that in Canada, "[t]here is no national system of education. Instead, each province and territory has its own system of education" which they administer and regulate independently (CIC, 2015). Speaking of Ontario specifically, Pascal (2009) describes early learning as a "chaotic mix of child and family services" and "a jumble of children's programs" (p. 5). Ball (2010)

⁵ Fan Expo is a yearly convention in Toronto, Ontario, celebrating fans of popular culture items such as comics, science fictions, horror, anime, and various types of gaming. Like other similar conventions, Fan Expo brings in a variety of actors, writers, and other artists, some of whom participate in topic panels and Q & A sessions.

states that most communities in Canada offer a patchwork of services, which she describes as a fragmented “individual-centred and non-integrated approach to family and children’s services” (p. 30). Additionally, while education falls under the purview of the provinces and territories, “a variety of care and education programs for specific populations (such as Aboriginal Head Start and Military Family Resource Programs) operate under the aegis of the federal government” (Ferns & Friendly, 2014, p. 4). Not only are services offered by a variety of government systems (provincial and federal), they are physically separate, which can limit accessibility to the services that are offered (Ball 2010; Pascal, 2009).

In recent years some individual provinces and territories have made changes to integrate care and education; seven provinces (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut) now manage care and education in the same department or ministry (Ferns & Friendly, 2014; Friendly, Halfon, Beach, and Forer, (2013). Ferns and Friendly (2014) explain that in the remaining “provinces/territories, responsibilities for kindergarten and child care are split between at least two ministries, with kindergarten the responsibility of Ministries of Education and child care usually falling under Social/Community Services ministries,” with British Columbia splitting the responsibilities over three different ministries (p. 14).

In Ontario, where this project takes place, Pascal’s (2009) recommendations are already impacting delivery. For example his recommendation of having service hubs⁶ has been taken up in some locations. Underwood and Trent-Kratz (2015) explore early years services in the context of Parenting and Family Literacy Centres, which function as a more centralized service hub as recommended by Pascal (2009), as they are “located in publicly funded schools” (p. 97). Underwood and Trent-Kratz (2015) found that these centres uniquely offer “a link to schools that no other early years program offers” (p. 111). They state that while for Ontario, “the current policy context includes major political realignment of responsibilities for early childhood and care” (p. 96), there are “currently 172 PFLCs in Ontario” (p. 102) effectively beginning to make links between

⁶ Service hubs have been operational in Australia since 1997 with the Human Services (Centrelink) Act 1997 which was further amended in 2011 (https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2011C00463/Html/Text#_Toc297017005)

early learning and care and education. That said, in Ontario in 2011, Parenting and Family Literacy Centres were only one of four major groups providing family literacy programming, with others being Ontario Early Years Centres, public libraries, and other community organizations (Ontario Literacy Coalition, 2011). These organizations have different guiding policies, but sometimes overlapping funding sources and similar programming; “Family literacy programs in Ontario are provided by multiple types of organizations, receive funding from various sources and fall under different policy frameworks, which has resulted in a patchwork of programs with diverse program models, accountability structures and reporting requirements” (Ontario Literacy Coalition, 2011, p. 6).

Why are these divisions between care and education an issue worthy of discussion? Pascal (2009) finds that these insufficient services put families in the position of attempting to bridge the gaps between what they have access to and what they need. These access to service issues relate to “failure in school, child poverty, youth violence, and the unmet expectations of new Canadians and their children” (Pascal, 2009, p. 4). Although care and education coverage is an issue for all Canadians, the problematic jumble of the current delivery system for programs and services impact Canada’s vulnerable populations the most, perpetuating cycles of intergenerational poverty. Low care and education coverage most directly impacts marginalized populations, such as low-income, immigrant or Aboriginal families (OECD, 2006b). The OECD (2006a) suggests that changes in social policies leading to increased care and education for children could have the power to break intergenerational cycles of poverty. In Canada, 16.9% of children live in relative poverty⁷ (UNICEF Office of Research, 2016); the most vulnerable group of children is that of recent immigrants (49%). UNICEF (2012) argues, “the child poverty rate is one of the most important of all indicators of a society’s health and well-being, [as it] is a measure of what is happening to some of society’s most vulnerable members” (p. 10). Multiple Literacies Theory promotes multiple literacies as a

⁷ The UNICEF Office of Research (2016) defines children as ages 0-17, and measures child poverty “as the percentage of children in households with incomes below 50 per cent of national median income (after taking taxes and benefits into account and adjusting for family size and composition)” (p. 5). The figure of 16.9% for Canada is based on 2013 survey data.

way to stimulate equity and access (Masny, 2009a); positioning literacies as multiple creates opportunities to think and actualize differently the services provided to vulnerable populations, and potentially giving way to more open-ended practices in both interventative services as well as the education system as a whole.

An important goal for Canada is to reduce child poverty and increase the amount of care and education services offered to families in need, but as Albanese (2010) suggests, “a tattered patchwork of policies and targeted programs” fall short, particularly when compared to the European nations with low or declining child poverty rates (p. 99). Kalil (2014), linking the differences in interaction between advantaged and disadvantaged parents and children, suggests that while “Governments are often reluctant to interfere in the private sphere of parent-child interaction, [and] ... parents are children’s first teachers” (p. 5). Kalil further suggests “governments may need to invest in parents so parents can better invest in their children” (p. 5). Until government programs are able to effectively implement social programs that meet the needs of young children and their families, particularly families in poverty, non-profit organizations will attempt to meet needs through family literacy intervention programs.

Family Literacy and Newcomers With Young Children. In Canada, FLIPs often target their services to the most vulnerable families, such as the groups listed in the above section. In the case of this project and the location the FLIP serves, the target population was primarily recent immigrants. This is common across Canada, as newcomers often meet the income and “literacy” target demographic for participation. Newcomers to Canada may have low incomes, and rather than so-called low literacy itself, may struggle with either English or French depending on the dominant language and legal requirements where they are located. As Dixon and Wu (2014) note, “[f]amily literacy programs might be seen as reflecting a view that something is wrong with immigrant families’ home practices that needs to be ‘fixed’” (p. 442). This thesis coming from a Deleuzian point-of-view does not use a deficit model to describe newcomers to Canada or to suggest that already existing practices in the home need to be “fixed.” However, I maintain awareness that beyond the simplistic concepts of “low literacy” and “low income,” newcomers to Canada, particularly those with young children, face a variety of challenges. Ali (2008) gives examples of some of these challenges, stating that

immigrant parents must negotiate a second language, culture, educational systems and a host of other structures.

A Portrait of Newcomer Families. How is the term immigrant defined? Although a form of categorization that is distinctly un-Deleuzian, in describing newcomer families in Canada it is useful to conceptualize whom this term might include, particularly as it may link to programs and services one might be able to access through this label. Votruba-Drzal, Coley, Collins & Miller (2015) define an immigrant family as having one parent born outside of the country, in their case, the United States. This aligns well with the language used by Statistics Canada (2015a) to describe individual immigrants. Statistics Canada breaks immigration down into three categories, first generation, second generation, and third generation or more. First generation is described as one born outside of Canada, while second generation “includes individuals who were born in Canada and had at least one parent born outside Canada” (Statistics Canada, 2015a). Third generation and beyond are those that have had both parents born in Canada. To provide a picture of these persons in Canada, according to the National Household Survey of 2011, first generation made 22% of the population, second generation 17.4%, and third generation and beyond 60.7%. In the case of this research, when I use the term newcomer families, it includes both first and second-generation immigrants. The import of work with these families becomes clear when we recognize that almost 40% of those living in Canada are included in this population of first and second-generation immigrants.

Engaging with participants in Ontario is also important, as “9 out of every 10 [recent immigrants] settles in Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta.” Although declining from 2006 to 2011, the 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) data found that 43.1% of all immigrants to Canada were received by Ontario (Statistics Canada, 2015b).

Shared Experiences. Immigrant and settlement researchers in Canada have explored the experiences of newcomers families in Canada, often finding similar experiences with issues such as meeting basic household needs, navigating the healthcare system, dealing with a new education system, all while also maintaining home language and culture. Ali’s (2008) study included focus groups and individual interviews with immigrant mothers and fathers from a variety of ethno-linguistic communities in three

major Canadian cities. Respondents linked unemployment and underemployment to their ability to meet family needs, “the most basic being the provision of appropriate food, clothing, housing and health care” (Ali, 2008, p. 152). For example, parents explained that they did not realize how many different kinds of clothes children in Canada would need, particularly in the winter. Other participants in Ali’s study were concerned about safe housing; one father expressed discomfort with public housing, explaining that the location his family was placed at had criminal activities taking place. In addition to safety concerns, the Social Planning Council of Ottawa (SPCO, 2010) notes a need for more adequate housing.

Many of the issues that newcomers deal with could be discussed in the context of “problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). One example is healthcare in Canada, a seemingly simple system to those who have always used it, but is another complicated system for newcomers to use. Engaging with healthcare, for both provider and patient, could be discussed as literacies in the context of health care systems. Lane, Vatanparast and White (2014) note that some of the barriers to access the Canadian national healthcare system are unfamiliarity and lack of cultural competency of service providers. Ali’s (2008) participants provide an example, in that their avoidance of healthcare system use is due to confusion about what parts of medical treatment are covered (i.e. prescriptions and some specialized tests may be recommended by a healthcare professional, but not actually covered by provincial health plans). Thinking with Multiple Literacies Theory and the concept that problems emerge through the disruption of literacies, perhaps literacies in the context of health care systems are far more complex than they are often treated.

Further related to literacies in the context of health care systems are language issues. Literacies are nonlinear and nonhierarchical, hence the impact of the interaction of literacies in the context of health care systems and language. Language is discussed in further detail in the next paragraph, but can impact the delivery of health services. In their research with Francophone families in linguistic minority situations, Zanchetta et al. (2012) notes that most language use in the provision of health services is at the discretion of the service provider; “Healthcare services such as hospitals are under the jurisdiction of provincial and territorial governments, and most physicians practice as small

businesses where provision of services in French is at their own discretion” (p. 48). A quote supplied by an Edmonton participant stated: “I started researching about an illness, but it was difficult because there was no information in French” (p. 53); this could very well be the case for any person or family in Canada for whom English is not the first language. Other participants, many of which preferred natural remedies, would order products from their home country “and even consulted with physicians there by telephone” (p. 52). Families who do not speak the dominant language in their region may have difficulty fully accessing the health services available to them.

Education and second language development is another area where newcomers may have similar experiences, particularly in environments where conventional definitions of literacy are in use. One concern of newcomer parents was that teachers did not understand the unique needs of newcomer children (Ali, 2008). Bernhard (2013) similarly found Canadian teachers “largely ill equipped to interact effectively with immigrants” and “often unaware of the extent to which cultural differences affect students and their families” (p. 108). Considering this in the context of multiple literacies, I ask if perhaps Canadian teachers are not aware of the multiple literacies with which students and their families engage because of preoccupation with conventional school-based conceptualizations of literacy. Kovinthan (2016) states: “One of the greatest challenges I experienced both as a refugee student and a preservice teacher was the lack of awareness by teachers regarding their students’ premigration, migration, and postmigration experiences”. Through Kovinthan’s narrative inquiry study, she finds:

there are significant gaps in the training and preparation of educators and preservice teachers to work with refugee children. These gaps include (1) a lack of awareness of who the refugee students are and what their experiences are, (2) the absence of discussion on topics related to refugees in the classroom, (3) a home–school divide that contributes to isolation and trauma already experienced by students, (4) negative attitudes and perspectives about refugee students held by educators, and (5) a failure to take a more nuanced perspective on diversity and multiculturalism. (p. 152).

Beyond school itself, many family services in Canada are not adequately prepared to meet the unique needs of newcomers (SPCO, 2010). Second language programs, even

for children, are not as simple to access as one would think. Guo and Hébert (2014) explored ESL programming across the provinces noting funding issues and limits on how many years of ESL support a child may have. Programming overall was described as “ad hoc, fragmented” (p. 174), but for children arriving closer to their teen years, the ESL component was identified as “too little, too late, to adequately prepare them for work and life in Canada” (p. 177).

In addition to the above challenges, families also hope to maintain their mother tongue. However, as Bernhard (2013) notes, this received little encouragement from dominant institutions. In some cases, Bernhard explains, “feelings of insecurity and sometimes guilt led them to abandon the use of their mother tongue with their children” (2013, p.118). Dixon and Wu (2014) suggest

[family] programs should not attempt to discourage any home language or literacy practices; rather, the focus should be on families maintaining those practices that are meaningful and/or functional for them, while increasing the use of effective home practices and adding to parents’ repertoire new practices that research has shown can help their children succeed at school” (p. 444).

Literacies in the context of family relationships, including those relating to language use at home, provide the opportunity to focus on the additive, rather than a deficit model of the home for newcomer families with children. A related idea comes from Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner and Meza (2003), who explore the other side of language use in a new country, when children then become interpreters for their parents. Even in conventional terms this could be considered as continuing development of literacies in the context of family relationships, and how these might interact in the world around them.

Challenges to care and education for immigrant families. As noted earlier in this section, newcomers to Canada with young children have unique challenges; immigrant parents must negotiate language, culture, educational systems and a host of other structures in their new environment in their quest to meet the needs of their young children (Ali, 2008). Some examples of these shared experiences have been shared in previous paragraphs. Parents’ challenges often relate to the interaction of beliefs, experiences and skills. One way to explore these challenges is to think about them in the context of internal, external, and negotiatory (Bastien, 2014; Bastien & Masny, 2015).

Internal refers to that which is within the home and family group, while external relates to the dominant culture of the exterior community. The negotiatory is conceptualized as a complex space where both the internal and external overlap. These ways of thinking about different challenges are not meant to be taken as rigid categories, but as ways to think about how different challenges might arise for families. Through the concept of negotiatory space this also provides an opportunity to think differently about what might be produced in the interaction of different types of challenges.

Internal. Internal challenges often begin with the desire to build a family that shares cultural values and the mediation of external influences on children (Ali, 2008). For immigrant families, this includes rebuilding social networks similar to those in their home countries (Cole, 2012; Masny, Bastien, & Hashi, 2013). How a family operates is deeply related to personal beliefs about parenting, beliefs that can be difficult to act on when parents' "normative images and processes...in raising their child are different from those used by the dominant society around them" (Ali, 2008, p. 149). The SPCO (2010) explains that parents and teachers have different expectations of each other's roles. These differences are explored in Huntsinger and Jose's (2009) study of 40 families, 20 identified as Chinese American (primarily from Taiwan) and 20 identified as European American (all but two parents born in the U.S.). They found major differences between the Chinese American and European families in relation to parental involvement in and out of school. Chinese American parents were less likely to help out at school, instead focusing on helping their children at home. Chinese American parents also found immediate and continuous error correction important and suggested that teachers overly praise students on report cards which they felt made it difficult for them as parents to target specific areas for improvement. The European American families were also somewhat dissatisfied with the information provided in report cards, but as one parent explained, through her weekly volunteering in the classroom she was able to gauge how her child was doing. Different conceptualizations of the parenting role in relationship to school involvement meant that the European American parents' tendency for greater involvement provided them with easier access to desired information. It is important to note that while there are general differences about parenting beliefs from culture to culture, these also differ within cultural and ethnic groups (Keels, 2009). Keels' study

(2009) explored ethnic group differences in parenting beliefs and practices, as well as their links to children's early cognitive development, and found differences between Hispanic-American families linked to English use, noting that English-dominant families had better developmental outcomes.

Immigrant parents may find that internal challenges contribute to “a significant loss in their self-referent assessment of their effectiveness as parents as a result of systematic constraints on their ability to mediate the effects of their new environment on behalf of their children” (Ali, 2008, p. 148). These challenges come in different forms, but can be related to parents' limited education or language ability (Ali, 2008; Crosnoe, 2010; Hernandez et al., 2009). Hernandez et al. (2009) found that limited schooling affects parents' comfort with the education system in general, as well as their ability to help with schoolwork. Parents who have limited schooling may be missing the knowledge and experience necessary to help their children navigate education systems (Hernandez et al., 2009), and may struggle to play an active role in their child's life in relation to the academic system of their new community. Newcomer parents in Canada may also struggle with communication if they are not fluent in the official language used in their region (Ali, 2008). For example, notes sent home may not be understood, and parents may be hesitant to engage with school faculty and staff (Ali, 2008). Bernhard (2013) similarly notes that “communications from school to parents including report cards are often incomprehensible, despite any translations that might be provided” (p. 109). With limited communication, parents may not know “what is available to them or expected of them” (Crosnoe, 2010, p. 4). As the previous examples may suggest, much of the communication and negotiation described could be described in terms of differing conceptualizations of literacies in the context of a Canadian or North American school.

External. External issues come in the form of financial hardship, unfamiliar bureaucracy and the expectations of school systems (e.g. Ali, 2008; Cole, 2012). While families might have made the decision to immigrate based on already existing economic struggles in their home country, economic disadvantage may continue as parents struggle to adapt to their adjusted status in a new society and find work that may yet be considered a lower position (Cole, 2012). Even among Shan's (2012) engineers, it was found that newcomers “internalized secondary labour status and downplayed their professional

aspirations, at least in the initial period after immigration” (p, 103). Bureaucracy is a problem for immigrant families in particular as some have a “limited understanding of institutional rules and resources” (Ali, 2008, p. 157). In some cases, technical documents required for items such as healthcare or taxes may not exist in the parent’s home country (Cole, 2012).

The expectations of the school system and parenting beliefs can also be a challenge. Differences in parenting beliefs can be problematic for marginalized populations as “notions about ‘good parenting’ are rooted in the discourse among white, European-origin policy makers and institutional leaders academics and students, service providers, media professionals and the dominant population” (Ali, 2008, p. 149). Although parenting concerns fall under internal challenges, they can become an external challenge as well. Families that do not subscribe to these beliefs may find their children are labeled as developmentally delayed by teachers who have differing expectations (Keels, 2009). Delpit (2012), writing in the American context on children of colour, shares her own experience with her daughter’s kindergarten class. She explains that through her interactions with her daughter, she knew all of her letters and sounds prior to kindergarten. With this knowledge, her daughter was placed into a “high” group of students upon entrance to kindergarten. Other children, who Delpit suggests may not have grown up in a similar home learning environment, were placed in a lower group. Delpit states:

Those children were in no way less intelligent or less capable of learning. They had just not come to school already knowing what the teacher was supposed to be teaching. Yet, they were already identified as ‘slow,’ before they were ever taught. (Delpit, 2012, p. 57)

Different perspectives on parental involvement and support can create conflict between home and school. Bernhard (2013) explains that “immigrant children growing up with a different set of priorities than that of the educational system are often construed as lagging behind and needing to catch up with their age-mates. Teachers, therefore, miss many of the other ways that these children demonstrate strength and competence” (p. 112). The Chinese American families in Huntsinger and Jose’s study (2009) provide an example of how these different priorities might play out. The Chinese parents spent a

great deal of time working with their children at home, sometimes investing in private tutors and other additional educational materials. Other families, such as one from Cole's (2012) study did not feel that educational materials for the home were a necessary expense. Ali's (2008) participants also explained that in terms of "time, energy and money" (p. 154) they were unable to afford the kinds of recreation they would like to provide for their children. Instead, one parent found herself relying on TV and video games even though she would have preferred something like organized sports. Families' different value systems may or may not align with the dominant parenting beliefs and practices expected by external bodies (Crosnoe, 2010), but they may also not have the resources to alter these practices. Still, as Singh, Sylvia, and Ridzi (2013) point out that in the context of refugee families in the U.S., while "literacy practices...might not be the norm in all families, ...these families have the same goals for their children—for them to succeed" (p. 44).

Negotiatory. Negotiatory challenges focus on parents working to find solutions to problems where family values and practices do not align with those of external forces. Parents negotiate these challenges in an "attempt to support and manage their children's educational experience" (Crosnoe, 2010, p. 2). Keels (2009) notes while there "are no culturally neutral, right or wrong developmental environments," they do affect the level of preparation a child has for a particular context (p. 382). Ali's (2008) participants found that teachers were not aware of the unique challenges immigrant children might face discerning and meeting classroom norms and expectations. Parents found this difficult to negotiate with teachers due to lower levels of schooling and language proficiency (Ali, 2008). Bernhard (2013) discusses the impact of parenting groups, explaining that participants became more proactive in their relationships with schools. An example provided was of a mother negotiating with the school principal to receive a field trip fee refund. The mother explained that her daughter's initial excitement had turned to discomfort as the field trip included staying away from home overnight. Initially the principal stated that her daughter must attend, but the mother remained firm. She told the principal that she would not send her daughter somewhere she would be uncomfortable. After further discussion, she received the requested refund. Parents participating in the group knew better what was expected of them (Bernhard, 2013) and thus were able to

negotiate internal beliefs and practices with the external expectations of the school system.

Reviewing these challenges, a common theme of unfamiliarity with systems is apparent. Schools pose unique challenges as school attendance may require government documents from an unfamiliar system, medical appointments for things like vaccines or even doctor's notes, and even financial resources for activity fees, required student supplies, or even uniforms. As stated earlier, thinking about literacy practices with Multiple Literacies Theory provides an opportunity to think differently about education practices (Masny, 2009a), which I propose could include interactions with, and potentially programming for parents. As Dixon and Wu (2014) state, despite the fact that schools need to be ready “to accommodate immigrant students’ home language and literacy practices, parent programs can also be established to empower immigrant families to expand their repertoire of literacy practices and therefore support their children’s literacy development further” (p. 442). From the perspective of Multiple Literacies Theory, I then ask: How might teachers and newcomer parents work together differently if the focus on school-based ways of being in the world was opened to include the multiple? Perhaps with a focus on literacies as multiple and part of an assemblage, teachers and parents might together engage in new ways accessing and negotiating through the variety of different beliefs and experiences related to the roles of teachers, parents, home and school engage that each holds. For example, teachers might explicitly discuss concepts of imagination and creativity with parents, making their classroom expectations for creative writing and storytelling known⁸.

As with social programs filling in the gaps of government services, until we think differently about the exclusivity of school-based literacies programing such as family literacy interventions will be a continual need. Family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs) respond to labels such as “low literacy” and provide parents with more familiarity with the school system. This familiarity provides the resources to successfully negotiate school-based literacy practices and the knowledge for parents to advocate on behalf of their child.

⁸ See Chapter 5, mapping 4 for discussion on creativity and imagination with the HIPPPY program and home visiting.

Family Literacy Interventions

In order to set the context, this section begins with an introduction to the program that is at the heart of this study: Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY). This is followed by a more general description of family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs), including components such as home visiting. It concludes with literature review on the perceived efficacy of these programs, with a focus on data on HIPPY and similarly structured programs.

HIPPY. HIPPY began in 1969 through the National Council of Jewish Women's Research Institute in Education at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel (Westheimer, 2003). It originated with the dual purpose of empowering⁹ parents to become their child's first teacher and preparing children from what they describe as low income, low literacy families, for primary school (Westheimer, 2003). This perceived need arose out of the mass immigration to Israel in its early years after its establishment as a state and the differences between the founding population from European countries and new immigrants from the Middle East and Northern Africa (Lombard, 1981). This group of immigrants was identified as disadvantaged educationally, yet motivated to immigrate by the possibility of upward social mobility that they were unable to attain in their countries of origin (Lombard, 1981). Lombard's (1981) description of this time suggests a strategic development of a national identity through education, which would include the use of Hebrew. Despite the efforts and intentions of the Israeli education system, there were inequalities in schools in different neighborhoods. Consequently the Afro-Asian population, identified as lower-literate and often low-income, did not thrive in comparison to their European counterparts in a system that privileged traditional forms of literacy. Lombard (1981) acknowledges that cultural differences may have made this difficult, noting that that it impacted relationships between parents and the school system as well as teacher perceptions of these groups (i.e. the assumption that parents were not

⁹ Empowering suggests that the person or program doing the empowering is assisting a person or group in a position of deficiency. Using Multiple Literacies Theory as conceptual framework resists this notion of deficiency and instead focuses on conceptualizing multiple ways of living in the world, which would preclude the use of this word. HIPPY documents use this word to describe their intent to provide support to parents who themselves do not believe that they are capable to become their child's first teacher so I maintain its use in this document when discussing HIPPY's perspective.

interested in their children's education). Recognizing that work at school to influence these children's success was not producing desired results, researchers turned to the home environment to affect change that would in turn better prepare children and families for the expectations of the school system, and thus the HIPPY program was born (Lombard, 1981).

HIPPY came to Canada in 1999, and since that time more than 7,400 families have taken part at sites across the country (HIPPY Canada, 2004; 2016). At the time of writing, HIPPY Canada has 15 multicultural sites and four Aboriginal sites (HIPPY Canada, 2016). Although there is variation in the implementation of HIPPY, the original model still stands. A local HIPPY program will most often include a local director, paraprofessional home visitors¹⁰, and families from a predetermined demographic (in Canada this is linked to income and literacy skills).

The first part of the program revolves around the participating parent, usually the mother. This person commits to spend 15 minutes each day using HIPPY provided materials with their aged 4-6 child. Once a week the parent meets with a home visitor to receive materials and instruction. Home visitors use role-play to familiarize the mother with the materials. The materials themselves are at a grade three level or lower in order to accommodate the parent's skill level. Materials are also designed so that parents can quickly see their child's progress, encouraging them to continue and providing the feedback that they as parents can indeed be their child's teacher (Lombard, 1981). Programs may also include enrichment activities with information on parenting or other local concerns such as health. In Canada some of these activities focus on local and Canadian cultural activities, such as visiting local museums or festivals, or activities such as ice-skating in the winter.

The second part of the program is the extension of the intervention from families to home visitors. Parents who have been active participants and demonstrated their commitment to the program are selected as home visitors to work as paid HIPPY employees for approximately 20 hours each week. Westheimer (2003) states that for

¹⁰ HIPPY Canada uses the term "home visitor" rather than paraprofessional to describe the paraprofessionals that engage in home visits with program participants. In this dissertation I primarily use HIPPY's preferred term.

some home visitors, “this job is their first step into the world of work and out of dependency. For others, working with HIPPY is their first meaningful job leading to the possibility of new career opportunities” (p. 55). According to HIPPY Canada’s 2015-2016 Annual Report (2016):

- 62% of Home Visitors were or are mothers in the HIPPY program.
- 68% of Home Visitors advanced or mastered their ability to support mothers to engage with their children with the HIPPY curriculum.
- 64% of Home Visitors improved their knowledge of community support systems and 69% improved their ability to identify family needs beyond that of HIPPY.
- 65% of Home Visitors improved their ability to help mothers develop community connections and civic engagement.
- 42% of Home Visitors are in the process of transitioning to higher education and 39% are in the process of transitioning to other employment. (HIPPY Canada, Annual Report, 2016, p. 3)

The impact of HIPPY on home visitors is not just a happy coincidence. Lombard (1981), based on reports from coordinators and home visitors, believed home visitors might actually receive the greatest benefits from the program. Lombard (1981) called for the exploration of home visitors’ experiences to determine the implications of wider use for paraprofessionals in schools and communities.

While the HIPPY program may be beneficial to children, families, home visitors and their communities, it cannot be ignored that in its roots, the program is designed for enculturation into Eurocentric ways of living. The aims of the proposed project within the conceptual framework of MLT do not include passing judgment, as Multiple Literacies Theory seeks exploration rather than classification (Bogue, 2009). Not passing judgment does not mean that this dissertation functions unaware of the original issues that led to the creation of this program and their links to how it may be run and funded around the world today. For example, it is important to remember that while HIPPY Canada sites may have a variety of funding sources, it is heavily funded by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC, May 2013); according to their 2015-2016 Annual Report, HIPPY Canada received

\$785,364 in 2015-2016 (HIPYPY Canada, Annual Report, 2016, p. 4). The links between the enculturation of Afro-Asian immigrants to Israel in the 1960s and the potential enculturation of immigrants to Canada today cannot be ignored.

What are Family Literacy Intervention Programs? Family literacy interventions, suggests Letouzé writing for the Coalition francophone pour l'alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario, support the adult's development as their child's first teacher and encourage the development of the adult's "cultural, academic and community literacies" (as cited and translated in Masny, 2008, p. 12). Masny (2008), writing on family literacy in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2006, 2009a, 2009b, 2011), emphasizes the value of a multiplicity of literate practices as well as the space for parents to further develop what might be considered traditionally accepted forms of literacy such as oral and written language, in order to negotiate different literate practices in different contexts. What these conceptualizations of family literacy hold in common is the facilitation of parent's multiple literacies development and expansion.

Although conceptualizations of family literacy programs are often similar, there are a variety of program models. Nickse (1990; 1993) identifies programs according to four types of intervention: direct adult and child; indirect adult and child; direct adult and indirect child; and indirect adult and direct child. At the time of Nickse's (1993) writing, there were approximately 500 family literacy programs in the United States, yet the names of the programs were found to be misleading; for example, those "that call themselves 'family' or 'intergenerational' programmes may not in fact provide literacy services to the whole family, or across generations" (p. 36). The four intervention types above arose out of this confusion in order to provide clarity as to what programs' goals might be.

Although at first glance the HIPYPY program studied in this dissertation might not appear to intervene directly with the child as program staff do not regularly work directly with the child, I argue that the nature of the program itself, including the planned curriculum and home visitation to assist in its use with the child, fulfills descriptors of a direct adult-direct child intervention. This classification focuses on long-term family intervention, appropriate for HIPYPY, as participation in the program is two to three years

in duration. The program also includes parent group meetings where transportation and childcare activities may be provided. Programs that intervene directly with parents to indirectly intervene with the child might have similarities with HIPPY, but are short-term, workshop focused, and do not include any interaction or intervention directly with the child. Nickse's (1993) typology would suggest that those programs focus only on parent education. Other programs where children attend centre-based care without their parents might be considered indirect adult-direct child, and would have the goal of providing school-based literacy experience and improvement for the child. The final type, indirect adult-indirect child is considered supplementary and for enjoyment, and may be a short-term program or intervention. While Nickse's (1990; 1993) typology is considered to be the most common in use, Skage (1995), writing for the Family Literacy Action Group of Alberta, notes that there are other ways of classifying programs, such as target group, type of activity, or language, while Shohet (2012) interprets these to include purpose and site.

Another common U.S.-based program is Head Start (although there are iterations using the name Head Start in other countries), which would be considered for the most part to be indirect adult and direct child. This is because while Head Start attempts to use techniques such as home visiting, this is a small part of their program, with the main part being children in more centre-based activities. Head Start has had varied reviews for program efficacy, but as Bierman, Nix, Domitrovich, Welsh, and Gest (2015) explain, programming at the local level does not necessarily even use the two prepared curriculums available, written in both 1962 or 1978. It is difficult to explore the impact a program might have when the common element may in fact only be the name Head Start. Bierman, Nix et al (2015) further note that even when programs are using a shared curriculum their implementation varies. In recent years, Head Start has been attempting to implement a supplement to existing programming called Head Start REDI (Research-Based, Developmentally Informed) (Bierman, Nix et al, 2015). Like the HIPPY program, Head Start REDI starts to provide teachers with more packaged lesson plans and activities designed to promote early learning (Bierman, Nix et al, 2015).

Bierman, Nix et al (2015) found when implementing the REDI program "Compared with their peers in 'usual practice' classrooms, children in REDI classrooms

made greater gains in areas of vocabulary, phonological awareness, print knowledge, emotion recognition, and social problem solving skills” (p. 226). This study has 356 child participants that were evaluated in fall and spring of the intervention year in school by a trained assessor. The area of greatest change was in language and emergent literacy skills, but social-emotional skills, behaviour, and self-regulation skills were included in the study. Bierman, Welsh, Heinrichs, Nix and Matjis (2015) examine a further addition to Head Start, REDI-Parent (REDI-P). Bierman et al (2015), like research noted in a later section (Brown & Lee, 2015) combines in-centre programming with the use of home visiting. REDI-P includes 16 home visits, 10 before the start of kindergarten, and six after the transition (Bierman, Welsh et al, 2015). Brown and Lee’s (2015) study provided Head Start parents with HIPPY for the home-based component (Brown & Lee, 2015).

MacLeod and Nelson’s (2000) meta-analysis of 56 family wellness programs (including family literacy interventions) found that multi-component programs and those with a home visiting component were the most successful. HIPPY can be considered a multicomponent program as it includes home visits, activities for the parent and child to do together, and parent groups. Brown and Lee’s (2015) combined Head Start-HIPPY programming can also be considered multicomponent. A single component program might again be the example of centre-based care, or a short-term parenting workshop without additional elements of intervention.

Home Visiting. As noted above, home visiting can be an important component of interventions programs. Home visiting is not only used for family literacy programs, but also for healthcare provision, such as programs providing postnatal care to mother and child. In healthcare, home visitors educate parents about “healthy child development with a particular emphasis on child injuries, abuse, neglect and maltreatment” (Haynes, Neuman III, Hook, Haynes, Steeley, Kelly, Gatterdam, Nielson, & Paine, 2015). For FLIPs, home visiting is related to helping parents prepare their preschool-aged child for school, and school-based literacy.

Like FLIP research in general, there are sometimes conflicting findings. Howard and Brooks-Gunn (2009) state: “a review of the literature reveals a mixed picture regarding the efficacy of home-visiting programs” (p. 134). Haynes et al.’s (2015) review of the literature on home visiting effectiveness in sum expresses that there are a multitude

of variables in home visiting programs and situations that can impact outcomes, including the home visitors themselves. Home visiting has been researched since 1993, and while “concerns remain...the evidence base suggests much more strongly the important benefits of home-visiting programs for parents and children” (Brooks-Gunn, 2009, p. 138). Looking at FLIPs and home visiting from the perspective of Multiple Literacies Theory recognizes the possibility of home visiting as a vehicle for the overcoding¹¹ of school-based literacies and ways of being in the world. However, seeing literacies as fluid and process recognizes that when disruptions occur, such as the addition of a FLIP to a family environment, we never know how that deterritorialization may reterritorialize¹². In other words, programs that are geared toward success in school-based literacies and ways of being in the world still have the potential to provide opportunities for the development of multiple literacies.

The home aspect of home visiting can play an important role in access to services for some families. Raikes, Green, Atwater, Kisker, Constantine, Chazan-Cohen (2006) note that home visiting programs “that target both children and parents, especially during infancy, offer funders and families an alternative to center-based interventions” (p. 21), which some parents may not be able, or willing to attend. Roggman et al. (2001) explain that in semi-rural areas like the community in which they did their study, families may be unlikely to go to a centre for services. Even in urban centres, transportation can be difficult for participants with low language skills in the dominant language as they may be uncomfortable venturing away from their home using public transportation. Raikes et al. (2006) state that for families “receiving home visiting services, important gains in cognitive and language development and in parents’ ability to offer stimulating home environments that notably supported language and literacy were achieved through engagement in the services and receiving child-focused intervention” (p. 22).

One aspect of home visiting that researchers link to success is how frequent or how many home visits occur in the program. Howard and Brooks-Gunn (2009) found that program effectiveness was related to how many visits are planned or occurred, stating

¹¹ Overcoding is “a form of social control through highly structured regulations as what to do, when, and how” (Masny & Bastien, 2016, p. 1)

¹² See Chapter 2 for an explication of these concepts.

that “programs with more planned visits tend to be most effective...[and] families who benefit the most are those who receive the highest dosage of the intervention” (p. 137). Haynes et al (2015) found the same focusing on the duration of the intervention. Kyzer et al. (2016) explain that a difference between centre-based programs and HIPPY is that programs like Head Start have a required minimum of two home visits per year while HIPPY runs weekly visits for approximately 30 weeks. The increase in number of home visits may explain some of the differences found in the children in Brown and Lee’s (2015) study with children participating in Head Start, or Head Start and HIPPY at the same time; children in the Head Start and HIPPY group scored higher than their peers in Head Start only group in language proficiency, and all HIPPY and Head Start group participants scored “developed” on a reading inventory as opposed to only 33% of the Head Start only group. Brown and Lee’s study was a quasi-experimental design with 22 participants, 12 children who had participated in Head Start only, and 10 who had participated in both Head Start and HIPPY. The measurement above was based on chi-square analysis of their results on the Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI). Brown and Lee’s study, although small, lends credence to a focus on the home visits with parents and the home environment for the development of school-based literacies.

Additional research has begun to further the potential impact of home visiting services. Kyzer et al. (2016) researched home visiting in HIPPY paired with the use of an assessment tool called the Family Map Inventory (FMI). Their research found that “home visiting coordinators base their perceived needs for a family on a stereotype of many program participants” (p. 48). The authors suggest that using an assessment tool would “help programs tailor services for the family” particularly when the family is served by a newer or less experienced home visitor (p. 48). Research now turning to how home visitors actually perform home visits may provide further opportunities to explore the variety of literate practices in which home visitors engage in addition to the study detailed in this dissertation.

An interesting challenge in the study of home visiting itself is noted by Roggman et al. (2001) explaining that it is difficult to observe home visits as they “occur in the families’ homes and require trusting relationships that often include intimate sharing of confidences and feelings. Home visitors and families may feel reluctant to have their

visits observed and studied if they feel intruded upon” (p. 55). In their research project, Roggman et al. (2001) developed a collaborative partnership between practitioners and researchers to overcome this potential difficulty. Working from the perspective of Deleuzian philosophy and Multiple Literacies Theory, I recognize that as a researcher engaged in a study with home visitors and parents, I am one of many parts of an assemblage. My regular engagement in team meetings, home visits and parent group meetings further positioned me as part of these relationships and part of the HIPPY program assemblage and the research assemblage of this study.

Impact of Family Literacy Interventions. Research on preschool experiences and home learning environments demonstrate why family literacy interventions, particularly for parents with young children, are important: the effects relating to conventional literacy measures from home learning environments, programs, and specific preschool centres persist several years after school entry (BarHava-Monteith, Harré, & Field, 1999; Love et al., 2005; Melhuish et al., 2008). One such study, Chatterji (2014), looked at HIPPY from a long-term economic view used non-random selection to investigate pairs of siblings to control for family background. Chatterji (2014) found “positive and statistically significant effects of HIPPY on Math test scores although...not consistent across matching models [and] positive, but insignificant effects ...on Reading test scores” (p. 4). Also noted was “a significant negative effect of HIPPY on the probability of a student being ‘held back’ in a grade relative to his or her peers” (p. 5). These effects are not uncommon; Padak and Rasinski’s (2003) collation of themes found in nearly 100 research articles found that family literacy programs can improve: academic achievement; general knowledge; oral language; reading; comprehension; writing; math and science; social skills; and health; as well as English language skills. Crosby, et al. (2015) note from their study of a school-based parental involvement program that children of parents who implemented the lesson at home made “gains in foundational literacy achievement (reading fluency) over those children whose parents implemented fewer lessons or did not implement the lessons at all” (p. 170).

Padak and Rasinski’s (2003) themes also included several areas where parents improved: attitudes about education; reading; writing, math and science; parenting knowledge; social awareness; self-advocacy; and employment status. According to

Ellingsen, Boone and Myers (2013) from the HIPPY USA National Research & Evaluation Center “[i]mpact studies to date show increased literacy and academic activities at home, more enriched home environments, improved confidence and parenting efficacy, and high levels of involvement when children enter school” (p. 1-2). FLIPs have also been identified as furthering home-based family involvement (MacDonald et al., 2010) and, anecdotally researchers have been told that it can improve parent-child relationships (Mare & Audet, 2003). These outcomes align with one of the key goals of FLIPs such as HIPPY: the empowerment of parents (Westheimer, 2003).

The impact of FLIPs goes beyond the individual child associated with the intervention, regardless of the intervention style. As Brand et al. (2014) note, families impact children’s literacy development, but “they often require scaffolding and guidance. Many parents are not aware of their potential impact or the methods they might use to foster their child’s literacy development” (p. 163). Mathis and Bierman (2015) note that interventions impact different families in different ways, and impact parents and children differently. For example, in some families the change may be in children’s skill acquisition, and in other families the improvement of parenting skills. For example, in DeLoatche, Bradley-Klug, Ogg, Kromrey, and Sundman-Wheat’s (2015) intervention project, where Head Start parents were given lessons to complete with their children at home, participants were found to have increased home based involvement. For DeLoatche et al (2015), this was the home component of parental involvement related to engaging children in learning in the home environment.

FLIPs are also associated with increased levels of parental involvement in education related activities. BarHava-Monteith et al., (2003) found that HIPPY participants had increased parental involvement in their child’s education and education-related activities such as parent-teachers conferences and parent-teacher associations. Additionally, HIPPY parents had increased enrollment in adult education classes (BarHava-Monteith et al. 2003). Although specific research on home visitors in these areas has not taken place, perhaps parental education and family self-sufficiency may also increase as parents who complete the HIPPY program with their children go on to become paid home visitors to guide new parents through the program. For immigrant families, becoming a home visitor for the HIPPY program is often the parent’s first work

experience in their new country and their first steps into employment and the economic security this can provide (Westheimer, 2003). Home visitors receive more than just the training required for their work as home visitors: they engage in personal and professional development to learn general workplace skills, preparing them for careers outside of early childhood education.

If family literacy programs have great impacts according to conventional measures of literacy, why use Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009; 2013; 2014; 2015) to experiment with data from a FLIP like HIPPY? Conventional family literacy research has continued to focus on child and parent outcomes as opposed to what might happen while participating in the program. Multiple Literacies Theory uses concept creation to experiment with data and consider ways to think differently about literacies. Using rhizoanalysis and viewing interactions as part of an assemblage considers the HIPPY program as one of many interacting bodies and asks how they might function and what might be produced in these interactions.

CHAPTER 4

Research Design

"...nothing was/is separate or linear in the thinking or writing up~down of the assemblage of the research." (Sellers, 2015, p. 10)

Research Questions

As suggested by the OECD (2006a), increased care and education for children has the power to break intergenerational cycles of poverty. Research suggests that Family Literacy Intervention Programs (FLIPs) such as Home Instruction for the Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPO) can create ongoing positive academic and social effects for children from low-income settings contributing to the goal of breaking intergenerational cycles of poverty. The primary goal of this study is the illumination of HIPPO home visitors experiences as they engage in literacy practices with HIPPO families. Home visitors were selected as the focus of this study for two reasons. First, although there have been studies on the effects of parent and child participation in FLIPs (c.f. Padak & Rasinski, 2003), there have not been any focusing solely on home visitors, making this an under-researched area of study. Second, according to reports from program coordinators, both in the early years of the program and today, home visitors demonstrate high levels of change throughout their time in the program. Research exploring the experiences of home visitors can make a unique contribution to FLIP literature.

Elements that will guide the investigation of the home visitors' role and relationship within an assemblage are the same as the challenges faced by the HIPPO's primary participants -- newcomer families, and their access to care and education services in Canada. It is important to remember that at the beginning of their participation, HIPPO home visitors were also parents that met participation criteria – labeled with the conventional concepts of “low-income” and “low literate” according to HIPPO criteria. As indicated in the literature review, immigrant families face a number of challenges related to education, language, and finances. Home visitors have the benefits of further education, language development opportunities and the financial benefit that a paid position provides, but are yet newcomers.

Conceptually guided by Multiple Literacies Theory and its emphasis on becomings, this study moves away from description and interpretation (such as the question “why”) and proposes questions that focus on what might be (e.g. “how might...”). Multiple Literacies Theory positions literacies as process; investigating literacy practices of HIPPY home visitors with immigrant families during an in-progress FLIP provides the opportunity to explore literacies in process in the context of an assemblage. Although the study has a guiding research question, Multiple Literacies Theory operates with an awareness of the unexpected; as there is no previous research on home visitors this project needs to be as open as possible to allow for the unpredictable, hence the variety of data collection events as well. Working with observations followed by interviews, as well as documentary data, allowed flexibility to explore questions that arise. Placing interviews after observations also allows the avoidance of interpretation on the part of the researcher as participants can be directly asked to discuss their perspective. Rhizoanalysis, allowing for the non-conventional mapping of an assemblage of disparate types and sources of data (described in greater detail later in this chapter), ties the project together. Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis used together ask questions of how interactions in an assemblage might function and what these interactions might produce. In this project, the focus is an assemblage that might include elements such as home visitors, parents, and an in-progress FLIP. With this in mind, the research questions are presented below.

Research Questions

What are the ways in which HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors engage in literacy practices with immigrant families? More specifically:

- a) How might this engagement function in an assemblage (i.e. parents, program, home visitors, HIPPY materials, researcher);
- b) What becomings might this engagement produce as a result of the relationship between elements in an assemblage?

Working Post-Qualitatively:

Deleuze, Multiple Literacies Theory, and Rhizoanalysis

The following entries on Deleuzian philosophy, Multiple Literacies Theory, and Rhizoanalysis serve as brief summaries of what is provided earlier in Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework. The descriptions below are designed to re-visit these descriptions as part of the research design.

Deleuzian Philosophy and Multiple Literacies Theory

The work of Deleuze and his collaborative writing with Guattari inform research rejecting interpretation and the pre-given (1987, 1984). Therefore, this study engages in concept creation and experimentation with data. Concept creation, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1994), looks to the future. Masny and Bastien (2016) suggest that concepts are linked to problems in that it is a problem to which a concept arises in response. Furthermore, concepts are not static or isolated, as with all things they experience becomings as they interact with other concepts. It is from the concept of the rhizome and the de/reterritorialization of qualitative research that rhizoanalysis emerges. Additionally, the subject is considered decentred, not in active control but produced by an assemblage (Masny, 2013c).

Multiple Literacies Theory

As noted in Chapters 2 and 3, Multiple Literacies Theory views literacies as multiple, nonlinear, and nonhierarchical. Multiple Literacies Theory is theory and practice, but in the research context focuses on the interaction of literacies, and asking what their interactions might produce. This project focuses on home visitors working with newcomer parents in Canada, hence the importance of Multiple Literacies Theory's focus on literacies as nonhierarchical; multiplicities of literacies are equally valued. Furthermore, from the perspective of promoting multiple literacies to stimulate equity and access (Masny, 2009a), the opportunity arises to think differently about education practices in relation to newcomer families, such as "family literacy" programming .

Rhizoanalysis

In this project, rhizoanalysis couples with the conceptual framework of Multiple Literacies Theory becoming a form of post-qualitative research (Masny, 2016), which

uses the Deleuzian philosophy of concept creation to experiment with data. Rhizoanalysis in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory can be characterized by four components:

- 1) individuals are positioned as decentered subjects (Masny, 2013c);
- 2) data are positioned as non-representational, non-linear and nonhierarchical (Masny, 2013c);
- 3) there is no interpretation of the data as interpretation assumes there is indeed a deep meaning to be interpreted (Masny, Bastien & Hashi, 2013); and,
- 4) anti-representation, as representation limits the world to what we know as opposed to what might be (Masny, 2013c).

Researching a Rhizome

The following sections describe both the location and components of the HIPPY site, and provide an introduction to the study participants. Describing both the program components and the site prepares the reader for descriptions of actual data collection through observations and semi-structured interviews as they are linked to the home visitors and the program components to which they contribute. Finally, the section ends with a more detailed description of the data experimentation (more conventionally called analysis).

Site and Program Components

This research project took place at an Ontario, Canada, HIPPY site. For the purposes of confidentiality and ease of discussion this site will be referred to as located in the fictitious city of “Springfield,” Ontario. HIPPY Springfield focuses their efforts on families they consider to be low-income, newcomer families in and around their area. They have a relationship with the Springfield Community Centre that provides them with the use of meeting, play, and storage areas. Like many sites around the world, HIPPY Springfield has structured its program to meet the needs of the local community.

As noted in the general program description in Chapter 3, the HIPPY program generally has several key components. First, weekly (or at age 5, bi-weekly) curriculum and materials packets are provided to parents. Curriculum and materials in Springfield are offered in English, but home visitors in Springfield are able to offer their services in several languages that match the needs of local newcomers. Second, the home visitors provide the materials to parents and role-play with the parent how they should be used

with their child through home visiting. Third, most programs offer enrichment activities of some sort. In terms of enrichment activities, HIPPPY Springfield is able to offer bi-weekly parent meetings where guest speakers present materials of interest. For example, one observed parent meeting focused on first aid skills for young children. Other activities common to HIPPPY sites in general might include parenting seminars, museum visits and outdoor outings. Finally, the home visitors themselves have weekly meetings in order to review materials as a group, discuss issues and support each other and participating families by sharing resources.

As the research questions for this project are aimed at the home visitor, the focus of observations and interviews (detailed in coming paragraphs) is on the home visits and the home visitor meetings. As the curriculum and materials packets are resources used during the home visit and are prepared during the home visitor meetings they relate as well. While the parent meetings are an important part of the program for participating parents, they were not officially observed as they relate to the parent rather than the home visitor, and while home visitors may assist in one way or another, they do not lead or prepare these programs at the HIPPPY Springfield site. The next sections first describe the participants, including the home visitors and parents, then the observation and interviews that took place.

Participants

Participants included five home visitors, five parents (one parent linked with each participating home visitor), the program coordinator, and the program founder. An additional “key informant” was added at the end of the study as in their community position they regularly participated and interacted with home visitors and parents in relation to the HIPPPY Springfield program. Participants, depending on their role, participated in many of the program components listed above. For example, home visitors engage with HIPPPY materials, participate in weekly home visitor meetings, attend parent meetings, and perform home visits.

Home visitors. Home visitors are parents who have successfully completed the HIPPPY program with their own children and now guide new parents through the curriculum. Traditionally, home visitors are limited to two years in this paid position. As HIPPPY is designed with the development of home visitors in mind, these could be

considered the third and fourth years of their participation. Home visitors work approximately 20 hours per week. This includes one-on-one work with parents during home visits as well as weekly meetings, additional training and personal development activities. Although not all home visitors at the HIPPY Springfield site were bi- or multilingual, many HIPPY home visitors in general are. At the Springfield site, in addition to English, home visitors spoke five unique languages ranging from those spoken in North and South America, to Asia and the Middle East. One home visitor was a monolingual Anglophone, three were bilingual with their mother tongues and English, and one was trilingual. According to HIPPY Canada's Performance Management Results (2016) "Most (88%) of Home Visitors are newcomers to Canada, come from 33 countries and speak 37 languages" (p. 7).

The researcher was introduced to HIPPY Home Visitors by the Program Coordinator on October 28, 2014 at a weekly home visitor meeting. The Home Visitors were aware that I would be coming on that day to introduce the research project and were provided with the recruitment letter as well as the opportunity to ask me questions both as a group and privately (See Appendix B). Consent forms (See Appendix C) were reviewed and signed prior to the first observation.

Home visitor participant biographies. **Alison** is a Canadian who has also lived in another English speaking country with young children of her own. She has a college diploma and some university. She participated in the program for ages 4 and 5 with one of her children and has been a home visitor for 4 years.

Barb immigrated to Canada as a high school student with her family from Asia. She speaks English and Cantonese. She holds a bachelor's degree from a Canadian university. Although she never participated in HIPPY as a parent, she has been a home visitor for 5 years.

Carly emigrated from a South Asian country about three years before the research project began. She has a bachelor's degree from her home country, and speaks a local language in addition to English and Arabic. Carly has three children, one that did not participate in HIPPY, a middle child that is completing the year of the project, and a younger child that would start the following year. This was her first year as a home visitor.

Diana emigrated from Mexico. She participated in the program as a parent the first year she came to Canada before becoming a home visitor. At the time of the research project, it was her second year as a home visitor. She speaks English and Spanish.

Erica emigrated more than 10 years ago from Asia and arrived with a bachelor's degree. She participated in HIPYPY as a parent with her child and as a home visitor for 3 years. She speaks English and Mandarin. She also shared that her friends in China wish they had access to a similar program for their children.

Participation

Parents. In order to qualify for the program, participating parents must be considered both low-income and low literate by HIPYPY standards. Low-income may be defined differently depending on the HIPYPY site. How “low literate” is determined is unclear, however at HIPYPY Springfield many participants are participating in the program in a new language; the program is offered in English and participants take part in English (albeit with the assistance of a home visitor with a shared language if needed). Four of the five participating parents were at least in their second year of participation and had experience and comfort using English. The remaining parent was new to the program and actively studying English as a second language. Participating parents came from Asia and North America and spoke five different languages. According to HIPYPY Canada's Performance Management Results (2016) “Newcomer HIPYPY mothers¹³ are arriving from 90 countries. Our largest demographic (56%) comes from Asia, followed by Africa (16%), the Americas (15%) and Europe (3%)” (p. 9).

I was introduced to participating HIPYPY families by the program coordinator and home visitors and provided them with an interest form and a recruitment letter (See appendix D). Consent forms for parent participants were carefully worded to ensure that parents with lower levels of English were aware of the contents before signing (See appendix E). One parent had a spouse also review the form and ask me further questions before signing, and another asked for clarification about a point of confidentiality at a later date.

¹³ As HIPYPY Canada's Performance Management Results (2016) state, “in the vast majority (95%) of cases, mothers and other female caregivers such as grandmothers deliver the HIPYPY program to their children” (p. 8).

Parent participant biographies. The biographies of parents who participated follow, linked with the name of the home visitor with whom they were paired. **Fiona (Home Visitor Alison)** – Fiona is a stay at home mother that emigrated from China with her family approximately 9 years before the date of her interview. This is her 2nd year of participation in the program with her aged 4 twins. She also has an older daughter aged 8 that did not participate in the program. She has a degree from her home country and her husband works in his field in Canada.

Gina (Home Visitor Barb) – Gina emigrated from China approximately 10 years ago and speaks Cantonese, Mandarin and English. Cantonese and Mandarin are both spoken in the home so that the children will learn both as they have family members that only speak one of the two languages. Gina has two children, and both have done HIPPY. This year they are doing the age 5 curriculum with the second child, so Gina and her family have been involved with HIPPY for 6 years. Gina and her husband both have degrees from their home country. Her husband currently works in his field, and before having children Gina also worked in her field in Canada. Gina also volunteers with the HIPPY Springfield program.

Henry (Home Visitor Carly) – Henry, married to Carly, also emigrated from a South Asian country about three years before the research project began. He holds a degree from his home country, and speaks a local language in addition to English and Arabic. He works in his field in Canada and has done so since shortly after their arrival. As Carly is the home visitor for her family, Henry does some of the activities with his daughter. They have three children, one that did not participate in HIPPY, their middle child that is completing the year of the project, and a younger child that would start the following year.

Ileana (Home Visitor Diana) – Ileana's family emigrated from South America approximately one year before the start of the research project. She and her husband have two children. The older is completing the grade 5 curriculum, and the younger was to start HIPPY the following program year. Ileana and her husband speak English and Spanish. Ileana is a stay at home mother currently homeschooling her older child and her husband is working in his field. Both Ileana and her husband have graduate degrees.

Jamie (Home Visitor Erica) – Jamie and her husband emigrated from China in the year prior to the research project. They had just begun age 3 HIPY with their daughter. Jamie and her husband have degrees from their country of origin, but her husband though working in Canada is not yet working in his field. Jamie is a stay at home mother who is also actively taking language classes through the LINC program.

Program Coordinator. The program coordinator is a full-time position. The program coordinator does initial home visits to determine suitability for the program and leads meetings and trainings, organizes parent meetings, and through a variety of administrative tasks generally keeps the program operating smoothly. In the case of HIPY Springfield, the program coordinator had previously been a home visitor. The Program Coordinator was provided with both recruitment text and a consent form (See appendix F).

Program coordinator biography. **Katherine, Program Coordinator** – Katherine and her family emigrated from South America about 10 years before the beginning of the research project. She was working in the field of education before moving to Canada. Her husband works in his field in Canada. In the home her family speaks English and Spanish. Katherine learned about HIPY from a friend working with the program, and did ages 3-5 with her child. After one year in the program with her child Katherine became a home visitor. After another year, she became the program coordinator.

Observations and Interviews

Data collection consisted of filmed observations of participants and audio-recorded semi-structured interviews using observation data as the starting point for discussion¹⁴. These are discussed in greater detail below. The number of observations and interviews that took place were meant to allow sufficient collection of data for a dissertation while recognizing that participants' time is valuable; as newcomers to Canada they may already face a variety of time-consuming challenges. Observations were, as noted earlier in this chapter, focused on activities in which the home visitors were engaged, as they are the focus of the research questions. This included home visits and weekly home visitor meetings.

¹⁴ See appendix G for semi-structured interview protocols.

Observations. In total there were approximately 12 official filmed observations. Again, focusing on the activities in which home visitors are engaged. This included the following:

- Two home visitor meetings. Home visitors met weekly to review the materials they will present to parents in the upcoming week, discuss any issues and share resources. Although I attended more than half of the home visitor meetings throughout the year, official filmed observations took place in fall 2014 and spring 2015.
- Ten home visits, two for each home visitor and parent pair. Home visitors visit parents once a week to provide HIPPY packets and instruct parents how to use the week’s materials (this is bi-weekly for age 5 participants). Generally and based on parent availability, the first filmed observation took place in the fall and the second in the spring (See Table 1 below).
- Additionally, throughout the program year (October 2014 – June 2015) I attended multiple parent meetings and the end of year celebration. These visits were not filmed and not official observations, but the home visitors requested my presence. Being available at the research site more frequently made it easier to arrange for official observations.

Table 1. Observation Schedule.

Activity	Participants	Quantity	Season/s	Duration
Home Visit Observation	Home Visitor & Parent	2 (x 5)	Fall & Spring	1 hour each
Weekly Meeting Observation	Home Visitors & Coordinator	2	Fall & Spring	2-3 Hours

Interviews. Based on the aforementioned observations, 24 semi-structured interviews took place as detailed in the following tables.

Table 2. Participant and Interview Types.

Participant	Type	Quantity
Home Visitor	One-on-one	10 (5 home visitors, 2 times each)
Home Visitor	Small Group	2
Home Visitor & Parent	Pair	5
Parent	One-on-one	4
Program Coordinator	One-on-one	1
Program Founder	One-on-one	1
Key Informant	One-on-one	1

Table 3. Interview Schedule.

Activity	Participants	Quantity	Season/s	Duration
Post-Home Visit Interview	Home Visitor	1 (x5)	Fall	45 minutes
Post-Home Visit Pair Interview	Home Visitor & Parent	1 (x5)	Spring	20-30 minutes
Post-Weekly Meeting Interview 1	Home Visitors	1 (x5)	Fall	45 minutes
Post-Weekly Meeting Interview 2	Home Visitors (Small Groups)	1 (x2)	Spring	1 hour
Post-Home Visit Parent Interview	Parent	1 (x4 ¹⁵)	Spring	20 ¹⁶ -45 minutes
One-on-One Interviews	Program Founder; Program Coordinator; Key Informant	1 (x3)	Spring	30-60 minutes

¹⁵ As noted previously, one pair interview blended into an extended family/parent interview as the home visitor was home visiting for her spouse to do HIPPY with her child. For this reason there is not a separate parent interview.

¹⁶ Some interviews were shorter due to time constraints of the participant.

Home Visitors:

- 5 one-on-one interviews with home visitors followed the first home visitor meeting observation and the first home visit observation. One week after the home visitor meeting observation each home visitor participated in a one-on-one interview with the researcher. The initial intent of this interview was to inquire about the training process for HIPPY home visitors, but most home visitors at the Springfield site were already experienced. Their weekly meetings focused more on preparation for the coming week and sharing resources. In addition to getting to know the individual home visitors' backgrounds, this interview focused on topics discussed in the home visitor meeting.
- An additional 5 one-on-one interviews with home visitors followed the first home visit observation. This interview was based on my observation of the home visit, and home visitor home visiting experiences in general.
- At the end of the program year, there were 2 home visitor group interviews that followed the second home visitor meeting observation. One group had 3 home visitors, and the other, 2. This was done as a group interview for two reasons. One was the time constraint of the home visitors, the other was that it gave the opportunity for them to share their experiences not only with the researcher, but with each other. At the end of this final interview home visitors expressed thanks for the opportunity to wrap up the year in a way that allowed them to reflect on their practice.

Home Visitors and Parents

- 5 pair interviews took place with the home visitor and parent immediately following the second observed home visit. The purpose of the pair interview was to help the parent be comfortable with my visiting them alone later. One of these interviews blended into an extended family/parent interview as the home visitor was home visiting for her spouse to do HIPPY with their child; it was also not culturally appropriate for the researcher to interview alone with the home visitor's spouse.

Parents

- 4 parent interviews, took place, generally a few days after the second home visit observation and pair interview with the home visitor. As noted in the previous point, one parent was not included as the parents and home visitor had a longer family interview together immediately following the second home visit.

Other HIPPY Related Roles

- 1 interview with the program coordinator took place at the end of the program. Although it is called one interview, it took place over multiple days as it we were interrupted several times with duties primarily relating to her role as program coordinator.
- 1 interview with the program founder took place at the end of the program in order to confirm details about the site itself.
- 1 interview with a key informant at the end of the program, a health professional that regularly interacted with other program participants through events such as parent meetings.

Semi-structured interviews were selected as a method of data collection for this project in order to allow participants' experiences to guide the interview process. For example, after a filmed observation of a home visit with the parent and home visitor, the researcher selected film vignettes to view with participants, not for the purpose of recollection (as in methods such as stimulated recall) but to explore moments of transformation/becoming in the assemblage. In Multiple Literacies Theory the interaction of the researcher, participant, film and other such elements form a new assemblage in which further becomings may take place. As Masny (2015) states:

the mind is not responsible for selecting video vignettes even though the experience of connectivity takes place in the mind. Rather it is within a research assemblage, including reading observations that rhizomatic ruptures happen and with the power of affect flowing through the relationality of elements in the assemblage, video-vignettes emerge. (p. 6)

Such film vignettes were selected in this dissertation in support of the exploration of the research question and its guiding elements. As in Masny (2015), the video vignettes (along with the semi-structured interview questions) "became the springboard to how

exchanges within the interviews might happen” (p. 7). Documentary data, such as noting a part of the weekly HIPPY curriculum pack was used in a similar way.

Program coordinator. One formal interview took place in the spring before the end of the program. Due to an interruption, the single interview took place on two days, just picking up where we had left off. In addition to questions arising from observations of home visits, weekly home visitor meetings and parent meetings, topics for interview discussion included: involvement in the HIPPY program; experiences with home visitors; and the perceived impact of the HIPPY program particularly in relation to home visitors.

Additional key informant. Over the course of my data collection in Springfield I came to interact with a local health professional that both presented at HIPPY parent meetings and regularly provided resources to participating parents and home visitors. At the end of my data collection I invited the health professional to share her experiences as a health professional engaging in a family literacy program in a 30 minute interview.

Documentary data. Documentary data produced during the study was collected. This included items such as brochures for local services provided to parents, as well as a full copy of HIPPY materials. The HIPPY materials were used to help review the packets that were used during home visits and home visitor meetings. Brochures about local programs and services were used to help me understand what was available to parents in the region.

Researcher’s notebook. During both official and unofficial observations I kept a research notebook where I jotted down notes to think about, questions I might like to ask for later, resources mentioned that I wanted to follow up about, as well as keeping records of appointments with participants. The notebook helped me to prepare for interviews based on observations, as well as making notes for what might later be included in this dissertation.

Potential and actual challenges. Parent participants were expected to have lower levels of English language use and a challenge I foresaw was the possibility of needing to employ an interpreter. However, out of all participants only one was relatively new to English, but was comfortable using English as best as she could for her one-on-one interview. Additionally, as an English language instructor for over a decade, I am adept at working with individuals with lower English language levels and am able find

appropriate solutions for communication. I found this of great import particularly for informed consent, and felt confident with participants' language levels and comprehension of the documents.

Conservation of data. In accordance with my commitment to the University of Ottawa Research Ethics Board (REB), as well as my participants, data is stored on a password-protected computer in the researcher's residence. Two backup hard drives are also stored in a safe. After the completion of the dissertation, one copy of the data will remain with my supervisor, Diana Masny, in a locked office (also in accordance with the requirement of the University of Ottawa REB).

Data Experimentation

Mapping. Filmed observation, interview, and document data was analyzed through rhizoanalytic map-making focusing on "connections that are produced in any given analysis event" (Waterhouse, 2009, p. 138). Mapping or cartography in the context of Deleuzian philosophy is not conventional; for Deleuze a map does not have a start or an end, we enter, and exit, in the middle. The key difference between a received and Deleuzian conceptualization of mapping is that the conventional is focused on representation; "Cartographies in the conventional way refer to mapping out representations of what is actually there within a territory" (Masny, 2012, p. 15). Cutcher, Rouswell & Cutter-Mackenzie (2015) engage in cartography. In their case rather than mapping with text, they collaboratively map spaces using "photography, poetry and drawing to create a suite of findings. In this visual essay, we present only the photographs as one of the many portfolios of visual encounters due to the limitations of the visual essay form" (Cutcher, Rouswell & Cutter-Mackenzie, 2015, p. 450). Although the mappings used in this study are not visual, like Cutcher, Rouswell and Cutter-Mackenzie, they do not add additional representative material, such as diagrams of my own rhizoanalysis.

What might be referred to as a conventional map Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to as a tracing. Mapping in the Deleuzian sense is rhizomic experimentation. As noted in Chapter 2, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discuss different types of lines – molar, molecular, and lines of flight. As Masny (2012) states, "Deleuze and Guattari saw the potential in rhizomatic cartography as an open system. A rhizomatic cartography consists

of lines of flight which intersect and disrupt molar lines and possibly molecular lines thereby deterritorializing and reterritorializing” (p. 19).

Mappings in this study include the role of affective selection and analysis of vignettes and their reporting through purposeful questioning, which is described in further detail in the following sections. This type of data experimentation is particularly important for the study of literacies as it provides the opportunity to put conceptual tools to work with maps and tracings “[bringing] forth ways in which we can do literacies differently” (Masny, 2012, p. 37). The focus of the data experimentation in this dissertation is not to create *a* new way of thinking about literacies in the context of family relationships, but rather to deterritorialize the received conceptualization of family literacy in order that we might all think differently about this, and other connected concepts. As Masny (2012) states, “Cartographies of literacies are made up of assemblages presented as tracings and maps, the latter involving rhizomatic (untimely) becoming. At that moment, a territory explodes with a line of flight deterritorializing the territory” (p. 37); the mappings in this dissertation deterritorialize family literacy, reterritorializing as literacies in the context of family relationships, asking us to think differently.

Vignettes. Selection and analysis of vignettes focuses on the transformation of the data as it is explored in the mind of the researcher as well as connections to the proposed research questions and their guiding elements. Vignettes will be created as the researcher explores the data and disruptions occur in the assemblage (Masny, 2013c). Colebrook (as cited in Masny & Waterhouse, 2011, p. 293) explains that vignettes are “selected and assessed according to their power to act and intervene”. While working with the data connections are made in the mind of the researcher (Masny, 2013c); this is not about the researcher, but about the assemblage at work causing the researcher to stop and act. In this type of analysis, there is the recognition that the researcher is only one part of the research assemblage that might include the interaction of data, the computer, the space in which the data is being analyzed and more. A vignette has the power to affect, and the assemblage including the researcher can be affected by the data. For example, while listening to an audio-recording the researcher, as part of the data assemblage might be impacted by affect and mark a section as a vignette to experiment with; watching the

interview data and reading along with the transcript propels an exchange, where the researcher compelled to stop and act, perhaps to note an exchange in a particular time/section. Perhaps I might take this section of text from the transcript and review it while thinking about Deleuzian concepts recently read, or in connection with current events and news; an assemblage made up content and expression has multiple elements, including the researcher and the data, but also other bodies and ideas. Deleuze (1995), discussing affect, states: Affects aren't feelings, they're becomings that spill over beyond whoever lives through them (thereby becoming someone else)" (p. 137). Vignettes have affective and transformative power.

Reporting of this rhizoanalysis involves the creation and exploration of concepts through purposeful questioning – questions presented to encourage new and unpredictable thinking. Working with Multiple Literacies Theory and rhizoanalysis, the concepts of significance or relevance as used in conventional research no longer apply. In Multiple Literacies Theory the idea of “plugging-in” recognizes that every interaction with data, even analyzed data, will be different for different persons (Masny, 2013a). In fact, it is the unpredictably different ways that different persons will plug-in to this that accomplishes the aim of Multiple Literacies Theory research – “thinking in different directions” (Masny, 2013a). Part of thinking in different directions must always include putting the tracing back on the map, making connections between the conventional and that produced in an interaction, perhaps then disrupting conventional ways of thinking about, in this case, FLIPs.

Mapping HIPPY and home visitor literacy practices in a rhizomic assemblage. The following chapter, Chapter 5, includes the data experimentation for this dissertation. At the beginning of Chapter 5, as well as in the introduction to this dissertation, I describe the difficulty of writing a rhizome in a linear fashion. To watch interview data and read transcripts might be considered conventional, but in this case I was watching, reading, and reviewing through the lens of Deleuzian philosophy and Multiple Literacies Theory. I had to struggle against myself, as at first, I found myself giving into my deeper organizational desires to organize data in tiny boxes. I suspect that the reality for many newer researchers is that despite this tug for order, there is none. In my case, I attribute this to my own understanding of the world as Deleuze presents it – a

rhizomic assemblage always becoming. I broke free from the desire to organize because looking at the world through little boxes obscures perhaps some of the most interesting and important things we might experiment with.

In Chapter 5 there are four mappings. A dissertation is part of an assemblage, and these mappings are part of their own, interacting with the other chapters in this document, and each other. What bound these mappings to find their way into the coming chapter is not because they are the be-all and end-all of vignettes on literacies in the context of family relationships; these mappings alone make up Chapter 5 through the affective selection of the vignettes and the boundaries set up front in the proposal for this project through the research questions. This also influences the voices that may appear to speak the loudest in this document; a voice that appears silent is not, their very participation in observations and interviews makes them very much a part of this dissertation as without all participants in observation the voices we hear in the interviews could not have spoken. Rather, these mappings and the voices that we hear focus on the experiences of the home visitors as we think through research questions on how home visitors engage in literacy practices with immigrant families, asking how this engagement functions, and what might be produced. In an assemblage, whether directly or indirectly, the home visitor, parents, program coordinator, and even the materials themselves are all a part of the data and mappings shared in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

Mapping HIPPY and Home Visitor

Literacy Practices in a Rhizomic Assemblage

In setting out to explore the literacy practices of HIPPY home visitors as they engage with newcomer families, I found myself continuously employing the opposite of rhizoanalysis. Rather than exploring connections and what might be produced in assemblages, and assemblages in assemblages, I first tried to squeeze HIPPY and the home visitors themselves into smaller and smaller, neatly ordered boxes. This was likely induced by the pressure that the form of a dissertation places on how one traditionally presents data; the conventional form of a dissertation is designed to trace a tree rather than chase and map lines from a rhizome. In this chapter, data is presented in the form of interconnected mappings, inviting the reader to follow the linear path the pages force while we explore the decidedly non-linear interconnected lines of HIPPY the program, the experiences of HIPPY home visitors, and the literacy practices used by home visitors as they work with newcomer families in Canada with young children.

While the mappings presented in the coming sections are interconnected, and themselves part of a larger map, they are presented in smaller, zoomed-in mappings to allow more in-depth exploration of each. Although not intended as a binary, these mappings can also be considered as two sections with an intermezzo in the middle. The first includes Mapping 1, a more macro view that allows us to see HIPPY not as an isolated program, but as part of a much larger assemblage of programs and services focused on newcomers in a Canadian community. This mapping engages in experimentation with HIPPY and its connection to the State and forms of power in the context of new Canadians in particular. This first section in its emphasis on the State and the promotion of normativity deals with the HIPPY program in a conventional way, along molar lines¹⁷.

The second section, or grouping includes Mappings 2-4, zooming in to areas of becoming and to the more molecular. Again, this is not set up as a binary to the molar from the first section, as the molar and molecular are in constant interaction. This section begins to ask what might be produced in these interactions of molar and molecular. To

¹⁷ See Chapter 2, Conceptual Framework.

begin the section we experiment with Waterhouse's (2011) conceptualization of rhizocurriculum and engage in concept creation moving to rhizoteaching and rhizo-home-visiting; concepts of curriculum, teaching, and home visiting are de- and reterritorialized through the rhizome. With these concepts in mind, Mapping 2 looks closely at HIPPY and English language acquisition. This experimentation takes two directions. First, it begins with an engagement with language acquisition for newcomers to Canada as a topic inextricable from State interests in settlement. Second, it asks questions of what might be produced when the HIPPY program, curriculum, and home visitors meet opportunities for language instruction and experiments with data about home visitor literacy practices in the context of rhizocurriculum, rhizoteaching and rhizo-home-visiting.

Mapping 3 experiments with conceptualizations of HIPPY home visitors as instructors of "Canadian culture", both as home visitors engaging in multiple literacies in the context of rhizocurriculum, rhizoteaching and rhizo-home-visiting as well as multiple literacies tied to State interests in settlement. Topics that arise in this mapping include parenting in the context of cultural expectations and the Canadian emphasis on both settlement and multiculturalism.

The final mapping presented in the chapter, Mapping 4, is still related to Canadian culture, but more specifically focuses on home and school connections. This experimentation takes place in the context of parental expectations of newcomers in relation to State-focused education. Further questions engage with concepts such as imagination, curiosity, and HIPPY science activities as taken up by home visitors and parents in the HIPPY program.

Key Concepts: Becoming, Assemblage and Rhizome

In order to proceed with this chapter, some concepts discussed in previous chapters must be refreshed – particularly that of the rhizome, becomings and the assemblage first presented in Chapter 2, the conceptual framework.

The rhizome as conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) is not a metaphor. Rhizomes continuously establish connections and constantly branch off in new and unexpected directions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) six characteristics of the rhizome include: connection and heterogeneity; multiplicity; asignifying rupture; cartography and decalomania. Characteristics 4-6 are discussed in

more detail through Mapping 2. Characteristics 1-2, connection and heterogeneity, are key concepts for the mappings that follow referring to the way a rhizome makes continuous connections; anything that can connect must connect. As opposed to a tree, a rhizome is not bound by binary or linear order; as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state, “Binary logic is the spiritual reality of the root-tree” (p. 5), whereas the rhizome knows “how to move between things, establish[ing] a logic of the AND...nullify[ing] endings and beginnings” (p. 25). It is through this ontology of AND instead of the binary OR that positions the subject as decentred in Deleuzian philosophy. For Deleuze, the subject is constituted as created through transformation in relation to experiences and the world around them (Masny, 2009b), viewing the constitution of the subject as what actually happens and understanding these happenings as having a life of their own (Stone, 2005).

It is the manner in which a rhizome is constantly changing and branching off in new and unexpected directions that it provides ways to think differently about multiple concepts. For example, rhizoanalysis itself is the product of the disruption and reconceptualization of methodology, an emerging and diverse exploration in empirical qualitative (or perhaps more accurately, post-qualitative) research (Masny, 2013c). Waterhouse (2011) explores the reconceptualization of curriculum as rhizocurriculum taking curriculum from an arborized plan to rhizocurriculum as a space of experimentation. The vignettes to come provide the opportunity to explore reconceptualizations of concepts such as rhizo-teaching, and rhizo-home-visiting. (Rhizocurriculum and rhizo-teaching will be elaborated on further at the beginning of the second section in relation to HIPPY, home visiting, and language acquisition.)

Becoming or becomings, can be thought of as continuous transformation that happens in what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe as an assemblage, a space of interconnected multiplicities. Assemblages have two interconnected segments: content and expression (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Content is conceptualized as “a machinic assemblage of bodies, or actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another” (p. 88). Expression is conceptualized as “a collective assemblage of enunciation, of acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies” (p. 88). Incorporeal transformation is conceptualized as transformation that takes place simultaneously with a statement expressing transformation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

The statement expressing this transformation is referred to as an Order Word, conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) as language that in its very expression can effect transformation or incorporeal transformation. Consider the word “newcomer”. Might the very expression of the State calling one a newcomer effect an incorporeal transformation *into* newcomer?

In the vignettes to come an assemblage might include the HIPPY program, the parent, child, home visitor, home, and school, just to name a few. They might be explored through content such as the variety of persons, programs, services and policies in interaction in the assemblage as well as through expression such as order words and the incorporeal transformations of HIPPY program participants. Plugging in to Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016) as theory and practice, mappings engage with what an assemblage might produce in reading, reading the world and self.

Section 1: HIPPY, the State, and Power

As presented in Chapter 3, HIPPY was born in 1969 in Jerusalem, Israel through the National Council of Jewish Women's Research Institute in Education at the Hebrew University. As Lombard (1981) details, there were notable differences between two populations, the founders from European countries and the new immigrants from the Middle East and Northern Africa. In particular, the new immigrants were identified as disadvantaged educationally (Lombard, 1981). Lombard states that at this time Israel engaged in strategic development of a national identity through education, but the Afro-Asian immigrants (often identified as lower-literate and often low-income) failed to thrive. Lombard (1981) acknowledges that cultural differences including teacher perceptions of these groups may also have had an impact, but regardless, researchers turned to home environments to prepare children and families for the expectations of the education system and from this HIPPY arose.

Since opening in Canada in 1999, more than 7,400 families have participated in the program at multicultural and Aboriginal HIPPY sites (HIPPY Canada, 2004; 2016). HIPPY Canada (2016), in describing the HIPPY multicultural program, states:

The HIPPY program activities encompass:

- a) Mentoring activities that facilitate the integration of newcomers into the schools, the community and the labour market;
- b) Initiatives that foster civic participation and volunteer work at the school, community, municipal, provincial or territorial and federal levels;
- c) Initiatives that address the specific social needs of newcomers, partners, and or communities in order to promote service or innovative projects.

(HIPPY Canada, Multicultural HIPPY, 2016)

The primary participants at multicultural HIPPY sites are newcomers to Canada, hence this study's focus on HIPPY home visitors' engagement in literacy practices (both in the normative and Deleuzian sense) with immigrant families. In addition to labels, or what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) conceptualize as order words with the power to effect incorporeal transformation¹⁸, such as newcomer or recent immigrant, which according to HIPPY are considered "low income" and to have "low levels of literacy" (HIPPY, 2010)¹⁹. For these newcomers, as is noted in point c of HIPPY's description of a multicultural site, HIPPY is one of many programs and services they have access to and may choose to participate in (see vignette 1b below); HIPPY is one element of the assemblage. It is also made clear that the purpose is integration in multiple spheres, including education, community, and workforce.

In addition to weekly packets of age-appropriate activities for parent and child to do together, HIPPY includes enrichment activities. These activities are often related to topics such as parenting skills and children's health, but may also include introduction to local and Canadian culture, such as visits to important landmarks or museums. While research on the HIPPY program suggests benefits to children, families, home visitors and their communities (see literature review of family literacy programs in Chapter 3), it cannot be ignored that at its root, the program was designed for enculturation into what may be described as normative and Eurocentric ways of living. Although HIPPY programs' funding varies depending on site, like other programs serving newcomers to Canada, they are in part funded by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC, May

¹⁸ Refer back to "Key Concepts" in the introductory section of this chapter.

¹⁹ These terms come from HIPPY Canada's descriptions of the program and participants (HIPPY, 2010).

2013). In writing this dissertation, I cannot ignore the links between the purposeful enculturation of Afro-Asian immigrants to Israel in the 1960s through HIPPI and the proposed integration of immigrants to Canada today.

In considering the structure and enculturation aspect of the HIPPI program through a Deleuzian lens of thought, we might explore the aims of what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to as the State, or State apparatus. The State can be positioned in relation to the concepts discussed in Chapter 2 of assemblage and de- and reterritorialization. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) conceptualize the State as an “assemblage of reterritorialization effectuating the overcoding machine within given limits under given conditions” (p. 223); the state, through overcoding, reterritorializes. As May (2005) notes, the examples of the State that Deleuze and Guattari use are somewhat dated. The State itself is conceptualized as an assemblage, one that I propose in our time today we might think of as society and its loosely defined social norms, as opposed to an actual state or government such as the Canadian Federal government. That said, the State/Society overcodes. May (2005) states that overcoding “is the taking of diverse elements of power to pull them together into a particular arrangement that is then applied across large segments of society... through borrowing a variety of little power mechanisms” (p. 141), or control by a thousand little mechanisms of power. According to May, it is a collection of these “minute interventions” that lead to overcoding, the point at which the State enters, and then reinforces to help “spread it to all corners of society” (p. 141).

In terms of settlement as related to enculturation, I view this overcoding as related to the perpetuation of State-sponsored “normativity” which suggests a deficiency on the part of newcomer families. Chapter 3 refers to Dixon and Wu’s (2014) work which suggests that the nature of some programming implies a need for newcomers to be “fixed” (p. 442); this fixing of newcomer families might be considered a promotion of normativity. The State in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) writing is discussed in relation to conceptualizations of organization and power. The State’s existence and focus is strongly tied to the maintenance of normativity, as it “must have only one milieu of interiority; in other words, it must have a *unity of composition*, in spite of all the differences in

organization and development among States” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 427). In order to perpetuate its own existence, it is in the State’s interest to promote homogeneity.

May (2005) links the concept of the State with capitalism and notes that unlike many Marxist descriptions of capitalism, Deleuze and Guattari both credit capitalism for things like “removing many past oppressions... [and] overthrowing mechanisms of conformity” (p. 143). May states: “We are no longer merely cogs in a larger social scheme that requires out unquestioning obedience. ... the old ‘codes’ that have ruled us have been swept away by...” (p. 143). However, in this de/reterritorialization new issues emerge, and it does not mean we are free; capitalism “creates its own difficulties, engages in its own oppression, ... [and reterritorializes the lines of flight it has freed from previous codes” (May, 2005, p. 147). Even today, with society as a different kind of State than exactly what Deleuze and Guattari would have been referring to in their examples, there is still reterritorialization, new social arrangements seeking to overcode. It is important to keep in mind that it is through the overcoding, the conformity and normativity that the very opportunities for deterritorialization (of course followed by reterritorialization) come to be. How might this conceptualization of a State, overcoding and the perpetuation of normativity provide the opportunity to think differently about the settlement aspect of programs like HIPPIY? How might overcoding function in the context of newcomers to Canada? Perhaps conceptualizations of normativity might provide the opportunity for de/reterritorialization in new and unexpected directions.

As May (2005) notes, a capitalistic State “is not purely exploitative” (p. 147). An important function of the State is that it makes “possible the undertaking of large-scale projects” and other public functions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 359). Could the making of these public functions be part of what might be produced in relationship between newcomer and State? Are the undertaking of projects related to newcomer integration part of the functions of the State? What else might be produced in this interaction? As the following vignettes are presented, they are explored in the context of the power of the State and its desire to perpetuate normativity as well as the State’s productive and public functions in relation to newcomers to Canada. This is important to the focus of the research study as HIPPIY home visitors engagement in literacy practices with immigrant families 1) functions in assemblage that includes the State, and 2)

becomings that happen are produced as a result of relationships between elements in an assemblage, which again, may include the State.

Mapping 1: HIPPY and the State

As noted in the introductory paragraphs to this chapter, this first mapping invites the reader to step back from an up-close view of HIPPY and the home visitors themselves, to take a more aerial view of a larger assemblage that reminds us that HIPPY does not exist in a vacuum but as part of an assemblage of programs and services for newcomers interconnected with concepts of the State and power. Exploring a more macro view of HIPPY and the community in these vignettes calls upon the position of Multiple Literacies Theory's (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016) interest in theory and practice. It asks what might be different if the focus of both research and practice in family literacy/ies were to explore what might be produced when individual programs interact with one another in a larger assemblage that includes the State.

Vignette 1a: Multiple roles of home visitors. The following vignette comes from my first one-on-one interview with Alison (November 4, 2014) following an observation of the weekly home visitor meeting one week prior (October 28, 2014). This part of the conversation takes place after we discussed her interest in working with children, including her having a teaching certificate for a specific methodology used in some private schools. After explaining that she had taught for one year, she states: "... I had my children so I couldn't pursue it any longer, so I think when my youngest is a little bit older, I'll go back, right now isn't the right time." We continued talking about her work with HIPPY and in the community.

Home Visitor Alison, Interview 1

A: Alison, R: Researcher

A: Like right now I'm doing three part-time jobs. Including this. Plus being a mom to four, and you know anything else is just overwhelming, but it's, it keeps me centred and it keeps me, I don't want to say calm, but it does in a lot of ways.

R: Okay. That makes sense, it's the kind, you're enjoying them and it keeps you looking forward...

- A: ... and it gives me purpose too.
- R: That's an important thing.
- A: It gives me purpose, because [unintelligible] then I'm depressed, because you're just going through the motions. **I want a job that means something,**²⁰ so this.
- R: Are your other jobs child related, or are they...
- A: **One of them is, one of them is for the YMCA, I work part-time in their child minding room,** and my other job is for the family business. [...]
- R: I'm interested in the YMCA, so **you're actually quite connected to the YMCA in a lot of ways...**
- A: **Yes. Which is valuable because I can kind of advertise that to families, did you know, this is what the YMCA offers, they do fee assistance things, so a lot of the parents that can't afford a gym membership, this gives them a reason to, because the fee assistance program there, some are familiar with HIPPY as well.**
- R: Okay. Actually, that's one of the things I wanted to talk about [...] One of the things I noticed in particular during [...] the beginning of the session [...] where you were all sharing you know about your, starting with different families, and in that I heard sometimes parenting tips? Sometimes resource sharing, and I want to talk about that a little bit.
- A: So what happens is that often in home visit, first of all, the first ten or fifteen minutes, maybe less, maybe more, we'll talk about their week and about something they're struggling with or something that succeeded. And **often if they're struggling they'll say well I'm really interested in finding a job, or a preschool program so that he can be away from me before he starts school, so can you suggest anywhere? That's where the resources will come in.** Now we can say okay, if you don't mind next week I can give you a list of things like

²⁰ As in this instance, in the upcoming vignettes, impactful words or phrases with the power of affect have been bolded. These are not intended to direct the reader as to what they might think or see or find impactful themselves reading the vignette, but rather to demonstrate the relationality of affect in the assemblage which includes the researcher, as this is also part of the research assemblage.

preschools that are reasonably priced and ones that have fee assistance, and you know it's kind of this cover all the bases kind of thing. **Most times they don't know how expensive daycare is, daycare is very expensive, but preschool programs that are comparable in price, like you can get cooperative schools, so those are alternatives to you know the whole daycare thing.** They have to go through the region to get subsidized, that's a process itself. So yeah, many times, **we'll do tools, we'll do if they're interested in the recreational programs, about even speech and language delays, some of them have special needs, the parents sometimes they're looking for special programs,** so its often times if you don't have the information, **like a resource to give them we'll give them a number** and say maybe try, we'll give you a number and you can try this one, and they'll maybe be able to help you more. If you dig a little bit deeper then hopefully we'll find something, which I find is valuable for me, living here all my life, **I have a bunch of resources and know a lot of things that go on, I make it my business to find out what's going on just so I can share it with people.** Often **I'll look for free community happenings that go on, so I'll let them know,** did you know on Saturday they're offering this, it's free, it's good to take the family to and stuff, so it's lots of different things.

As Alison states above, HIPPY does not operate alone. For example, HIPPY families can be found using services from the local YMCA as many will meet the financial assistance threshold. As noted in the literature review, word like “jumble” (Pascal, 2009, p. 5) and “patchwork” (Ball, 2010, p. 30) are used to describe the way in which services are offered to families with young children in Ontario and Canada as a whole, respectively. Furthermore, HIPPY home visitors spend time during their home visits engaging with parents' needs that fall outside of the direct part of the HIPPY intervention. As Alison states: “many times, [HIPPY home visitors will] do tools” with their participating families, telling them about resources available in their community. In exploring home visitors literacy practices through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016), what might happen when we think of literacies in the context of rhizomic connection? Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state that “any point of a

rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be”; the rhizome is at work making connections. How might a program like HIPPY operate differently if the program and the home visits are considered as one of many connections in a rhizome, one of many “semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 7)? When asking how the engagement of a home visitor in literacy practices with immigrant families functions, perhaps we might think differently about the role of a home visitor, focusing on their work as a connective node in a rhizome as their interactions within an assemblage of programs and services ceaselessly making connections between families, services and the community.

Further questions ask how the act of a home visit itself might be explored in the context of the rhizome, a key Deleuzian concept from the conceptual framework in this dissertation. According to Honan (2007), the rhizome disrupts linear thinking. In discussing rhizoanalysis, a disruption and reconceptualization of research methodology, Masny (2016) states: “When there is an unpredictable event, ruptures in conventional research happen and emit lines of flight whereby rhizoanalysis through reading a research assemblage creates new connections of becoming (transforming)” (p. 5-6). Curriculum was disrupted and reconceptualized as rhizocurriculum in Waterhouse (2011). What might be different if the concept of a home visit were disrupted and reconceptualized as unpredictable rhizo-home-visiting?

What might rhizo-home-visiting consist of? During a home visit, as Alison describes in the above vignette, a parent might share a struggle. The planned format of the home visit may rupture, the trajectory of the home visit may shift, lines of flight emerging. A rhizo-home-visit (further conceptualized in the next paragraph), in this sense might then create new connections, a becoming other than the preconceived plan of the HIPPY program or activities for that day; perhaps as in the focus of this study, the de- and reterritorialization of a home visit is produced as a result of the interaction of elements in an assemblage.

Alison says above: “I make it my business to find out what’s going on just so I can share it with people”. Although one cannot predict the direction in which becoming might happen, might preparing for a home visit that may disrupt and transform be a form of

engaging in rhizomatic work? Might this be one of the ways in which HIPPY home visitors' engagement with newcomer families functions in an assemblage? This rhizomatic work could take the form of mapping rather than tracing. Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) 5th and 6th principles of the rhizome include cartography and decalcomania. They state: "What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real...A map has multiple entryways, as opposed to the tracing, which always comes back 'to the same'" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 12). Mapping in a home visit might refer to a home visit built on the concept that the visit starts in the middle, not simply with the arrival of the home visit. The home visit includes what happens in the home in the minutes, hours and days before, and after as parent and child take up the activity packets provided, or not. Conceptualizing home visitors' engagement with the home visit as rhizo-home-visiting²¹ could perhaps include the tensions of preparing for a home visit without necessarily submitting to the pre-given, i.e. only following the activity packets. This could position the rhizo-home-visit as experimentation toward what might be, what is yet to come.

But mapping is not the end, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) remind, "*the tracing should always be put back on the map*" (p. 13). The home visitor in a rhizo-home-visit remains open to the new directions the visit can take, but connections also come back to the tracing, the curriculum packets and the list of materials to be covered in a visit. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state, "The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involved an alleged 'competence'" (p. 13). The performance of experimentation and the reproduction of competence are not "good and bad sides" (p. 13) creating a situation where there must be a map or a tracing. Rather the map AND tracing both exist as part of the rhizome.

Home visitors engaged in rhizo-home-visiting may be both reproducing competencies in the form of completing the requirements of the curriculum packets, but also engaging in experimentation; each home visit is different and there is no way to determine in what direction any of the activities or other elements of the assemblage might take them. In this manner, perhaps home visitors can be thought of as engaging with multiple literacies

²¹ Rhizo-home-visiting will be taken up in more depth in section two of this chapter along with the concepts of rhizocurriculum and rhizoteaching.

(e.g. literacies in the context of experimenting beyond a curriculum packet, literacies in the context of curation of resources) in the context of rhizomatic connection and mapping, the home visitor herself becoming other, becoming connective not unlike a hub, mapping through experimentation and connection a larger assemblage of programs and services for newcomer families.

A further question raised in this vignette returns to the concept of the State and tensions of power and control and the maintenance of unity or normativity. By Alison's descriptions, there seem to be a number of hurdles faced by newcomer families to receive some services. For example, as in the above vignette, Alison explains what it is like if someone considering taking employment asks her about how to arrange for their child to attend preschool. She notes that she will first need to take a week to prepare information in order to provide them with lists of preschools, and that the list will need to include those that are "reasonably priced and ones that have fee assistance." She further states that parents are not aware of the expense, or the difference between daycare and preschool programs in both price, and then availability of subsidy available from the region, much less how to navigate all of these items. This is not unlike Ali's (2008) participants' avoiding the healthcare system because they found it difficult to navigate, confused about what might be covered and what might not.

The ability to find childcare in order to work is difficult, a jumbled system or contradictions that one must be walked through (i.e. a preschool can be subsidized so it will likely be cheaper than a daycare). As noted in the literature review both the province of Ontario and Canada as a whole tend to offer child and family services in a jumbled, fragmented, patchwork (Ball, 2010; Pascal, 2009). That said, it is not only the newcomer that encounters difficulty in both the location and access of services. Alison, in the above vignette, states that she makes it her business to find things out. She states that when "do[ing] tools" with parents she is also helping parents look for specialized programming, from those for recreation to those of support if children have special needs. She describes trying different places to see if they can help parents. Even Alison, who for most of her adult life has lived in Springfield, has to be deliberately on the lookout for resources and information, "dig[g]ing a little bit deeper...[and] hopefully... find[ing] something..."

Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concepts of *pouvoir* and *puissance* might inform a discussion of the difficulty of locating and accessing resources, for both a newcomer and an almost life-long resident, as described above. After a brief introduction, I will experiment with the data in the context of these concepts. While both of these terms are often translated into English as the single word, "power" there is a distinction to be made. Waterhouse (2011) conceptualizes *pouvoir* as "a form of power associated with the State and its institutions... power in the pursuit of particular ends; seeking to establish and maintain territories that may stifle becoming by organ-izing bodies and striating space"(p. 36). Massumi (1987) states that "Puissance refers to a range of potential... 'a capacity to affect or be affected,' a capacity to multiply connections that may be realized by a given 'body' to varying degrees in different situations" (p. xvii). Waterhouse further suggests that "*puissance* is associated with the affirmative, and yet disruptive, forces of life..." such as deterritorialization opening smooth spaces of becoming (p. 37). More simply stated, *pouvoir* can be conceptualized as dominating, and an institution known for being dominating, while *puissance* is associated with the power of becoming (D. Masny, personal communication, October 14, 2016). From this point forward, I will refer to them as *pouvoir* and *puissance*.

With these conceptualizations in mind, how might we think of *pouvoir* in the context of the organization and power of the State in relation to newcomers and HIPPY home visitors? To what end might the State's *pouvoir* seek to organize newcomers? With awareness that many HIPPY sites somewhat become agents of the state through the program's roots in enculturation as well as government funding, might we consider aspects of the program itself as both influenced and influencing through the State's *pouvoir*? Perhaps the State seeks to organize both the program itself and the people in and through it, promoting a certain way of being in the world.

HIPPY Canada (2016a) links the program with integration in Canada as a whole stating: "Canada recognizes that if newcomers are to benefit from and contribute to the social, cultural and economic success of this country, we must provide an innovative and responsive set of services that support settlement and integration." Although with funding and links to CIC's mandate for immigration may seem to say that HIPPY operates solely with the power of the State, *pouvoir*, might there be space for *puissance* as well? Could

the HIPPY program, viewed as a body itself have as Massumi (1987) stated, also quoted above, “a capacity to multiply connections...to varying degrees in different situations” (p. xvii). What deterritorializations, what becomings might come from the HIPPY program? How might this function in relation to the role of home visiting? Perhaps home visitors, with their own assemblages in continual transformation, might be what Waterhouse (2011) describes as “affirmative, and yet disruptive, forces of life” (p. 37), and their connections making accessible resources to families have elements of *pouvoir* and *puissance*. HIPPY Canada (2016) states that HIPPY “contributes to CIC’s desired results of ensuring the acceptance of immigrants and their full engagement and participation in Canadian social, economic, political and cultural life.” This may be a manifestation of *pouvoir* in the sense that it still may end in the promotion of unity for the State, yet *puissance* in that there is a disruption from what might have been different without assistance/interference. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) do not use OR, but rather AND. There is always room for slippage and the potential for *pouvoir* AND *puissance*.

In the above vignette Alison states that “often in home visit...the first ten or fifteen minutes...we’ll talk about their week and about something they’re struggling with or something that succeeded.” Depending on what the family might be struggling with, they ask her if she can suggest anything, and as Alison states, “That’s where the resources will come in.” In Alison’s interactions with parents as a home visitor might her provision of resource information be a form of *puissance*? Perhaps home visiting could be reconceptualized in some ways as *puissance*, a power of disruption and becoming in relation to the participating parents. Home visiting might also be considered to have elements of *pouvoir* as a tool of the State providing approved resources to parents in order to promote the unity the State requires to continue its existence.

Vignette 1b: Parent, home visitor, and community resources. The interview in the following vignette comes from my first one-on-one interview with Carly (November 4, 2014) following an observation of the weekly home visitor meeting one week prior (October 28, 2014). Some of the program names in the vignette have been redacted to maintain privacy of the site.

Home Visitor Carly, Interview 1

C: Carly R: Researcher

R: Now, Parent and Child...one of the things, you mentioned a lot...during the meeting when people were asking about resources ...was...Triple P parenting, and Parent and Child. ...So where did you find out about Parent and Child?

C: Parent and Child at Springfield Ministries, they're like, this is like a charitable, what we say, charitable....

R: Organization?

C: Organization. And it is at Springfield St. in Springfield. And they have like, they support people who are low income, who don't have houses, or ... so they support them, give them free food, food bank, they have a beginner [unintelligible] program. S on Springfield Street, [unintelligible] has a program, and the drop in for kids, Parent and Child, for the Springfield region, so they have the [unintelligible] every day. On Thursday they are on Springfield Street. On Friday they are in other places. They are in some other place, so, **I live so close, so I go there every Thursday.** And then I started prenatal program. They told me, every Wednesday Springfield Region have a prenatal program. And then, they conduct, conduct different programs at this place. **So the same way I go with Katherine [the HIPPY program coordinator] for HIPPY.**

R: **So one of the first reasons that you went to the program was that it was near your house?**

C: **Yes.**

R: **And then...**

C: **It was so close, I just walk by one morning and...**

R: **And you started attending more and more.**

[...]

R: It was okay. And so you did Parent and Child, and you did, what is the Triple P parenting?

C: I did the prenatal program, for mothers who are pregnant, when they have babies, from 3-6 months they can have that program. And then I did Financial Peace, that

program, like how to budgeting, that was like a 14 weeks program, also held at Springfield Ministries by some other associates, then I have like Triple P parenting program, that is how to raise your child, you know, different challenges, and then I did Nobody's Perfect, for how to raise a child, HIPPY program, and I did, what else I did. **Because I did lots.**

Carly was just starting her first year as a home visitor when we had the interview from which the above vignette came. At that time she and her immediate family had been in Canada about 3.5 years, and in Springfield for three of those years. Carly's connection to HIPPY, however, was not direct. It was through the connections of a variety of services she was able to access that were offered to individuals and families in Springfield that she came to be invited to HIPPY. As noted earlier in relation to Ball (2010) and Pascal's (2009) work, having a variety of different services offered by different groups in different places is not unusual. The program coordinator of HIPPY, Katherine, recruited Carly and other HIPPY participants from those engaging in programs at Springfield Ministries. Carly, having participated in prenatal programs, parenting classes, child and parenting activities and even a personal finance course has gone from a consumer to a provider; from being classified by service providers (such as HIPPY) as one of many low-income families, to a service provider providing income to her own family through paid employment. Carly's involvement in the community is not only with HIPPY as the following related vignette notes.

Vignette 1c: Community participation at school council. This interview comes from my second one-on-one interview with Carly (March 10, 2015) following an earlier home visit observation (February 23, 2015). In her first and second interviews, Carly spoke of her involvement at her children's public school, particularly on the school council. At the time of the study, she had been on the council for more than 2 and a half years first as a parent representative, and then as co-chairperson. In her first interview (November 4, 2014), she stated that it was "...to be in touch with the school and kids and principal, and what happen in school" and that "It was a good thing for [her] too". In the vignette below from Carly's second interview (March 10, 2015), she described her children's school and her relationship to the community.

Home Visitor Carly, Interview 2

C: Carly R: Researcher

C: That's a small school, and everybody knows everything, and that's, **the diversity is really good at that school**, you can see many communities, many countries' people there, and I'm in school council too, I'm a council person, so every month we have a meeting.

R: When did you join the school council?

C: When I came to Springfield, in 2011.

R: So even before you joined HIPPY or you took any of the programs, you went straight to the school council?

C: Yes.

R: Why were you interested in the school council?

C: To learn more about school, to be more involved in the community, plus school. **So that's what my main thing, and to understand how the school and how the teaching works, because my schooling is in [my home country], so the schooling is totally different. To learn more about the school, to understand how it works, this is how it works, this is how I join.** First I join [unintelligible] parent representative, and now I become [unintelligible] council co-chair, it's been like two years now.

HIPPY is one small piece of an assemblage of programs and services operating and interacting with one another in Springfield: there may be newcomers, schools, and other community programs and organizations. Home visitors' engagement with parents and families functions within this assemblage, and what is produced in their interactions relates not only to the HIPPY program, but the many other programs and services. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), an assemblage includes both content and expression, the bodies (i.e. people, institutions, groups) and statements²². If we consider potential bodies interacting in an assemblage of services, programs and other items

²² See introductory section on assemblage at the beginning of this chapter.

related to newcomers in Springfield, what might be found? HIPPY, as an example of a community organization, also has a mission of integration and support for newcomers and their active participation in the community (HIPPY, 2016), as well as parenting programs and relationships with other community members such as the health department. As different items in an assemblage interact, as indicated in the first and second principles of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) rhizome, "any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be" (p. 7). Looking at elements of connection in the above, we note that the CIC provides funding for some HIPPY sites²³ and other community organizations and programs aligning with their policies.

What about the State's interest in integration and the programs and services that take up the promotion of State ideals? The State, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), is interested in normativity for self-perpetuation. It might be that this is achieved through particular kinds of newcomers (such as those described above by HIPPY Canada, 2016²⁴), created through order words and overcoding. Community programs such as HIPPY may have aligned interests. For example, part of HIPPY's (2016) goals include "Initiatives that foster civic participation and volunteer work at the school, community, municipal, provincial or territorial and federal levels." How might this participation be taken up by newcomers to Canada? Could we consider Carly's engagement in both preparatory programs and her positions as a home visitor and member of the school council as reaching the goal of "civic participation and volunteer work at the school" (HIPPY, 2016)?

In the conceptual framework for this dissertation I refer to the shift in focus from subject agency to how the subject is composed. In the context of Deleuzian philosophy that which produces the subject is an assemblage, and as Masny (2009) states in the context of reading, reading the world and self, "[a]n individual only becomes individuated...by experiencing particular kinds of relations" (p. 184). Here, there is the

²³ HIPPY sites operate individually, and so each site would need to apply and meet the qualification requirements for CIC funding, or any other funding program for that matter.

²⁴ Note that HIPPY is interested in: "the integration of newcomers into the schools, the community and the labour market," and "civic participation and volunteer work at the school, community, municipal, provincial or territorial and federal levels" (HIPPY Canada, Multicultural HIPPY, 2016).

opportunity to experiment with the interaction of the assemblage, or kinds of relations that produces individuation. Further, how might this assemblage interact with the State, and what might be produced in the context of elements such as Carly's comment in vignette 1c about "good diversity"? In the vignette, Carly states: "the diversity is really good at that school, you can see many communities, many countries' people there". How might "good diversity" be conceptualized in reading, reading the world and self and the constituting of individuation? How might conceptualizations of diversity related to ethnicity, communities, or "many countries' people" function, and what might their interaction in larger assemblages produce? Reading intensively, or disruptively (Masny, 2016), what might be produced by conceptualizations of diversity as good?

Another element related to an assemblage in Springfield that cannot be ignored is that of physical location of services. Although it may seem quite obvious that the location of a program would impact participation, there are a variety of factors that further influence newcomers' relationship with location. Discussion of the physical location of a program or service is often set aside for more abstract discussion of ideas, yet it can have a major impact on newcomers to Canada's willingness to participate. Carly states that she knew there were programs in other places, but when she started "I live so close, so I go there every Thursday". As above, I asked her, "So one of the first reasons that you went to the program was that it was near your house?" and she said "Yes. [...] It was so close, I just walk by one morning and...". Carly's statements suggest that perhaps sheer proximity to a resource might impact willingness to participate. Transportation is provided for some programs and services through taxi coupons, but this does not automatically solve a location issue. For example, women from some cultures may not be willing to travel in a vehicle with an unfamiliar male driver. A program or service offered within walking distance, however, they could attend without issue. This leads to the question of how program planning and services for newcomers to Canada might be impacted if location was considered more carefully.

A further question to experiment with asks in what ways the State's positioning of services might enact a form of control? For example, in one Ontario city, one of the largest providers of LINC programs is within close walking distance of a large block of apartments and other housing (L. Jones, personal communication, October 12, 2016).

Near these apartment buildings are language lessons, medical offices, a grocery store and several other useful services. *Where* the State chooses to provide the programs and services impacts *who* has access and access to *what*. The groups of families that are placed in the housing nearest the largest LINC provider and other services have great access to services. What about families placed in a different location, such as those that do not live near a frequent bus route, for example? With this in mind, perhaps for community organizations seeking to provide services for newcomers to Canada, location could be considered further than placing a service in a neighborhood in general and more linked to walkability and visibility near areas of housing or other services already frequented by newcomer families. This is not unlike the vision shared in Pascal's (2009) report, in which he encouraged the development of service hubs tied to schools (such as the Schools As Community Centres programs that operate in New South Wales, Australia) – positioning a variety of services in places parents may already be going. In this manner of linking place with accessibility to newcomers, might then community organizations be linked to the concept of *puissance*, a creative force for change?

Intermezzo. Considering the above vignettes together, how might things be different if we focused on HIPPY and other community organizations not as individual resources, but as parts of a larger assemblage of resources? In experimenting with an assemblage of resources, how might they function, and what might be produced? Thinking in this direction might align with Pascal's (2009) conceptualization of service hubs discussed in Chapter 3, places where families can access multiple services at the same location. Might considering them as a constellation of programs and services provide more room for the creative power of *puissance*, with its brief and regular disruptions of the molar State's hold on power? Perhaps elements of program planning might disrupt and become other if programs and services were considered part of a larger picture? Might HIPPY home visitors like Alison already consider their interactions with parents as part of a larger group of community services? How might the programming that Carly attended have linked her to further services, not unlike how she was introduced to HIPPY? Might this be a part of how an assemblage functions, producing new connections and opportunities? Perhaps the practices of home visitors, particularly those

new to the program, might change if HIPPY, and therefore training and weekly meetings, were focused on its functioning and impact as part of an assemblage of other services.

.....

Section 2: Concept Creation and Experimentation with HIPPY and the Rhizome
Intermezzo – HIPPY and the Rhizome

HIPPY & Curriculum. At first glance, HIPPY as a program might appear to be highly structured: shared trainings, identical packets and books, right down to provided materials such as plastic HIPPY shapes. Across Canada on any given week there will be home visitors sharing the same weekly curriculum packets with parents during a home visit, roleplaying the activities parents will do with their children. During the week, these parents will all be reading the same books to their children and working through the same activity packets. Through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) rhizome, we have the opportunity to explore the multiplicities in these similarities. In other words, thinking with the rhizome reminds us that there is more than meets the eye, more at play than the appearance of a neat hierarchical organization. Deleuzian philosophy rejects the linear, and instead looks to non-hierarchical connections; in terms of HIPPY, we don't know what unexpected and non-hierarchical connections might take place.

One such variation is the de/reterritorialization of a home visit. Parr (2010) describes deterritorialization as "a movement producing change" (p. 69). A territory is disrupted, or deterritorialized, "and exposure to the new occurs which is then followed by a stabilization or reterritorialization" (Masny & Bastien, 2016, p. 1). In the case of the home visit, what might be produced in the interaction of elements in an assemblage is the deterritorialization of formally teaching a parent to use the curriculum with their child as per the HIPPY plan, to a reterritorialization as impromptu language lessons for the parent. As noted earlier, the stated purpose of FLIPS such as HIPPY are to 1) empower parents to become their child's first teacher, and 2) prepare children for primary school (Westheimer, 2003). These programs in an official sense are about parents as teachers, preparing their child for school, not parents as second language learners being taught English as a second or additional language by home visitors, or newcomers becoming informed about cultural expectations in Canada, both in their communities and in their

children's educational institutions. This is despite the fact that many parents participating in these programs are in fact newcomers who are beginning their settlement process and ESL learners participating in state-run language acquisition programming. As noted in Chapter 3, many newcomer parents also have limited education or language ability (Ali, 2008; Crosnoe, 2010; Hernandez et al., 2009).

The experimentation with data in the upcoming mappings is not about standard language learning, or even normative literacy practices, it is rather about the rhizomic de- and reterritorialization of the HIPPY curriculum and home visit through conceptualizations of rhizocurriculum, moving to rhizoteaching, and even rhizo-home-visiting, all conceptualized in the coming sections. Through this experimentation, discussion emerges as to how HIPPY home visitors' engagement in a variety of literacy practices with immigrant families might function, and what becomings might be produced. The following section begins with a conceptualization of the work that led to Waterhouse's (2011) principals of rhizocurriculum. This is presented in order to later experiment with further de- and reterritorializations of curriculum, teaching, and home visiting.

Rhizocurriculum. Connecting with the concept of rhizocurriculum allows us to explore HIPPY home visits with a new lens. Waterhouse (2011) and Wallin (2010) use Deleuzian thought to reconceptualize curriculum as rhizocurriculum and curriculum as *currere* respectively. Wallin (2010) states:

curriculum extends from the Latin *currere*, meaning to run. This alone evokes a way of thinking where the curriculum is an active conceptual force...*to run* implies that the conceptual power of *currere* is intimate to its productive capacity to create new flows, offshoots, and mutliplicitous movements. (p. 2)

This is much the same way as the rhizome, connections, branches, lines – molar, molecular and those of flight. Wallin (2010) uses the concept of *currere* to move away from curriculum as running a pre-existing track to curriculum-*currere* as life and experimentation.

Waterhouse (2011), working with both Deleuzian philosophy and Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016), proposes an extension of current expansions of curriculum in the form of rhizocurriculum. Why the need for

reconceptualization? As Hwu (2004) suggests, over-structure is death; Deleuze and Guattari (1987) say “Once a rhizome has been obstructed, arborified, it’s all over, no desire stirs; for it is always by rhizome that desire moves and produces” (p. 14). If we are looking at the heavily structured nature of HIPPY, there could be concern that it is becoming over-structured. A conventional or perhaps arborescent curriculum cannot move and cannot produce in the manner of a rhizome. Connecting Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) conceptualization of the rhizome and curriculum, Waterhouse (2011) outlines five principles of rhizocurriculum: connection, heterogeneity, smooth and striated, affective, and transformative (p. 284). As concepts experience becoming themselves, these principles are recast as they connect with new data; the emergence of rhizocurriculum in Waterhouse’s (2011) work related to participants in the LINC ²⁵ program will be different in the context of my own with HIPPY home visitors.

Mapping 2: HIPPY Home Visitors as Language Instructors – Rhizocurriculum and Rhizoteaching At Work

It is a multiplicity—but we don't know yet what the multiple entails when it is no longer attributed, that is, after it has been elevated to the status of a substantive. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 4)

This mapping deals primarily with conceptualizations of language, language acquisition, and language teaching using concepts of rhizocurriculum and rhizoteaching to experiment with data. While language acquisition might be a conventional aspect of the vignettes in this mapping, language is part of a larger assemblage. In the context of Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016), language can be discussed in terms of reading, reading the world and self, reading intensively and immanently the connections and elements in an assemblage. In reading, reading the world and self, conceptualizations of language may experience rupture in the following vignettes, in a part of an assemblage read disruptively that includes multiple elements, such as, parent,

²⁵ LINC is the English acronym for Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada. This is a free language program “funded by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC)” and offered in English or French depending on location (settlement.org, 2016). LINC includes Levels 1-7, suggesting level 4 as intermediate language proficiency.

home visitor, and home visit. For example, what might be produced when home visitors and parents discuss “correct” forms of language?

As noted in Chapter 3, other researchers have engaged with Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016) and language acquisition in bilingual and multilingual contexts. Bylund and Björk-Willén (2015) experiment with conceptualizations of languages in the context of Multiple Literacies Theory as “a heterogeneous reality with endless connections [with] multiple points of connections to be made and unmade” (p. 88-89). Zhang and Guo (2017) also experiment with questions blurring of boundaries of bilingualism in a minority language environment. This mapping also experiments with conceptualizations of language, language acquisition, and language teaching, particularly as related to literacies in the context of family relationships.

Vignettes 2a-c: Home Visiting for English Language Acquisition. Vignettes 2a-c are presented together, as it is in combination they may raise questions about how conventional language acquisition and language teaching might occur through the HIPPY program, home visits, and home visitors, in other words asking how home visitors engage in literacy practices with HIPPY parents, and what might be produced in the interaction of home visitor and other elements in an assemblage. Thinking with the previously noted conceptualization of rhizocurriculum we explore vignettes of impromptu language lessons that take place during home visits, viewing the home visits not as blind enactments of a predetermined curriculum, but as spaces of experimentation, particularly in the context of English language teaching for home visitors, and acquisition for parents. The HIPPY program is not designed for language acquisition, but might it create an opening for moments of language learning to happen? As opportunities emerge, different principals of rhizocurriculum are experimented with; some will bear similarity to the ways in which Waterhouse (2011) put the concept to work, while others will diverge as de- and reterritorialized by experimentation with diverse data.

Vignette 2a: Language for communication. Before observing any home visits home visitors were observed during their weekly meeting, followed by an interview. The linguistic struggles of some parents came up in the meeting. In her first interview (November 4, 2014), Alison stated that language:

starts off as being a big part of their lives at first...so I'm kind of there to help them get acquainted with what's going on in Canada and that it's ok to go out and be, but I feel the first thing that they have to kind of get out of the way is be more comfortable with the language. Because obviously if you don't have the language, you're afraid to leave your home, because you can't communicate if you want to find somewhere, you can't communicate that, you take the bus, you can't communicate that, it's just one of those things that's common.

Vignette 2b: HIPPY's provision of vocabulary. Another home visitor, Diana, said something similar in her first interview (November 4, 2014), stating that one of her parents is isolated because of a lack of English proficiency and that the home visits are situations where parents learn new vocabulary.

Home Visitor Diana, Interview 1

D: Diana R: Researcher

R: [...] How do you think that's made your experience different from some of the other parents in the program?

D: I have a mother who she's struggling to learn English, and **she's all isolated, she doesn't want to go nowhere, and I help her maybe at school just to communicate with this kid's teacher, and it's so, so difficult, just to be around and get around with everything if you don't have the language.**[...]

R: So, the, a different point on the language idea, so you're saying that a lot of the adults are learning and they're going to programs like LINC and that kind of thing, how does that work in the home visit, and how do you think the HIPPY materials work with the language learning?

D: It even helped me at the beginning. Because it's not that vocabulary, every week I need to at least learning one or two new words. Yeah. It helped me. I see that the parents that don't have too much English, like not everything is new, because if they don't know that language, they won't be able to be in the program, because they need to have a certain level of English to be in the program, but when I see

people, or I see moms that they don't have much English, it's amazing, because, oh, this is a new word, oh I didn't know how to pronounce that, or how to say that. So they are also learning English at the same time they are reviewing the program and they need to practice with their kids. So it helps.

Vignette 2c: Home visits as practice for LINC. Home visitors such as Alison further note that many of the HIPPY parents in this community are participating in the aforementioned LINC program. In Alison's case, during one of her weekly home visits she dedicates approximately 15 minutes to speaking English with the mother in preparation for her LINC class. Erica, in her second interview also discusses using home visits to practice English with participating mothers.

Home Visitor Erica, Interview 2

E: Erica R: Researcher

R: Okay, that makes sense. Now this particular family that we visited, where would you explain her language ability, the mom?

E: The mom's English level is like in the LINC level is level 4, and she just came from level 3 to level 4, but **she's eager to learn and she's very open minded and she's easy going, so I can, I give her more to read and to talk, so I think she's not very shy, she's not very you know very conservative, so she like to talk, she like to practice, I give her more chance to be main character in the role play, so as a mom. You know we usually work, they work as a kid and we work as a mom, but in this case I like her work as a mom and I'll be the kid. And first, and she practice more English speaking, and the second way, she gets more familiar with the curriculum, all the activities in the curriculum. And, I think she's more ready to do this with her children.**

While HIPPY is not explicitly a language acquisition program for newcomer parents, as the program is in the target language (in this location, English), it becomes a part of an assemblage that for many participating newcomer parents includes language

acquisition. Many newcomers to Canada, particularly those engaging with programs such as HIPPY, also participate in the federal Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program in the language most appropriate to their location (English or French). Thinking about language acquisition taking place in the context of HIPPY home visitors and a HIPPY home visit, perhaps this could be connected to the rhizomatic principles of connection and heterogeneity. In the context of HIPPY, I would suggest that the teaching and learning in a home visit, like that in a classroom, also “unfolds as it forms complex connections similar to a rhizome” (Waterhouse, 2011, p. 284). Furthermore, heterogeneity is an active force in all home visits as each visit, each exploration of the curriculum packet with a home visitor and parent, a parent and child, is an encounter “with the new and different” (Bogue, 2004, as paraphrased in Waterhouse, 2011, p. 284). Linking to Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) conceptualization of the rhizome, connection and heterogeneity function together, in that “any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be” (p. 7); it is in heterogeneity that points can find anything other with which to make connections.

Might this be the rhizomatic principle of connection and continuous transformation at work? Connections between HIPPY and LINC, teaching one’s child and being taught? Although connected, there are non-linear parts of an assemblage, interacting, disrupting, and becoming. The teaching and learning time in the home disrupts, the visit may de/reterritorialize from a focus of teaching the parent the activities for the week, to teaching the parent the language needed in order to do the activities for the week with their child in English, as well as language for engaging with the community at large. HIPPY, existing in an assemblage, connects with other aspects of the community. As noted in the previous section, HIPPY parents are encouraged to participate in community activities and use resources such as drop-in activities and the library. As Alison and Diana each state, without language skills some parents may remain isolated, uncomfortable leaving their homes and reluctant to try to communicate with others in the community. This links to Crosnoe’s (2010) assertion that with limited communication, parents may not know “what is available to them or expected of them” (Crosnoe, 2010, p. 4).

How might we think about home visitors differently in this context? As noted in Mapping 1, HIPPY is but one of many services in which newcomer parents might participate, including language programs. Home visitor interviews in Mapping 1 stated that part of each home visit may be related to issues a family might face, such as childcare or employment, all of which may be part of an assemblage that the to which the home visitor's presence adds. Language classes such as those offered through the LINC program can be included in the resources parents have access to, and home visitors suggest. Home visitors state that their reasoning for engaging in language work with parents is related to responding to issues of isolation due to minimal ability to communicate in English. The concept of rhizo-curriculum emerges in response to the rhizomatic nature of the home visit and the connections that are made; a home visit is more than role-playing the curriculum, it is all of the elements in the assemblage that come together producing the home visitor, parent, and home visit, each with their own potential for becoming.

Vignette 2d: HIPPY boosting language acquisition. Like Erica in vignette 2c, Alison also links the HIPPY program to English improvement in parents.

Home Visitor Alison, Interview 1

A: Alison; R: Researcher

R: Do you see potential for the curriculum to boost language learning or language experience?

A: It does, because I've had a mom who has. Who's improved her English from HIPPY. So it's a few of them, not just one, but a few of them. It's kind of, it's with the reading of the books, which helps improving just the communication, being able to ask questions, and clarifying things, they ask me meanings of words, stuff like that, and often there's words that are spelled, that sound the same but are spelled differently, the to, like going to the store, number two, and me too, so they'll ask me the differences between all of those, so also a grammar lesson as well because most of them that are interested in the language ask, the more interested they are, the more questions they ask.

Waterhouse (2011) presents rhizocurriculum as transformative, which ties into Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concepts of de/reterritorialization and lines of flight. Waterhouse (2011) states: "We do not experience a rhizocurriculum and its... affects without undergoing a transformation, a becoming. The way these transformations happen cannot be known in advance" (p. 285). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state that the lines of rhizome may break (this includes the molar and molecular lines), or shatter, but will begin again – de/reterritorialization. In some cases, the lines of a rhizome explode into lines of flight. Home visits can de- and reterritorialize, but they can also go off in completely unexpected directions. Rhizocurriculum recognizes that rhizomes are always changing and that ruptures constantly happen creating continuous transformation.

Any language found in the curriculum, or used during a home visit could cause a rupture, a transformation of the visit, as parents and home visitors engage in multiple literacies. For example as Alison states, something like two words "that sound the same but are spelled differently" can spur a change in conversation as the definitions of vocabulary words are explained. As Masny (2013c) states, ruptures provide the opportunity to change directions, often in unpredictable ways; a moment where a parent asks a question is a moment with potentiality for rupture, and a home visit taking off along a de- and reterritorialization. Although this may relate more to traditional forms of literacies, in these moments becomings in the context of language acquisition may occur. Could we then view the home visit and home visitors' engagement in literacy practices with parents as opportunity for continuous transformations, or becomings? Rhizocurriculum recognizes that teaching and learning experiences are not bound by teacher-student binaries, curriculum documents, or physical spaces. Teaching and learning in the context of rhizocurriculum makes connections between multiplicities and allows the power of affect to spill over. As affect spilled over, disruptions, transformations, and becomings happen, sometimes with just the home visitor sharing one new vocabulary word with a parent the catalyst of such change.

Vignettes 2e-f: Developing "correct" language. The following two interconnected vignettes come from a home visitor and parent pair – Home Visitor Alison, and Parent Fiona. The two vignettes are presented together highlighting the home

visitor's statements about the mother's language ability as well as how the mother describes her own relationship to language in the pair interview.

Vignette 2e: Language development with HIPPY Mom. This vignette comes from Alison's second interview, which took place after the first of two observed home visits with her parent Fiona. This conversation revolved around Alison's practices during a home visit, including asking how working with parents with less English fluency might work. There are links between how she describes Fiona's language acquisition, with the vignette to follow (2f) that come from Alison and Fiona's pair interview that takes place immediately following the second home visit observation.

Home Visitor Alison, Interview 2

A: Alison; R: Researcher

R: [...] so her [Fiona] first language is obviously not English, when you're working with her, do you find yourself gauging what she understands, how does that work for you?

A: [...] she's actually very good, in particular this family, is very good at telling me if she doesn't understand?

R: Okay.

A: So **she does ask a lot of questions**. That obviously changed, last year it was a lot slower because she was still quite new to it, but this year she's gotten a lot better and if there's terms that she doesn't understand, she'll say oh, what does this mean, you know, what do I do, but I try and more role play with her than I do talk. She needs to hear the language so she knows how to say words, **she'll often ask me what words mean, and if I'm giving her tips on how to do something, she often writes what I'm saying, so she remembers when she does go back, to the curriculum with the girls**, so it's, so yeah, she's pretty good at telling me, and if she seems overwhelmed, she'll kind of have that puzzled look on her face, so and every so often I have to kind of remember to ask, not only with her, but with many other families as well. That are you ok, do you understand what I'm saying, they'll be all yes, and what have you. So she's very good.

Later in the same interview, we continue the discussion:

- R: You have to do a lot of explaining in these different situations, and I was wondering about the balance of explaining, too little, too much, you could talk about that.
- A: Again it's kind of hard to know whether it's too much? You kind of know when it's too little, cause they'll come back and try to explain it, and she's very good at that, like she'll say, well do you mean this, and she'll repeat back and then I'll say, then that, and then also I'll kind of expand on it. That sort of idea, until she seems to understand what it is. And often cases, I will say to her, if you don't think, like for example if it's something that requires a lot of speaking and a lot of talking from her girls, they're not quite there yet, they do speak English, but it's not in full on sentences, so they're very shy, and they're very timid themselves. Mom can get them to come out of their shell, but they don't know a lot of the – words, because English is not spoken in the home. They speak English at school, but they don't talk very much at school, so they're still, everything is very new for them and they're on the younger side, so they just turned 4 in December...
- R: Oh, okay...
- A: [...] they're very young still, so I tell mom, I always say to mom, that if it's something that requires a lot of words, then I'll say, even if they say, like if you're expecting them to say the cat went inside the house and hid, they might say "cat hide", and you'll say yes, the cat did hide. Where did it hide? So I'm teaching her that you accept the answer they give you as long as it's on the same page, but then you also expand on it, so you're modeling what you expect from them? So she seems to get it and that will in turn improve mom's language as well, English pronunciation, she's very worried about that, she's worried that her pronunciation is not the correct way so the girls won't learn it properly, and I said you know what, kids adapt very well. They're at school for 6 hours, 6.5 hours, and all the English that they could ever possibly have is around them for those hours, I said, **so the more time you spend with them teaching them is valuable whether you can speak English properly or not. I said at least you're communicating in a way they understand, and you're their mother**, so it's kind of, it's you'll learn

from them, so as they get older they will, like mom will learn from them as opposed to the other way around. Because their language might surpass mom's, which is the case in many of the HIPPY families, the child's language, English language, will surpass the parents, it doesn't feel so good being a parent and having that, but it's just the way it is. Right? So...

Vignette 2f: The right words. This vignette comes from an interview including the parent and the home visitor, and took place immediately following my second (and final) home visit observation. During the interview, I showed the parent and home visitor a video clip of the previous observation, where the parent was writing down English vocabulary words on the curriculum documents.

When they first saw the clip, they laughed:

Home Visitor Alison and Parent Fiona, Pair Interview

A: Alison (Home Visitor) F: Fiona (Parent) R: Researcher

F: Similar...

A: Is this today? No, I have a different shirt on...

During the home visit before the interview, the home visitor presented an activity that involved a picture of an empty plate, and 2-3 pages of different food items for the child to colour, cut out, and glue to the plate (shown below). The parent and home visitor went over each food item while the parent wrote down their names in English, much like as in the video of the previous home visit.

I asked them about this in the interview:

F: It is important I think, because **English is not our native language, as parents we still learning some new words, some is also new words for us.** So I write down, and let me remember, and **give our kids right words.**

A: And it's in English that she's writing them. So some parents do the opposite. They'll write them in their native language, and then it helps them remember what it is in English. But some of them write it in English, because they want to be able to know **the proper word**. And it helps them remember how to pronounce it. So **it's different I guess, however you learn**.

R: So do you think you've learned a lot of vocabulary words using the HIPPY curriculum?

F: Yeah, yeah. Some also. **It's a process of learning**.

A: Her reading has come a very long way. I told you that before (*motioning to parent*). Her reading is **so much more fluent**, and yeah, very, very good.

The Deleuzian concepts of smooth and striated are useful here to discuss a further principle Waterhouse (2011) uses to conceptualize rhizocurriculum: Smooth space can be conceptualized as open space with only situational properties where elements have positions only in relationship to one another (some use the example of the game Go²⁶), while striated space is more structured with clearly marked boundaries (chess would be a corresponding game example with each piece assigned unchanging rules) (Conley, 2010; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

Waterhouse (2011), using Aoki (2005), proposes that rhizocurriculum takes places in the “in-between curricular spaces” (Waterhouse, 2011, p. 285); rhizocurriculum “moves in both striated and smooth spaces; at times tracing a curricular territory of required knowledge content and at others mapping lines of flight, of escape, of deterritorialization into the unknown” (p. 285). In this characterization of rhizocurriculum, I differ from Waterhouse. In this area I move from the concepts of smooth and striated to explore inbetweenness to Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concepts of cartography and decalcomania. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the concept of cartography in relation to the rhizome is that it is a map that through decalcomania is “entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real” (p. 12). To look at a rhizocurriculum, and perhaps rhizoteaching, it might be viewed in the same way, oriented towards experimentation. Rhizocurriculum and rhizoteaching mean being open

²⁶ Two players use white and black pieces on a grid; the moves one can make with the pieces related to their existing position on the board in relation to other pieces.

to new and perhaps the things that happen in-between, but this can be extended to curriculum and teaching that seeks out opportunities to experiment. Might the inadvertent extension of the home visit to a vocabulary building experience be a form of experimentation? Perhaps this is one of many becomings that occur as a result of the relationships between elements in an assemblage, including HIPPY home visitors and their home visits.

Waterhouse's (2011) use of smooth and striated can also be a way to explore tensions between Deleuze and Guattari's map, which is solely geared toward experimentation versus tracing which refers to conventional reproductions of hierarchy. In terms of curriculum in the real world, the tracing (government documents, requirements, etc.) conflicts with the map (what might be produced in the real-life classroom). Conceptualizing smooth and striated space as a part of rhizocurriculum provides concepts with which to explore the problem of what happens where the classroom meets curriculum, or when the home visit meets HIPPY curriculum packets. Could it be the interaction of the smooth and striated, the tracing and the map, the curriculum packet and the home visit that produces language lessons?

In this context, what might plugging in produce? Might the smooth spaces found in a home visit overlay the striated curriculum creating a deterritorialization that shifts focus from parent as teacher to parent as language learner? Could there be a deterritorialization of the role of the home visitor from a teacher of a specific curriculum packet to a teacher of language? From curriculum to experimentation, rhizocurriculum to moments of rhizoteaching? The rhizome, and thus rhizocurriculum and rhizoteaching, is not a permanent state. Experimentations with rhizocurriculum provide an awareness of the potentialities of moments of deterritorialization of curriculum; experimentations with rhizoteaching looks to how moments of teaching in a home visit might give rise to moments of rhizoteaching. In the context of the characteristics of a rhizome, rhizoteaching seeks out opportunities for experimentation (decalcomania), ready to follow lines of flight emerging from disruption of an assemblage.

An important link between vignettes 2e and 2f relates to the striation of the smooth in the context of language. For example, when Alison talks about the mother's use of English with her children notes in vignette 2e that the mother should not worry

about using English incorrectly as 1) the children spend a great many hours at school in an English environment, and 2) the time a mother spends teaching her children is valuable “whether you can speak English properly or not.” There is a tension between smooth conceptualizations of language, such as Alison stating that the mother should not worry about correct English use, and striated such as Fiona’s expressed concern of giving children the “right words”. While these vignettes can be used to explore the unique opportunities for language acquisition in HIPPY, other questions, particularly when linked to vignette 2e, arise. For example, how might a concern for using the “right words” relate back to issues emerging in Mapping 1 relating to issues of State and overcoding practices?

Bylund and Bjork-Willen (2012), engaging with Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016), discuss the concept of multilingualism through a study in a bilingual Swedish-Spanish school. One instance discussed is children producing incorrect Swedish vocabulary as translations of Spanish words. They state that Multiple Literacies Theory “analyses the reading process as a collective and productive affair with no endpoint” (p. 81); reading with Multiple Literacies Theory is about plugging in, not interpreting. Bylund and Bjork-Willen read language similarly, stating that “what it means to know or learn a language are multiple” as “there is no starting point and no endpoint, but there are multiple points of connections” (Bylund & Bjork-Willen, 2012, p. 89). Bylund and Bjork-Willen state that multiple literacies include the “pluralities of different actions occurring in the process of reading” noting that the productivity of such is not in an endpoint but from this complexity. If what it means to know or learn a language is multiple, complex, and without an endpoint, perhaps we might rethink concerns about giving children the “right words” and promote Alison’s conceptualization of the parent-child relationship shared in the statement “the more time you spend with them teaching them is valuable whether you can speak English properly or not”. How might HIPPY be different if home visitors’ focus was primarily on the parent-child relationship without the additional pressure of parent-child-English-relationship? What might the assemblage produce were the pressure for English use different?

Vignette 2g: Teaching tools, translation and pictures. This interview took place after the first observed home visit. At this time, the family had only been enrolled in HIPPY for a short time. Erica and Janet, the mother, share the same first language. Janet being relatively new to Canada has minimal proficiency in English, but is enrolled in LINC classes. In the video clip that I showed Erica during this interview, Erica was demonstrating the meaning of vocabulary words needed for an activity where the parent and child trace their footprint, cut out multiple copies, and then use them to practice big and little steps. Erica demonstrated tracing a footprint, followed by role-playing the activity with Jane playing the role of the child.

Home Visitor Erica, Interview 2

E: Erica, R: Researcher

R: ... When you're working with your parents, many of them English is their second language, when you're working, how do you figure out their understanding, their level of understanding?

E: At first I can use the eye contact, they can see or not, and even for some mom, they have very lower English speaking, I need to make sure, are you clear? Do you understand? **Sometimes I use pictures**, I use everything last time I mention, and it's better for the family, don't have the same language as me, so, **I use every method to let them understand and sometimes, let them kind of repeat some part and make sure they understand.** And every week when we go back to the family I will ask how the previous week's curriculum activity, and I give them all my contact information of they have any problem during the week they can connect me right away. Make myself available.

R: [...] So, this home visit did seem a little bit unique, because you don't share language with every parent, so I wanted to show you some clips and ask you to talk about it [...]. Tell me about those moments...

E: Honestly, I can see myself in front of the camera, I was confident! The mom is not, maybe, just in front of the camera, maybe she's not very, I can see she's not

- very comfortable, but in the visit she's very relaxed, that's a little bit difference I can notice, [...] I didn't realize any other stuff here...
- R: What about the language?
- E: Yeah, you are right. Because you know, the mom we have the same mother language before, so **if there's something she's not clear in English, I use my mother language talk to her.** [...].
- R: Because you gave to her some vocabulary words there.
- E: Yeah. And, just like, **translate some words, and then she can get it right away.** We don't...
- R: Which kinds of words do you usually end up translating? [...] there are vocabulary from the books, or there is like instruction words, or you know the first page, those are kind of hard. Which ones do you usually translate?
- E: Ah, for the activities, and even for the first page, the skills box? I explain them, and if I explain in English, they can understand, unless they need something and I will use the language they understand. [and ...] **every time I do some research, maybe the pictures, I will save on the phone.** I don't want you know we use the research at that time, right? That's I learn from this lesson [...] **I keep those images in my phone, save to my phone, and some times, if I have a print out, or I find in the magazine, I save it and bring it with me in case some other family need it.** Yeah.
- R: [...] So some of the vocabulary is hard to explain.
- E: Yeah. **You know the fact things, for example, a fruit, and right? And you cannot , you can describe the colour, the size, the shapes, but they still don't get it, but that's why this time you need some image.**

Interrelated areas of questioning emerge, first from Erica's statement describing her own appearance in the observation film as confident, and second relating to the emergence of new teaching techniques. Erica's first response to the filmed observation clip of her teaching was exclaiming: "Honestly, I can see myself in front of the camera, I was confident!". Returning to Waterhouse's (2011) conceptualization of rhizocurriculum as transformative, I ask if perhaps this transformation, or rather becoming, can be

conceptualized as movement toward rhizoteaching. The home visit de/reterritorializes, moving from a role-play of curriculum to active moments of teaching, or perhaps an experimentation in rhizo-teaching, produced by an assemblage of home visitor, parent, language proficiency, shared language, the curriculum packet, and other elements.

Further and more specific questions might be asked related to Erica's emerging technique of teaching by making her own visual dictionary on her phone. Plugging in to multiple literacies, is her use of this technique a part of her becoming teacher, and rhizoteaching? Is it produced as part of a moment of rhizoteaching that has now de- and reterritorialized as rhizo-home-visiting? Thinking differently, could her continued use and development of the tool become a reterritorialization of rhizo-teaching? Does any preparation of images indicate a giving in to the pre-given by following assumptions as to what may arise during a home visit, and rhizo-teaching becoming simply teaching again?

Vignette 2h-i: Negotiating English and shared home languages. One issue that on its face might look convenient for HIPPY home visitors can also be a challenge: HIPPY home visitors are selected for their diverse linguistic knowledge and experience, but it can be challenging to maintain a “mostly English” home visit with a shared language. In the following vignettes, HIPPY home visitors Barb and Diana discuss language use during home visits.

Vignette 2h: When English is limited. This interview, Barb's first with me, took place following an observation of the home visitor group meeting. Barb explains that in some cases a shared language is necessary in order to work with the parent if their English experience is limited. Barb states that her reason for using so much of the shared language in the situation she describes is to avoid frustration for the parent. She further states that wants him to learn English in order to communicate with others in Canada.

Home Visitor Barb, Interview 1

B: Barb, R: Researcher

R: [...] Sometimes we talked about last week language learning, and parents that are still learning, or almost have no English, do you want to talk about that a little bit?

B: Okay most the time, English is also problem. I got one family, he can't speak English. But they speak Cantonese. So that's why Katherine [the program coordinator] gave them to me.

R: Yeah, okay.

B: So I have to using Cantonese explain to the father, and then I going to read that in English, but I do use more, **60% in Cantonese, I use 40% English, so I don't want them to get upset because they don't understand they can't teach the child [...]** [I] also want him [the father] to learn English too, because he been here for so long, he not even can speak English, so ... it not right for him. **Right? But you're in Canada, at least you can communicate. I don't speak good English, but I think I can communicate with most people. Like, I think I want him to learn little bit more English, I'm sure very soon he going to go for school interview. If he go the school interview, he want to know how the son doing, and he can ask simple question.** Both of them, mother and father cannot speak English. The little bit, 10% English maybe? It's really tough. They do the manufacture job [...], you don't need to speak. So 40% I'm trying to use English to teach the, so hopefully they take a little bit from every week. So, I try this. But most of them, my families, they can speak basic English, and most of the mothers go to LINC, so learning English, so I also say, couple of the families say they love to see me, every week I go see them, so she can understand the English, because let's say they speak Spanish, I cannot speak Spanish, I have to use English, I got no choice, I have to using English to read it to them, and to ask to me. Kind of force them to speak English. I think that's a good thing too. Practice. Because language is mainly practice. Practice, Otherwise you forget....

Vignette 2i: When parents have English experience. In this interview, which took place after the first home visit observation, Diana discusses the different linguistic situations she finds herself in as a home visitor. This vignette focuses on situations where she shares a first language with the parents.

Home Visitor Diana, Interview 2

D: Diana, R: Researcher

- R: Now, the family that we went to visit, you share a language.
- D: Yes.
- R: But you don't use it ever.
- D: No. [...] Because **we want them to start learning English. They need to talk with their kids in English, because with that, we also want them to learn all the things in English. Because this is a program to help them go to school.** So if they teach in Spanish, then in this case is Spanish, they won't have all the things that you want them to learn. [...] So it's easier even for the mom, if they learn it how to teach English and for their kid also.
- R: And with this mom, she has very good English, as well. [...] Because I noticed when you, if she did have a problem you explained, you discussed it in English.
- D: Yes.
- R: Okay, but, do you have other parents that speak Spanish?
- D: Yes, I do.
- R: Tell me about those parents, or if it's similar...
- D: It's similar, but sometimes you need to explain in English, and after you finish, you talk, did you understand? And sometimes their faces tell you no, I didn't understand anything, but at least they have already heard how they need to teach to their kids, how is it pronounced, and now you explain them. Okay, this is what you are going to do, and that helps to them. But first, always in English, and sometimes, it's like you're explaining way in your own language, but not teaching in the curriculum in Spanish, because it doesn't make sense, especially, most of them, not all of them, most of them are newcomers, and **what we want is their kids to get English as fast as possible so they can get into the English program as soon as possible.**
- R: What about the parents and their English. Do you think the parents are learning?
- D: Yes, they are. You know one specially in age 4, and age 5, they have new vocabulary, for me was also new vocabulary to be honest, once I started to work with my kids age 5, especially, two or three books, like, Aboriginal peoples, the first time last time, there are a lot of vocabulary that in that case I didn't know. So

even, you saw with her, that even she has really good vocabulary, she told you right? You know, some of the vocabulary was new for me too. So, if, the people who have no English, it's difficult and they learn English, it might be the ones that have no vocabulary.

In the above vignettes, h and i, an emerging issue of language teaching in the context of rhizoteaching is the positioning of parents and home visitors' first languages as in service to English and English language development. Home visitors are encouraged to maintain English in home visits using role-play in order to deal with linguistic challenges. However, home visitors are also selected with their linguistic abilities in mind, as in Springfield and other Canadian HIPYPY sites most are bilingual or multilingual. These elements of bi- or multilingualism are also elements in the assemblage, interacting, and which the power for these interactions to produce becomings. The Deleuzian principles of connection and transformation that Waterhouse (2011) uses to conceptualize rhizocurriculum may both be useful tools to experiment in thinking differently about language use and home visiting. For example, how might home visiting be different if the use of shared languages was promoted more as a benefit than a last effort solution? Could this perhaps move home visiting from an English OR other language position to an English AND experience? Let's return to a quote from Alison in vignette 2e: "the more time you spend with them teaching them is valuable whether you can speak English properly or not." Perhaps this might apply to the home visitor-parent relationship as much as it does that of the parent-child. What might the use of parents' first language AND English to encourage family literacy activities in the home produce when released from concerns about parents' first language OR English as if they could not coexist? What might the addition of a focus on multiple literacies such as those outside of language (e.g. literacies in the context of visual or tactile items) produce?

Further questions arise in relation to the provision of vocabulary: Diana's focus is on what a child might need for school in Canada, while Barb considers how the parent may need to interact with the school. Both home visitors state that part of the vocabulary needs parents and children have are related to interaction with education. Perhaps this speaks to one issue raised in the literature review – the fact that schools are not ready to

serve the diverse population of newcomers that live here in Canada (cf Ali, 2008; Bernhard, 2013; Kovinthan, 2016). Nonetheless, thinking about the provision of vocabulary through the principle of transformation, we may see transformation produced in these experiences, both as through rhizoteaching the home visitor becomes vocabulary instructor, and the parent becomes language student. Although we never know in which direction a becoming may happen (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), there may also lie possibility in the parent's vocabulary acquisition that becomings may happen in relation to their engagement with the education system.

Intermezzo: From rhizo-curriculum to rhizo-teaching, becoming-other. In this linear document, we leave this mapping much like we entered it – in the middle, with questions and possibilities. Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016) focuses on concept creation, to transform and “respond to problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies” (p. 342). In Waterhouse's (2011) dissertation the concept of rhizocurriculum emerged and was experimented with. In this dissertation, through experimentation with data and concept creation and bound by the study focus of home visitors' engagement in literacy practices with newcomer families, rhizocurriculum emerged and de/reterritorialized in the form of concepts of rhizoteaching and rhizo-home-visiting. Could the concept of rhizocurriculum, perhaps de-and-reterritorialize itself as moments of rhizoteaching in a home visit, responding to a planned curriculum disrupted by language, language ability, or language acquisition? Perhaps disrupted by the de-and-reterritorialization of home-visitor-as-curriculum-packet-guide, to home-visitor-language-instructor?

Deleuze and Guattari (1994) state that “The creation of concepts in itself calls for a future form, for a new earth and people that do not yet exist” (p. 108). Working with concepts that arise rather than those that are pre-given, through the constant connections of the heterogeneous and continuous transformation to meet problems creates the opportunity to look forward, to ask what might be. Where concepts such as rhizocurriculum, teaching, and home visiting meet, might there be an opening for experimentation in the home visit, opportunities to break away from the curriculum packet structure to follow a line of flight to expand the parent's language skills, openings for moments of rhizo-teaching and rhizo-home-visiting?

.....

Mapping 3: HIPPY Home Visitors, Newcomers and “Canadian Culture”

The first observation I did for this project was of the home visitors’ weekly meeting [October 28, 2014]. Home visitors meet weekly to discuss any challenges they may be facing, exchange resource information, and review the curriculum activity packets that they will be teaching to parents in the coming week. During the initial discussion of issues and suggestions one phrase popped out, which I noted in my observation notebook: “We have to teach them. It is probably fine back home, but it’s different here...”. During my first set of interviews I asked the home visitors about this idea of the necessity of teaching parents about Canadian culture.

This mapping demonstrates the connected nature that is found in rhizoanalysis as links between the relationship of HIPPY, newcomer parents, and the State.

Vignette 3a: No parent likes to be told how to raise their kids. In her first interview that followed a group meeting observation, Alison responded to the aforementioned topic in the vignette below:

Home Visitor Alison, Interview 1

A: Alison, R: Researcher

R: [...] I think the phrase someone used, during the meeting, is that we have to teach them, because it’s probably okay back home, but it’s not here, it’s different here. And there was a lot of talk about different cultural issues, and your engagement with parents like that, there’s both the cultural issue and you also talked about language issues. I don’t know if you wanted to talk about them together, or separately, it’s up to you, but kind of like your take on the experience.

A: Okay. It’s, like, **I find, because culturally, for me the way people interact with their families, whatever goes on in their home, it’s what goes on in their home, that’s influenced by their culture, and where they come from, and sometimes that’s not acceptable here, so I usually, like I don’t know, I’m indifferent to it, like I don’t like to go in the home and tell parents how they**

can raise their kids, no parent likes to be told how to raise their kids, so I kind of do a different approach. I listen to what they say, and say, oh, that's interesting, because here in Canada, we, we get, like I'll rephrase and say, not to say that they're wrong, but I'll educate them and say well here in Canada, we're not allowed to touch our children that way, or whatever, because we can be charged with a criminal offense or whatever, like I usually don't use that kind of language, but it's, I kind of turn it around and say rather than you can't do that, I tell them that's interesting because here, and then I tell them what we commonly see here in Canada. And sometimes they do ask me, they'll say we practice this in our country...

[technical difficulties in the middle of recording here]

- R: ...we were talking about a different way, a soft way to discuss cultural differences, and you were saying how you like to talk about what we do here in Canada, as opposed to what we don't do here in Canada.
- A: Or not what's wrong with what they do, because what they do is what they do, and I encourage people to keep their cultural values, it's very, that's very important, to keep, it's part of the, it's who they are, and that's how they're going to raise their kids, I can't tell them how to raise their kids, and it's different if it's in society. It's in their home, their closed doors, no one sees what they're doing. It's different if it is the outside of the home, if they were to be in society and stuff, and then again, like I don't know, I have a difference of opinion on that, **we aren't there to tell them how to raise their kids, we're there to educate them on how things are done here, and it's a different way of communicating, right, like negative, you're doing this wrong, that's not what you're supposed to so, I think it's the way you term it, it's the language you use, it has to be different and of course, that's got to be altered according to the understanding of the English language.** Some of them do have very low comprehension of English, so a lot of things, **the curriculum's a little bit easier because it's all role play, but when you're trying to explain something like that it's a little bit more complex. So it's kind of, it's more difficult to kind of**

- get the message across, when they don't have the understanding of the language.**
- R: before we talk more about languages, is there a particular thing or issue that does come up for you where you do the reminding of a way that we do this here in Canada, is there a common thing or it's all different...
- A: No, it's different and it's never been anything where I've had to say, well this is what we do in Canada aside from maybe celebrations, so different religious celebrations that they have that are different, some are interested in, all of them, all the families are interested in what do we, me as an individual, they're interested in how we do things, and they educate me in how they do things in whatever country they're from, so **it's kind of a shared learning experience, which is nice, because it gets away from accusing them of doing something wrong, judging them because of where they're from, I don't like that, just like I don't like to be judged myself, according to my values, so I give the respect that they want from me, or at least the respect, I give them the respect as I want respect.** So it's worked so far.
- R: Has your feeling about that changed at all over the years, has it grown more like this since you started?
- A: It grew more, as I've kind of gone on. I know I'm not supposed to pass judgment on anybody, so when they do share experiences with me I kind of you're taken aback by it, and say oh, that's interesting, and then as they warm up they share more experiences with you, but some of them are shared experiences and you're just kind of sharing stories with each other. I think the terms that they use is one things that sometimes we're uncomfortable with, like often I'll hear, well I don't beat my children. Beating children, for them, culturally, is different than beat for us. We think when they say beat that they mean [Alison making a fist to demonstrate] that they're physically abusing them, because I have seen their children, I know that there's nothing going on, I think just the terms that they use are different terms than we use in Canada that can be misinterpreted. [...]

What might happen when the concept of parenting in the context of settlement in a new country plugs into multiple literacies? What might the assemblage, connections of HIPPY, parents, home visitors, “Canadian culture”, multiculturalism, home cultures and more, produce? Using Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) non-binary concepts of smooth and striated space²⁷ how might we think of striated space in this context? It might be HIPPY curriculum packets with carefully planned activities, training materials for home visitors, and program goals, all of which might promote a certain way of interaction between mother and child, a “correct” way to parent. As noted in Chapter 3, parenting beliefs are deeply personal, and the differences between newcomers’ beliefs and those of the dominant population can be problematic (Ali, 2008). What might be considered good parenting is often Eurocentric (Ali, 2008), and may not align with the beliefs of a newcomer family (Crosnoe, 2010). How then might the unpredictability of what happens in a home visit become smooth space overlaying striated space? For example, perhaps moving from the portrayal of a parent-child interaction in a HIPPY book to a question from a parent about what might be considered normative behaviours in Canada. What might plugging in produce? Perhaps these interactions might create opportunities for de/re/territorialization and lines of flight (Masny, 2011), opportunities to think differently about parenting for both home visitor and parent.

Viewing the interaction of smooth and striated space as productive, how might the introduction of home visitor conceptualizations of parenting in Canada de/re/territorialize? How might their practices function in an assemblage? When home visitors recast²⁸ parenting in the Canadian context what literacies might be explored? What becomings might happen? Might we consider literacies in the context of home visitors communicating across linguistic and cultural barriers? Perhaps home visitors also engage in literacies in the context of negotiating State promoted forms of parenting (through laws, education programs, etc.) and the personal beliefs of families with

²⁷ As noted earlier in the chapter, the situational properties of smooth space are similar to the game Go, while the more structured striated space is similar to chess.

²⁸ For example, how Alison deals with cultural differences in vignette 3a: “I listen to what they say, and say, oh, that’s interesting, because here in Canada, we, we get, like I’ll rephrase and say, not to say that they’re wrong, but I’ll educate them and say well here in Canada, we’re not allowed to touch our children that way, or whatever...”

different cultural concepts about how parenting might function. How a family operates is deeply related to personal beliefs about parenting, beliefs that can be difficult to act on when parents' "normative images and processes...in raising their child are different from those used by the dominant society around them" (Ali, 2008, p. 149).

Differences in parenting beliefs can be problematic for marginalized populations as "notions about 'good parenting' are rooted in the discourse among white, European-origin policy makers and institutional leaders, academics and students, service providers, media professionals and the dominant population" (Ali, 2008, p. 149). Families that do not subscribe to these beliefs may find their children are labeled as developmentally delayed by teachers who have differing expectations (Keels, 2009). Keels (2009) notes while there "are no culturally neutral, right or wrong developmental environments," they do affect the level of preparation a child has for a particular context (p. 382) – a concern of family literacy intervention programs like HIPPIY. With this in mind, the following lines of thought are proposed: How might de/re/territorialization function in the context of the assemblage of home visiting – home visitor, parent, curriculum, child...? What becomings might happen as a result of the interaction of these elements in an assemblage? Perhaps conceptualizing the relationship between smooth and striated space as productive could change how we think about what happens during home visiting. We might further ask what this may produce in the context of multiple literacies, such as multiple literacies at work in the context of culture and parenting-as-literacy-practice.

Vignette 3b: Canadian Culture and Settlement.

Home Visitor Diana, Interview 1

D: Diana, R: Researcher

R: [...] Sometimes in the meeting we said, in Canada we do it this way, how did that feel as a parent, or did you experience anything like that?

D: Yeah, I have. And **sometimes it's new thing that I need to learn because I want to be part of, since I want to live here, I want to get the Canadian culture. So sometimes, its something you need to learn, and would learn because it's better for me to get more settled, and even for my kids, learn all the cultural things, so they can get with other kids and be the same, and in the same country you're living in.**

- R: What is it like as a home visitor when you're in those kind of situations?
- D: Sometimes it's difficult, because [...] **some the people are not willing to change anything.** They want to have their own world and they don't want to interact and they don't want to learn about the culture, so **that makes it sometime difficult for them.** Even you as a home visitor try to let them know, we do this this way, and some of them it's like nope, I do it this way, I do, I've always done this like this, and not going to change it. So sometimes you find people that are able to change, but some of them, they just don't want. Yeah. And I think it's difficult, but it's important. If you're living in this country you need to learn about it, right? Because you're going to be part of it.
- R: Was there anything is particular that you found difficult as a parent?
- D: Not that I remember now.
- R: Nothing. [...] there were changes in your family in how you did things?
- D: For example, now I remember. The Thanksgiving. We don't have Thanksgiving at home. The first year I didn't pay attention to it. I knew that it exist, and it was a free day for everybody, you know? And this year my kids were like, Mommy, what are we going to have for Thanksgiving? And I was like, what? But okay, it's important, and talked with my husband, and okay **we are going to live in this country they need to be learning, so we made the special dinner, and even though for them, because when they go back to school they were going to ask, what did you have for thanksgiving dinner, right? [...] So those are the things that I didn't have in my culture, but I will start to have because I become part of here, and they need to be part of everything.**

From this vignette emerges the potential for experimenting with the promotion of Canadian culture for the purpose of settlement. The home visitor in this situation talks about culture in terms of settlement and for her children, "get with other kids and be the same, and in the same country you're living in." In this case the home visitor aligns with the normative agenda of a state potentially engaged in overcoding. I say potentially because of the somewhat conflicting statements regarding multiculturalism policy in Canada. For example, in the article "Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship" (2012) these statements are made:

- 1) “Multiculturalism ensures that all citizens can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging.... The Canadian experience has shown that multiculturalism encourages racial and ethnic harmony and cross-cultural understanding,” and
- 2) “Mutual respect helps develop common attitudes.... Through multiculturalism, Canada recognizes the potential of all Canadians, encouraging them to integrate into their society and take an active part in its social, cultural, economic and political affairs.”

As noted in Mapping 1, the existence of the State is tied to normativity, and its “*unity of composition*” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 427). Multiculturalism as conceptualized by these quotations both encourages the maintenance of one’s identity, yet creates unity of composition through diversity. It is important to note that Deleuze and Guattari (1987) conceptualize identity through the concept of difference; difference is not different-from, but rather continuing non-linear becomings. When reading the two CIC points on the maintenance of identity and the integration of point two there might seem to be a contradiction as one could expect the development of common attitudes to indicate a shift in one’s identity. However, as Jackson (2013) discusses, Deleuze and Guattari do not consider identity to be stable, particularly in terms of in comparison with something other. States and institutions are molar and seek normativity; the development of common attitudes seems in opposition to diversity and maintaining one’s own identity yet conforms to the state’s pursuit of normativity. Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualization of identity as difference and becoming rejects the linear, instead engaging with non-hierarchical connections. In more conventional research, the idea of the maintenance of one’s identity while still developing common attitudes might remain in opposition, an OR situation where one can be settled OR keep one’s identity. Canadian written policy suggests (despite the State’s pursuit of normativity), a more Deleuzian approach of AND; a newcomer to Canada can have pride in ancestry AND belong/integrate with non-linear and non-hierarchical conceptualizations of identity through difference and becoming.

How might Diana’s statements about integration and home visiting connect to this non-hierarchical AND conceptualization of multiculturalism? In describing participating parents, she states: “Even you as a home visitor try to let them know, we do this this way,

and some of them it's like nope, I do it this way, I do, I've always done this like this, and not going to change it." However, when describing her own experience she says:

We don't have Thanksgiving at home. The first year I didn't pay attention to it. I knew that it exist, and it was a free day for everybody, you know?...But okay, it's important, and talked with my husband, and okay we are going to live in this country they need to be learning, so we made the special dinner, and even though for them, **because when they go back to school they were going to ask, what did you have for thanksgiving dinner, right?**

In considering multiculturalism and settlement from the position of AND, although Diana's statements draw a distinction to not changing and doing new things like celebrating Canadian holidays, both positions can be considered a part of multiculturalism practice in Canada.

With this in mind, how might home visits and the role of the home visitor be conceptualized differently? What becomings might emerge with the home visitor and their practices in a home visit as elements in an assemblage? Part of the HIPPY multicultural mandate noted in Mapping 1 includes "Mentoring activities that facilitate the integration of newcomers into the schools, the community and the labour market" (HIPPY Canada, Multicultural HIPPY, 2016). How might a home visitor deal with the tension between multiculturalism including both integration and maintenance of identity? As with language, already identified as an issue related to settlement in Mapping 2, the ways of being in the world are multiple. The same could be said for ways of settling in Canada, including aspects of maintaining identity AND integrating; there is a multiplicity and all are equally important.

Intermezzo

Settlement is a complex topic to discuss, and perhaps is no less so for what we might call frontline workers, such as home visitors. The assemblage of weekly interactions with home visitors and parents is an unpredictable space of de/reterritorialization and becoming; when a home visitor arrives at a visit, they have no idea how, or when, a home visit may disrupt. Further more, they have no idea in what ways or directions the home visit will transform. A key question emerging from these vignettes may be to ask how home visiting and home visitors engage in settlement as OR

and AND, and what might be produced in the interactions of home visitor, parent, and conceptualizations of settlement.

This intermezzo also seeks to serve as a connective pause between the intertwined Mappings 3 and 4. While Mapping 3 focuses on questions around home visiting, home visitors and settlement, Mapping 4 turns to a connected but more narrow issue of home and school connection.

Mapping 4: HIPPY Home Visitors Negotiating Home and School Expectations

A mapping that is very interconnected with HIPPY home visitors as assisting newcomer families negotiate the world of Canadian culture is that of negotiating expectations between home and school environments. Perhaps before the data were collected it might have seemed that this might just be in the sense of commonly touted phrases like “aligning home and school”, but it is more so in the actual differing expectations of things like the roles of parents and teachers, and even behaviors and learning experiences that are promoted in Canadian schools perhaps differently from in one’s previous country. What kinds of literacy practices do home visitors engage in in this sense? How does this engagement function, and what might it produce?

Vignettes 4a-b: Imagination and Creativity. This mapping begins with two different home visitors that originate from China and the importance that they now place on the development of both parent and child imagination, creativity and curiosity.

Vignettes 4a: Imagination. This interview with Erica came after the first home visit observation. The observation took place very close to the time the family joined the HIPPY program so Erica had seen the family very few times yet herself.

Home Visitor Erica, Interview 2

E: Erica, R: Researcher

R: Toward the end of this [...] it’s the story with the dog, it’s the last week with the dog and you show the container and putting the dog in and he’s sleeping and that kind of thing, and you mentioned to her [the mother] about imagination.

E: Yes.

R: Can you tell me a little bit about that? Because you talked about imagination a lot of times [during the home visit].

E: Because in this part I talk a lot, maybe based on, I'm a mother. So before we just focus on the academic things, but for the imagination maybe, that's my experience, I kind of, not ignore, but I didn't pay a lot of attention, so and doing this curriculum and this activities, I realized that it's very, very important, especially for the new families. They want the children to learn a lot of language, they need to do everything on the right track, and so that's why. Most part, for one part, of course that comes from HIPPY skill boxes, and also from kind of my personal experience I think I know to bring up the attention to the parents.

R: Why do you think imagination is important?

E: You know for the younger kids, and they have a like, I shouldn't use that, the word, but you know it's like a word you need to let them grow by themselves for a little while, and don't give them limitation first, and that's why they can dig, drill into a lot of things, and they can expand their ---, and not the mental, ahhhh...

R: Emotional?

E: **Not only emotional, emotional I think the brain part I can use mental things, but you know, mentally, the need to expand their world.**

R: **Okay, so it grows their world mentally?**

E: **Yes.**

[... later in the same interview]

E: Oh, by the way, so I'm just record the question ask about the imagination, why I keep you know, enhance this word to this family, because this family has some concern about the older daughter, they want, you know they come from the same country, so China, I understand what their expectation from activity, so I think that's, it's a part, and lot of families I met, **we come from the same background, and they don't realize how important the imagination is, so that's why it's another thing why I keep talking about imagination is important.**

R: Do you think that imagination is more important, or considered more important here in Canada or in western culture.

E: Yeah. But right now, back in our country, more and more people realize, more and more parents actually, they realize, so we actually kind of you know move our focus from only the academic part to this, this part.

During the interview Erica is asked about her frequent mentions of the importance of imagination during the home visit. From her own experience as a parent, she states:

So before we just focus on the academic things, but for the imagination maybe, that's my experience, I kind of, not ignore, but I didn't pay a lot of attention, so and doing this curriculum and this activities, I realized that it's very, very important, especially for the new families. They want the children to learn a lot of language, they need to do everything on the right track, and so that's why.

As with conceptualizations of settlement in Mapping 3, the issue of OR and AND emerges. Stating that families want their children to learn the language, might there be a concern that imagination is not helpful? Erica refers to her own previously held attitudes on focusing on academic things. In her home visiting, however, Erica offers the academic AND imagination. She states: "you know they come from the same country, [...] I understand what their expectation from activity, they don't realize how important the imagination is, so that's why it's another thing why I keep talking about imagination is important." As Erica notes, imagination is not part of growing up in some cultures. Perhaps her, and other parents', engagement with imagination in Canada might be a fulfillment of the statement made in "Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship (2012)" regarding the development of common attitudes.

This difference in conceptualization of what is important in education, particularly for parents from Asian countries aligns with previously presented literature in Chapter 3; Huntsinger and Jose's (2009) study of Chinese American and European American families found major differences between Chinese American and European conceptualizations of parental involvement relating to educational activities. One example related to parents' involvement at school; Chinese American parents spent a great deal of time on school-related activities with their children, but at home, rather than

at the school itself. One can see how in an assemblage different conceptualizations of school, education, and parental involvement might happen.

Another way to experiment with the concepts of the academic and the imagination might be to engage with Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) order words²⁹; simply stating that something is imagination or academic might then transform it as such. Perhaps Erica's consideration of imagination as an important part of preparation for school might even effect a transformation for imagination to then become academic.

What might happen when plugging the concepts of the academic and the imagination into Multiple Literacies Theory? As stated in my conceptual framework, Multiple Literacies Theory (Masny, 2009, 20013, 2014, 2016) promotes multiple literacies as a way to stimulate equity and access (Masny, 2009a). Home visits, just as general educational practices, may benefit from exploration of the multiple, providing the opportunity for home visitor and parent to explore different ways of engaging in literacies in the context of family relationships. What might be produced during a home visit that engages in imagination as well as the expected academic work? Might this disrupt parental (and even the child's) expectations of and conceptualization of school? How might the conceptualization of the academic and the imaginative as non-binary produce the opportunity to think differently about the function of education?

At the end of the interview when Erica asks to return to the topic she mentions a shift in thinking about education in China, stating: "back in our country, more and more people realize, more and more parents actually, they realize, so we actually kind of, you know, move our focus from only the academic part to this, this part." Although the focus of this dissertation is on newcomers to Canada, Canada is not the only country in an assemblage that might include HIPPY, home visitors, and parents. In this case, we might consider China, Chinese culture, as well as family and friends who have remained there as other active components. As elements in an assemblage disrupt and transform, becomings happen; becomings can also happen in China, particularly as China reconsiders and reconceptualizes its education system. In her first interview (November

²⁹ As noted previously, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) conceptualize order words as language that in its very expression can effect transformation or incorporeal transformation.

4, 2014), Erica mentioned that she talks with her friends in China about the HIPPY program:

This summer I went back to visit, and of course, what do you do there, and I introduce [HIPPY], and oh my goodness, that's such a good program, I say, it's totally free in Canada, can we have here? Even we can pay for that....

When thinking about newcomers to Canada and concepts of settlement, perhaps we might also think about the larger assemblage and the connections that these newcomers have with their home countries and what might be produced when those parts of an assemblage disrupt and transform?

Vignette 4b: Creativity. This interview with Barb took place following the first home visit observation.

Home Visitor Barb, Interview 2

B: Barb, R: Researcher

R: [...] So I thought that was something interesting you said, that the parent has to be creative. [...] Do you want to talk about that a little bit?

B: Okay, so, key is the two kid. If just read them a book, all kid is really boring, so you need to get the, for me is, if different age, if I just read the book, doesn't matter, 3-4-5, specially 3 and 4. **If you read the book, they are really boring. If you just, change the tone of the voice, or do something different, get their attention, I think they learn faster, they learn more. ...**

R: Another thing, let me find this [video playing] So there you are talking about...

...

B: **The book imagination. It just, if you read the book, every book's different, right? Read the book, and then you can, let's say you're pretending the airplane in the sky, how did the airplane fly, so you add a little bit extra, so you have wings and you can fly, so kind of make the kid interesting, so the airplane flying in the sky, so that's it, and then the kid never learn, how do they fly, they don't know. So they add it on, because they had wings, they had**

engine, they can fly, so I think the kid is learning more on certain thing, and also get them thinking, so they are interesting in learning on different thing.

R: Okay. And another phrase you said there, **you said that imagination can sometimes be difficult without help...**

B: It could be difficult, it depend on the mother, it depend on the parent.

... Some parent, just read the book, they don't teach their kid extra. And some parent, had so much knowledge, because lots of immigrant, they are professional people before they come. ...they are educated people, but they can't, right now, they just stay home, they learning the English before they go find their own job. So depend on the parents. **Some parents have good imagination, some parents really difficult.** They just read the book, so sometime I have to give them an example. And how do you make the story interesting.

R: Is there anything from this home visit, or in general about home visits that you want to share, or an idea you have.

...

R: So it's more than just the book.

B: No—yeah. The book sometime is, if you just read the book, sometimes the parent don't understand, the children don't understand. If I explain to them the way they live, probably the parent get more interesting, and then they can Google some more if they want, if not, it just repeat what I told them, so like this really need the knowledge before they can lead the children, and also when you reading the long book like that, it's really boring, so you read that for 10 minute, 15 minute, it's really boring. If you just said imagining the sea, let's see, I'm teaching you, I'm going down to the ocean, bottom of the sea, go like that, imagination, oh that's a shrimp, you catching that and putting it in the basket, that's more fun that way. So what you think?

Like Erica, Barb is also from Asia and has experience in particular working with parents from China. Her statements on creativity (and imagination) take a different direction, however. Barb often connects the need for creativity with the words boring and interesting, for example when talking about a longer book she says: “when you reading

the long book like that, it's really boring, so you read that for 10 minute, 15 minute, it's really boring". She states: "Some parents have good imagination, some parents really difficult. They just read the book, so sometime I have to give them an example. And how do you make the story interesting." What might be produced in the interaction of boring and interesting ? As noted in the introduction to rhizocurriculum in Mapping 2, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) say "Once a rhizome has been obstructed, arborified, it's all over, no desire stirs; for it is always by rhizome that desire moves and produces" (p. 14). Perhaps in the context of an assemblage of parent, child, book and more, we might consider a reading without the conceptualization of imagination that Barb states in the vignette as arborified, or even as a tracing. How might parent and child reading activities be different if promoted by home visitors as activities closer to Deleuzian mapping and experimentation rather than tracing, with parents experimenting with new books, characters, voices and questions rather than only those prescribed through the HIPPY curriculum packets? What other HIPPY and school-based parent-child learning experiences might be different when conceptualized in this way?

Vignettes 4c and d: HIPPY Science Activities. It is the concepts of imagination, creativity and mapping/experimentation as discussed in the previous vignettes that connect with a unique aspect of the HIPPY – discovery science activities. In the two vignettes below, Diana and Alison discuss the HIPPY science activities that they present and parents' response to them.

Vignette 4c: From science to the library. This first interview with Diana took place after the first filmed observation of a group meeting. During the group meeting, a discovery science activity was role-played by the home visitors in preparation for the week ahead.

Home Visitor Diana, Interview 1

D: Diana, R: Researcher

R: [...] the science activities, how does that go over in families? How did that feel when you were a parent?

D: Sometimes it's difficult because it takes a little bit more time, but it's also interesting to see how the kids get really involved. And sometimes it's just one activity, and just starting with that will have a lot of new things that they will be interested on. **I remember for example, in the melting activity with my kids that you put on ice, copper and aluminum and then one, and you see how does it melt, and after that my kids started to ask us, and we finally am talking about all the polar bears and their melting ice that is going on in that part of the world, so really, really interesting.**

R: **So it sounds like they kind of lead to something else usually?**

D: **Exactly.**

R: Okay. How does it go over with the parents, when you go in and show them...

D: **With some of them you can see the same thing, some of them are, okay, it's fine, and some of them, they tell you the same thing, you know my kid was so interested that we ended doing this or that because we started with this activity, and then we ended going to library to look for something...**

Vignette 4d: Applesauce science. This interview took place after the first observed home visit. Because Alison's family was slightly off the expected HIPPIY schedule, I was able to observe the HIPPIY curriculum packet in action that had been reviewed and role-played by home visitors when I did the first group meeting observation. At that time, I was very curious about home visitors' presentation of, and parents' responses to the very interactive discovery science activities.

Home Visitor Alison, Interview 2

A: Alison, R: Researcher

R: [...] One of the last things I wanted to ask, and I think I asked you a little bit about this in our first interview, but you actually did the applesauce science activity with this family, and so I'm wondering if you want to talk about this a little bit, either that the apple sauce one in particular, or science activities, parents responses to it...

A: So, some of them kind of are like why are we doing these, like, **when they think of science experiments they think of I think science as in like beakers, and explosions and things that you see in magazines and movies, so when they think of science is good, cooking is science, and yes, because you've got one matter and you're changing it's state to something else, so it's a science experiment because you're doing a before and you're doing a during, and you're doing an after.** It's, and the main, **it's the joy of the science experiments is that they're interactive,** and more, I tell my parents I know it's scary to have your child involved in the kitchen because there's a lot of dangerous things around, but you first of all have to teach them the rules, and if you never expose them to it, then it's going to become more scary, for you and for them because they're not prepared, and they're old enough, so we're not talking two-year-old, **we're talking you know 3 and up. And I said usually by that point, they want to do what mommy's doing in the kitchen, they want to know what you're doing, so involving them as much as possible is important and the skills that they use in those science experiments can be transferred to when they're doing reading comprehension as well, because doing these science experiments, so you always do the experiment, and mom experiments with the child, and then after, the end product, you say, do you remember how we made this, the end product being apple sauce for example, do you remember what we did, so it's like going back and recalling what you did, which is like going back and retelling the story, so it kind of connects the two, so it still works on the language but then it's a fun component and then you of course talk about scientific terms as well, and you know the matter change and all that stuff so... and the parents seem to love it.** The age five parents? Love it. The kids just absolutely, they can't wait to do it because it's all very, it's cool for them, and it's, the 3s, it's something fun to do with mom and that's about it, but anyways, you expose them more, and a lot of them say you know what, so and so loves to be with me in the kitchen, so, but they don't involve them until they – until we show them a way that you can involve them and it's not like they have to always be on the outside watching, they can do the measuring, and help you

count, and they can help you, so there's many things the children can do that's still safe, but then at the same point there's learning the safety of what you do when you're in the kitchen.

When considering the science activities in HIPPY they connect well to previous vignettes that place importance on the development of imagination for both parent and child as they provide the opportunity for experimentation in the most traditional sense of the word. How might the connections between science and creativity and imagination be made? As Alison states, they are connecting science “as in like beakers, and explosions and things” with the science that happens in the kitchen, and in the home in general. The science activities themselves are not endpoints, as Diana says when she describes her experience as a HIPPY mother doing the discovery science activities with her children. She described how with one activity around ice, one topic led to another:

D: I remember for example, in the melting activity with my kids that you put on ice, copper and aluminum and then one, and you see how does it melt, and after that my kids started to ask us, and we finally am talking about all the polar bears and their melting ice that is going on in that part of the world, so really, really interesting.

R: **So it sounds like they kind of lead to something else usually?**

D: **Exactly.**

Like the experimentation of imagination and creativity that Barb and Erica describe in relation to reading, might science activities also lead to rhizomatically driven learning experiences for parent and child? Situations, perhaps, such as reading about Chinese New Year traditions in a HIPPY book, looking up further information online on both Chinese and other New Year traditions, and then attending a local celebration and meeting other newcomer families with young children. Rhizomic learning might refer to taking lines of flight when engaging in learning activities in the home. Cliché statements such as “it is the journey not the destination” may apply in the case of HIPPY activities

such as the science experiments, as perhaps it is the *experimentation* not the *experiment* that disrupts an assemblage and providing the opportunity for becomings to happen.

Alison states in her interview, referring to children starting the activities at age 3: by that point, they want to do what mommy's doing in the kitchen, they want to know what you're doing, so involving them as much as possible is important and the skills that they use in those science experiments can be transferred

Alison's statement connects the science activities to time spent between parent and child as well as kitchen safety. Considering multiple literacies at work, might we connect the activities in the home and particularly the kitchen as multiple literacies? Most participating parents are stay-at-home mothers; how might the connection of a field such as science to their home-based activities disrupt conceptualizations of ideas such as "housework"? Alison also refers to the transfer of skills. How might the promotion of this transferability during a home visit impact what might be produced in the parent-child interactions of an activity? What might be produced in the interaction of home visitor and parent, followed by parent and child?

Intermezzo. Mapping 4, just above, is a smaller view experimenting with the connection between imagination, creativity, and science activities in the program, and how home visitors engage with these topics through literacy practices with newcomer families. This mapping also questions how home visitors engagement with parents on the topic and practice of imagination and creativity align with local educational values of the same. It further asks how home visitors introducing certain aspects of imagination and creativity might disrupt preexisting assemblages and wonders what might be produced, both here in Canada and abroad through the connections of newcomers to family and friends abroad. We exit on the question of science, asking in Alison's words, if there might be science all around our homes, not only "in like beakers, and explosions and things," and how we might think differently about our homes and lives in the context of continual experimentation.

An intermezzo is an "inbetweeness [that] gives way to 'thinking's power'" (Masny, & Bastien, 2016, p. 10). This paragraph of an intermezzo, when read linearly, comes at the conclusion of four interrelated mappings exploring a year of data collection about a HIPPY program site and the experiences of HIPPY home visitors. There are a

multiplicity of mappings that remain yet to be mapped, as what has been presented above is likely just the beginning of experimenting and questioning data of which I've entered and left in the middle. These four mappings have focused more narrowly on the ways in which HIPPY home visitors engage in literacy practices with newcomer families, experimenting with data to ask how their engagement might function in an assemblage, and what becomings might be produced as a result of the relationships in an assemblage. In the following chapter, the dissertation follows Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) statement about mapping: "the tracing should always be put back on the map" (p. 13).

CHAPTER 6

Putting the Tracing Back on the Map

“It is a question of method: the tracing should always be put back on the map.... [but] it is inaccurate to say that a tracing reproduces the map....The tracing has already translated the map into an image; it has already transformed the rhizome into roots and radicles. It has organized, stabilized, neutralized the multiplicities according to the axes of significance and subjectification belonging to it. It has generated, structurahzed [sic] the rhizome, and when it thinks it is reproducing something else it is in fact only reproducing itself...What the tracing reproduces of the map or rhizome are only the impasses, blockages, incipient taproots, or points of structuration”
(Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 13).

The four mappings found in Chapter 5 exactly what they are called: mappings. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987) the point that “distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 12); maps are for experimentation, as the mappings found in Chapter 5 were experimentations thinking through data on the literacy practices of HIPPI home visitors with Deleuzian thought and Multiple Literacies Theory. Multiple Literacies Theory guided this experimentation through concept creation. Concepts are created to deal with, and “respond to problems posed in the world disrupted by literacies” (Masny, 2013c, p. 342). This quote from Masny (2013c) has been presented more than once in the course of this dissertation, but is a very important part of how data were analyzed and discussed through vignettes with concepts emerging to deal with the different issues that do pose problems in our world, particularly in reference to literacy practices. This chapter constitutes a pause, putting the tracing back on the map; in other words, this chapter pauses experimentation in order to connect the data experimentation with the literature review. Tracings are related to stabilizing, as noted in the beginning quote; tracings reproduce “points of structuration” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 13). This chapter connects these points of structuration, looking at points of connection as molar³⁰ lines overlay rhizomic mappings, to “Plug the tracings back into the map, connect the roots or trees back up with a rhizome” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 14). The goal of this chapter is not to arborify the rhizomic maps of Chapter 5, but rather to connect a rhizomic

³⁰ See Chapter 2.

experimentation with concept creation related to research questions and a tracing's organization of multiplicities through conventional literature review.

As noted at the beginning of Chapter 5, all of the mappings are interrelated; it is due to a conventional use of a Word document to share these ideas that they are bound by a linear page order. This part of the dissertation is structured in such a way is to rhizomically explore potential “points of structuration” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 13) in the literature review that might emerge when the tracing is put on the map. The tracing is put back on the map through discussion around four topics, again bound by linear order, but temporarily nested through relationships: the chapter moves from settlement in a new country as a family with young children, to the access to services that a family might need (or want), to the language barriers that such a family might face, finally to a topic of conventional work in family literacy programming – home and school connections.

Challenges in Settlement

Home visitors from the HIPPY Springfield site are an active part of many aspects of participating families' lives, and yet home visitors in general are not the focus of most research on HIPPY and similar programs. As noted in Chapter 5, home visitors engage in a variety of topics during a home visit – these might include how to find childcare in order to get a job (Mapping 1), or assistance with language acquisition (Mapping 2); both might be thought of not simply as family literacy program issues, but as settlement issues. Putting the tracing back on the map in this case might consider settlement and related issues as a point of structuration that emerges when a tracing reproduces a map. As HIPPY Canada (2016) describes on their website, the multicultural HIPPY program that runs across Canada includes not only conventional family literacy activities, but the facilitation of integration for newcomers, the encouragement of civic participation at multiple levels, and the meeting of social needs. Might these be considered areas of molarity? Home visitors engaging in literacy practices with newcomer families are doing so in the context of the wider concerns of settlement and integration, which includes, as discussed in Mapping 1, the State.

The use of family literacy programming for settlement is not without critique, despite the fact that many home visitors are themselves newcomers to Canada who have

experienced settlement³¹. As noted in Chapter 3, this type of programming might suggest deficiency, that newcomer families somehow need fixing (Dixon & Wu, 2014). In Deleuzian thought this ties into the concept of order words and overcoding; as discussed in Mapping 1, the word newcomer (or immigrant) might become an order word that perhaps is used to indicate deficiency as the State continues to overcode, potentially in the perpetuation of normativity. In Mapping 3 vignettes discuss home visitors talking about ways to tell parents how things are done differently in Canada. This also links to HIPPY's origins in the late 1960s where it was suggested that Afro-Asian immigrants were failing to thrive (Lombard, 1981). It might be useful to consider by whose standards this conceptualization arose.

There are certain aspects of the HIPPY program materials themselves that might also be suggested as perpetuating normativity. As noted in Chapter 5, Mapping 1, HIPPY has been challenged on the links between their materials and the kinds of questions dealt with in high stakes testing (Westheimer, 2003). However structured HIPPY activity packets and programming might be, as previously discussed in more than one mapping, home visitors work in particular during home visits is very much rhizomatic as home visits disrupt, and de- and reterritorialize, based on the interactions in an assemblage of home visitor, parent, language needs, childcare questions, and more. The practices that home visitors engage in can be considered mappings involving experimentation. All the while the tracing must be placed back on the map. Home visits can also reproduce normative competencies as found in the weekly activities and other materials.

Some specific aspects of settlement that the literature discusses include social relationships in the community as newcomer families seek to build social networks in their new communities (Cole, 2012; Masny, Bastien, & Hashi, 2013), and employment. As noted above, this links with HIPPY Canada's (2016) goals as they work with newcomer families. Home visiting programs such as HIPPY are an alternative to many centre-based programs in that they can meet the needs to families who are not able, or perhaps willing, to travel to centres (Cohen, 2006); this is perhaps particularly important when we consider HIPPY as home visiting for settlement as well as traditional forms of

³¹ As noted in Chapter 4, four of the five home visitors were recent immigrants themselves, and the fifth had experienced settlement in another country.

family literacy programming as one does not have to yet feel comfortable outside of the home to participate.

An additional concern is employment, which can be linked to the ability to meet one's needs, and that of one's family; un- and underemployment impacting this ability was a concern of Ali's (2008) participants. Although home visitors do not necessarily explicitly deal with these exact issues, they are a part of the assemblage of a home visit. Recalling again Alison's experience in Mapping 1, she described parents asking for information about childcare so that they might try and find employment. It is this kind of access to services, and the State's assemblage of programming for normativity that we discuss in the next paragraphs.

Access to Services

Unless one has had a confusing interaction with a government service, or perhaps assisted a newcomer to Canada in accessing a service, it might seem that most services are simple and straightforward to access. However, these points of structuration when tracing mappings may also demonstrate "impasses, [and] blockages" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 13). For example, healthcare: issues demonstrated in the literature include confusion about covered services (Ali, 2008), and lack of cultural competence of practitioners (Lane, Vatanparast & White, 2014). Any kind of bureaucracy is difficult for immigrant families unfamiliar with a new set of norms (Ali, 2008). A further issue in these situations is that technical documents that we might consider to be universal are in fact not; as Cole (2012) notes the documents one might need for basics such as healthcare or taxes might not even exist in one's country of origin. These areas of molarity are all in addition to the potential for linguistic challenges, which are discussed in the next section.

Location might also be considered part of access to services for newcomer families. Different services are offered by federal and provincial systems, and are most often physically located apart (Ball, 2010; Pascal, 2009). As noted in Mapping 1 with Carly's experience, where a service is located in relation to areas where newcomer live can greatly impact their ability to take up the available programming. Perhaps this is why the practices of a home visitor in Canada involve assisting newcomer families in accessing resources; in Mapping 1 home visitors have even been referred to as connectives, or in some ways a hub. Although services might themselves be a jumble,

these services are still part of a rhizomic assemblage in a community, which for HIPPY parents includes a HIPPY home visitor bringing it all together. When the home visitor becomes a part of an assemblage that includes a newcomer parent, it disrupts and transforms, and perhaps produces connections that may provide greater access to resources.

Language Acquisition and Use

Another issue linked to access to service is language instruction, a further area of settlement services that is labeled as “ad hoc, fragmented” (Guo & Hébert, 2014, p. 174). Home visitors engaging in rhizo-home visiting, as described in Mapping 2, become a part of language instruction as impromptu language lessons are produced as an assemblage including elements such as home visitor, HIPPY activity packets, and parents interact, disrupt, and becomings occur. Many aspects of home visiting become related to language instruction: Alison and Diana provide vocabulary words to parents through the lesson; Alison blocks off a short time in every home visit to work with a parent studying in LINC; Erica looks for opportunities for another mother studying in LINC to lead the activity and speak out loud; and Barb and Jessie negotiate language learning and translating to ensure parents are prepared to do the coming week’s activities. In all of this there is also the concept of becomings in relation to the home visitors and rhizo-home visiting and rhizo-teaching. In Vignette 2g, Erica’s visual dictionary was discussed in relation to what might be produced as part of rhizo-teaching.

Home visitors also deal with home language use, such as home visitor Alison’s position with parent Fiona on how the most important point is being a child’s mother; as found in Vignette 2e, Alison states:

They’re at school for 6 hours, 6.5 hours, and all the English that they could ever possibly have is around them for those hours, I said, so the more time you spend with them teaching them is valuable whether you can speak English properly or not. I said at least you’re communicating in a way they understand, and you’re their mother...

The idea Alison is responding to is documented in the literature, as some parents concerns about language development lead them to give up “use of their mother tongue with their children” (Bernhard, 2013, p. 118). This is not unlike the parent Alison is

working with, Fiona, who in Vignette 2f states that she want to “give our kids right words.” One of the major areas discussed in Chapter 5 in the context of literacy practices is home visitors engagement in rhizocurriculum and rhizo-teaching for language acquisition during a home visit.

Home and School: Expectations and Connections

Although this thread of thought appears in all mappings, connections between home and school (in conventional research referred to often as “alignment”) are the focus of conventional family literacy intervention programs and were largely explored in Mappings 3 and 4. This of course still connects with issues of State promotion of normativity in Mapping 1, and relates to language use and learning found in Mapping 2. In the literature there are several interrelated elements that seem to produce the challenges newcomer families face in their interactions with educational institutions: unfamiliarity with local school systems, unfamiliarity with dominant local language and sometimes culture, differences between home and school on parenting beliefs and practices, and the school’s lack of preparedness for newcomer families. The conventional research interests related to the promotion of normativity related to these topics perhaps relate to its position as a potential point of structuration.

Although unfamiliarity is often discussed in terms of language or systems, unfamiliarity in general connects with many of the differences between conventional research and the Deleuzian approach I have taken. Just as with HIPPY, “low literacy” can actually mean a lack of experience in a new language, unfamiliarity seems to be taken as a form of deficiency, as opposed to engaging with the multiple literacies and practices families already have. In the literature, Hernandez et al. (2009) discusses how parents with limited schooling themselves struggle to help their children, both with school assignments and the education system itself. This unfamiliarity should not be considered deficiency, however, as Keels (2009) points out, when parents parent according to their own parenting beliefs, children may be labeled developmentally delayed. Bernhard (2013) suggests that these types of labels are linked to teachers missing other competencies, or as I would suggest, multiple literacies in which the children engage. Families all want their children to succeed, suggest Singh, Sylvia, and Ridzi (2013) writing in the context of refugee families in the United States. It is, however, the

dominant population that defines normative expectations for how parenting works in the context of school (Ali, 2008); parents and teachers coming from different backgrounds have different expectations of the roles each play in the child's education (SPCO, 2010), and yet teachers may have limited knowledge and experience relating to immigrant families (Bernhard, 2013; Kovinthian, 2016). As Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state: "when [a tracing] thinks it is reproducing something else it is in fact only reproducing itself. That is why the tracing is so dangerous. It injects redundancies and propagates them" (p. 13); as a tracing reproduces itself, perhaps molar structures such as dominant populations and the State continue to promote and propagate forms of normativity that only look at the tracing, not taking into account the map.

Although HIPPY is not a parent group in the same sense as other programs might be, in addition to home visits and activity packets it has parent meetings that may bear similarities to parenting group programs. The literature suggests that these groups are impactful in helping parents understand the differences in expectations, of perhaps home and school culture, and to support their child in the school system (Bernhard, 2013; Dixon & Wu, 2014). Part of the work in which home visitors engage is assisting parents with their negotiation of Canadian culture, including that of schools and school expectations. Diana, a home visitor and recent immigrant to Canada herself spoke of negotiating Canadian culture in relation to celebrating unfamiliar holidays, such as Thanksgiving. As stated in Vignette 3b:

we are going to live in this country they need to be learning, so we made the special dinner, and even though for them, because when they go back to school they were going to ask, what did you have for thanksgiving dinner, right? [...] So those are the things that I didn't have in my culture, but I will start to have because I become part of here, and they need to be part of everything.

Diana's statement is about how her family deals with Canadian culture. Another home visitor, or family might do this very differently.

Mapping 4 deals with some of the topics relating to schooling systems, and how parents might have different views about the importance of specific skills. The interrelated vignettes at the beginning of Mapping 4 relate to the terms imagination and creativity. Erica in Vignette 4a and Barb in Vignette 4b take different directions, with

Erica focusing on the child's preparation for school, and Barb on the parent's engagement in the process. Erica talks about the cultural differences that impact parents' focus and the importance that is placed in Chinese culture on "academic things" as opposed to more creative pursuits. Barb's focus on imagination is related to what parents can do that make reading and interactions interesting for children, or rather in her words from Vignette 4b about parents not using imagination: "if I just read the book, doesn't matter, 3-4-5, specially 3 and 4. If you read the book, they are really boring." In Vignettes 4c and 4d the HIPPY science activities are discussed. Vignette 4d in particular notes that the concept of science can be de- and reterritorialized as home activities disrupt and transform into science with the use of scientific vocabulary.

Intermezzo

What is a tracing, and what might it look like? This chapter has experimented with connections and relationships as points of structuration connect with interrelated experimental mappings. The tracing, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) note, is not a reproduction of a map; it is a molar structuralization of a map that reproduces "only the impasses, blockages, incipient taproots, or points of structuration" (p. 13). Putting the tracing back on the mappings found in Chapter 5 has reproduced these blockages in the form of settlement challenges, many of which are perhaps related to the molar lines that exist as part of a rhizome. The lines that make up a rhizome, they do "[b]reak, crack, and rupture" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, vi). In the following chapter, a rupture is explored, and lines of flight taken...

CHAPTER 7

Lines of Flight...

“There are those who have gone before us, who have swum in this water before... They may help ease us into the water, teach us some of the strokes, so we don’t drown before we get started. We can apprentice ourselves to them. Sooner or later, however, we must push off from the shore and conjugate things for ourselves... we must all do it for ourselves, each of us. We can apprentice ourselves to Deleuze if we like, as he does with those who come before him. But he cannot swim for us.” (May, 2005, p. 112)

Rhizome, Rupture, Flight

Throughout this dissertation there has been a constant engagement with the concept of the rhizome. In review, a rhizome has roots and shoots that branch out in multiple directions, splitting and taking off in new directions. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) put forward six characteristics of the concept of the rhizome (explored in detail in Chapter 2), some presented in pairs: 1 and 2) connection and heterogeneity; 3) multiplicity; 4) asignifying rupture; 5 and 6) cartography and decalcomania.

The rhizome continuously establishes a multiplicity of connections and is constantly changing as it ruptures and branches off in new and unexpected directions, lines of flight (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). The word rupture here is of great import, because this chapter is the result of rupture. Rupture refers to a rhizome breaking, or shattering “at a given spot, but... start[ing] up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 9); lines break, and rupture, and flee, but the rhizome simply starts up again. This chapter is a rhizome breaking at a given spot, and starting up again on an entirely new line. Working with a rhizome that’s very nature disrupts linear thinking (Honan, 2007), provided the opportunity for this break and new line to occur.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discuss the last two characteristics of the rhizome together: cartography and decalcomania. For Deleuze and Guattari, “[t]he rhizome is... a *map and not a tracing*... What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real” (page 12). The map does not reproduce, it constructs and fosters connections, which is exactly how the rupture creating the lines of flight in this chapter occurred, but first a review of lines.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) propose three kinds of lines: molar lines, molecular lines, and lines of flight (see Chapter 2 for more details). The rhizome, as discussed above, is made of these lines that have no beginning or end; we always enter in the middle. There are also no good or bad lines, only different types that intermingle and interact. Lines of flight, the focus of this chapter, are described with words like “rupture”, “clean break” (p. 199) and “[a]bsolute deterritorialization” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 200). Parr (2010) described deterritorialization as “a movement producing change”; “to deterritorialise is to free up the fixed relations that contain a body all the while exposing it to new organisations” (p. 69). If we consider lines of flight absolute deterritorializations, lines of flight emerge from a movement or rupture producing change, freeing it from all previous fixed relationships. Note that a line of flight is not something created by the rupture, it has been there all along “await[ing] its hour, and wait[ing] for the others to explode” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, 205).

Researching rhizomatically is a transformative exercise (Honan & Sellers, 2008) that allows researchers to map new connections and look to possibilities of what these connections might produce rather than reproduce preexisting structures. It provides the freedom of movement and connection that produces rupture, explosion. For researchers, the rhizome creates an opportunity to experiment with a multiplicity of unexpected relationships and transformations (Leander & Rowe, 2006), no matter where they may lead.

From Mappings and Tracings to Rupture

The mappings presented in Chapter 5 were interconnected in the manner of the rhizome, emerging through experimentation with data and concepts. The mappings presented experimented with data and asked a number of questions, some of which are asked again below. They remain purposefully unanswered. The purpose of asking such a question is not to find a single correct answer, but rather to think differently about the issues raised.

In terms of HIPPY and the State, questions focused on how overcoding might function in the context of immigration and related issues, and what incorporeal transformations might take place (i.e. incorporeal transformation *into* newcomer). Mappings also asked how a program like HIPPY might operate differently if the program

and the home visits were considered as one of many connections in a rhizomic assemblage with other community organizations. In exploring home visitors' literacy practices through the lens of Multiple Literacies Theory, what might happen when thinking of literacies in the context of rhizomic connection? The emerging concepts of rhizocurriculum, rhizo-teaching, and rhizo-home-visiting, were linked to language acquisition and use in this study. Perhaps the HIPPY program, while not designed for adult language acquisition, might create an opening for moments of language learning to happen. In the context of parenting, home and school connections, more questions focus on how the introduction of home visitor conceptualizations of parenting and education in Canada might de/re/territorialize in a home visit. Further, what might the assemblage, connections of HIPPY, parents, home visitors, "Canadian culture", multiculturalism, home cultures, and more, produce? Despite all of these questions, there are still further questions to ask.

Chapter 6 moved away from the experimentation of mapping to the structuration of tracing, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state: "the tracing should always be put back on the map" (p. 13). As noted previously, maps are for experimentation, and tracings do not reproduce the map in its entirety, but rather "the impasses, blockages, incipient taproots, or points of structuration" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 13). Chapter 6 used the action of putting the tracing back on the map to connect points of structuration, such as conventional literature review, with the experimental mappings of Chapter 5. However, there is more than "Plug[ging] the tracings back into the map" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 14) in this dissertation. This chapter is about "a rupture in the rhizome whenever segmentary lines explode into a line of flight" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 9), despite the danger of "reencounter[ing] organizations that restratify everything..." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 9).

As Deleuze and Guattari note, a line of flight isn't something that happens afterward, in fact "it is there from the beginning, even if it awaits its hour, and waits for the others to explode" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 205). The rupture did not occur at the end of the aforementioned mappings, but rather much further back even as part of the data collection that allowed for the experimentation to take place. As noted by Leander and Rowe (2006), working with a rhizome allows for experimentation with unexpected

relationships. During observation time in this study, both formally while filming and informally by joining in in weekly activities, I learned about the macro connections HIPPY Springfield did have with its community. As noted in the mappings, parents often participate in several community programs at once, from parenting classes to language programs. Through weekly home visitor meetings, bi-weekly parent meetings, as well as other special events, another person in the program became a participant, the local health professional, Michelle³², who engages regularly with the program and its participants, to share her perspectives on the HIPPY Springfield program and the Springfield context with me. Perhaps it was at this moment that a line of flight exploded, a complete deterritorialization, a new line going off in new and unpredictable directions.

HIPPY, Springfield, and Community Health

The remaining pages of this chapter travel along lines of flight that emerged from the data, and from the rupture of the visit with the local health professional. Key points of discussion and experimentation connect with a reconceptualization of literacies in the context of family relationships as one part of a larger topic of community health. For example, in Mapping 1, important connections between HIPPY and the state were made. HIPPY is not the only family literacy program that is linked to government aims and receives some public funding; through their connection with government agencies such as Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), family literacy intervention programs are already a part of the constellation of community services that relate to the overall health of a community. Home visitors then might be considered as negotiating available services to help families access the wide variety of community services that they have access to, with the right information, as discussed and noted in Chapter 5.

Home visitors serve in a variety of roles in the context of home visiting. In Mapping 2, rhizocurriculum emerged as a concept to experiment with vignettes of home visitors assisting parents as they learn English as a Second (or Additional) Language. Erica, in Vignette 2c, shares about how a home visit might change to meet a parent's needs, saying:

You know we usually work, they work as a kid and we work as a mom, but in this case I like her work as a mom and I'll be the kid. And first, and she practice more

³² Michelle is a pseudonym.

English speaking, and the second way, she gets more familiar with the curriculum, all the activities in the curriculum.

As Mapping 2 continues through experimentation, the concept of rhizoteaching emerged as an additional concept, such as in Vignette 2g where Erica states that she brings pictures on her phone in preparation for home visits:

every time I do some research, maybe the pictures, I will save on the phone. ...I keep those images in my phone, save to my phone, and some times, if I have a print out, or I find in the magazine, I save it and bring it with me in case some other family need it.

In Mapping 3, home visitors' engagement with parenting advice emerges, while in Mapping 4, connections are made between home and school, teacher, parent and child. From the use of language to engage in the community, to the sometime different expectations of parents and teachers, these topics might be more thoughtfully questioned and experimented within the context of an overall assemblage of community health.

Literacies in the context of family relationships and literacies in the context of community health might at first seem unrelated, but when put in the context of the recommendations from Pascal's (2009) report, and with the perspective of a community health professional, the rhizomic connections with a variety of community services and community health emerges in reading, reading the world and self. Michelle herself had questions about the relationship between family literacy programs and community health when she first entered this domain. She stated in her interview:

To be honest, when I first started in public health, I didn't appreciate how much, I didn't necessarily have a lot of value, because I came from a very clinical setting in dialysis and emerge, and then going into public health, you know, what, talking to a parent? Give me somebody who's on a dialysis machine or that really has a disease, so it's really more a systems approach to health. It's not as clinical, like it encompasses the whole being, the whole well-being of an individual, not just one particular area or component, so more comprehensive systematic approach to health.

Connecting home and school. In my interview with Michelle she discussed the HIPPY Springfield program as part of the constellation of programs that are part of her

domain, public health for children aged one to 6 (in the context of their families).

Michelle described her position, stating: “I’m on the preschool team. And so we do, 1-6 years of age, we’ll dabble into 0 as well, because we go to a lot of drop-ins as well.”

Michelle’s future goals in working with families with children aged 1-6 connect in an assemblage that includes Pascal’s (2009) vision of schools as service hubs as she seeks to connect directly with children and families with, and through, local schools. In her interview, Michelle acknowledged the difficulties with such access to schools due to safety concerns (particularly in the context of physically being able to go in and out of school buildings), but states that the work of her public health unit is interconnected with that of schools, from the younger children to the older, and with parental involvement and connection. Michelle states:

There’s natural barriers because of security issues and concerns, you know, people coming in and out. But schools seem to be the next, that’s where people are, right? They drop their kids off; they pick their kids up. And when you think about some of the, the vision that Charles Pascal had, almost like a school like a hub, where parents can go and get access to all kinds of information. I know a nearby city has parent resource centres that take place within schools or a kind of drop-in program that we have in our neighborhood groups, but they happen within the school, and then the principal comes down and introduces new families and so forth. It just seems like a really nice relationship.

The link to the school as a hub and building relationships with families even before their children are school-aged ties to one of the more obvious and targeted goals of family literacy intervention programs (FLIPs) – the traditional concept of “school readiness”. Might school readiness in and of itself have become an order word, a point of State-sponsored normativity? Perhaps conventional conceptualizations of school readiness, when interacting with literacies in the context of family relationships, might be reconceptualized beyond the ability of a child to hold a pencil, or perhaps parents’ knowledge of school expectations. There is no way to predict in what direction a becoming might happen, but perhaps as part of programming including literacies in the context of family relationships, an introduction to the local school system for parents might also have its place. Perhaps the molarity of conventional school readiness might

de- and re-territorialize to include child, parent, teacher, and school, until yet another rupture happens and the assemblage de- and re-territorializes again, perhaps in the future as literacies in the context of schools' preparedness for diverse families and learners.

In Springfield, there are parent and child groups across the city. They include the support of local organizations, such as the library system and other large charity organizations. Linking to community health and the work that Michelle's team does, their community health programs, offered in the form of parent and child groups, perhaps might also engage with normative concepts of school readiness and expectations.

Michelle states:

it is very much play-based, and we're trying to be as coordinated or similar to the experience that they might have starting school and we have some dividing transitions. It's a little bit different in school, with the full-day learning now. But it still helps model for parents how to support their child's transition from one activity to another. How to say hello, and how to say goodbye. We provide a lot of visual cues, especially because we have many second language learners, and so we show parents how pictures can really help interpret the world for their child.

Perhaps parenting groups operated for community health could also be considered a part of school-readiness programming, connecting literacies in the context of school to community health.

From literacies in the context of family relationship to literacies in the context of health and wellness. Michelle, coming from a medical profession, discussed her own transformation of making connections between health and family literacy (quoted above), sharing her initial assumptions about what was conceptualized as part of public or community health, as well as the more concrete connections between family literacy and physical health. In describing public health she states: "you work for [an organization], that oversees, not just the core elements of health, as chronic disease prevention and communicable disease prevention, but also the softer components of health, the parenting capacity piece..." Although dichotomized as softer and harder components of health, the parenting aspect of health is considered one component of health. That said, there are connections between even the "harder" components of health and the programming of community family groups that operate all over Springfield. The

programming of these groups has very specific focuses: parenting messages, social and emotional well-being of children, physical activity, and healthy eating. Michelle states that these programs:

[target] newcomers or vulnerable individual families, [and support] families with children 0-6 years of age. [There is a] drop in program. There's a lot of intentionality behind the scenes, so we embed strong parent, positive parenting messages, we embed a lot of messaging around the social-emotional development of young children, physical activity, healthy eating. We have some, slightly, small transitions with each program, so the children come, they have free play, they come with their parents, it's a parented program, free play, and then have a craft, its not structured that all children stop doing one thing and move on to another because of the different stages, but its made available to them, and then we do stop the program at a particular point in time, the children transition to helping to tidy up, wash their hands, come back and provide a healthy snack. And each week its themed, with the alphabet, so if its letter "A," we're having apples or something. So even though we only have the families for a few minutes in terms of the healthy eating part each week we feel like its an opportunity to model and provide access to foods that may be, they may never try. And it's interesting because a lot of families are challenged with picky eating, my son will never eat this, my daughter... they watch their peers and that all changes and parents go kind of, oh...

The programs are also an opportunity to talk about safety, something Michelle states is not necessarily universal. She states:

We also use that as an opportunity to talk about safety. Safety for their children as it may be very different, that has different meanings in different contexts, depending on where you're from. And what that means here in Canada. From a behaviour management perspective, riding in a car with a car seat, to wearing a helmet when you're on a bike. So a lot is focused on safety, a lot is focused on basic parenting in terms of behaviour management, attending to sick children, where would you go, how do you get a doctor, and so on. And where possible we try to provide things in multi languages, but its hard to come by these days.

The idea that these programs address the “soft” school readiness components noted in an earlier section and what Michelle had identified as more “core” health issues connects with recent thoughts from the medical community. Medical professionals in pediatric primary and specialty practice are exploring larger social connections to health and considering “moving care outside the office into the community” (Cheng, Emmanuel, Levy & Jenkins, 2015, p. 961). This is not unlike the aforementioned (Chapter 3) Raikes et al. (2006) who suggest that home visiting programs are an alternative for some families may not be able or willing to attend those in centres, or as Roggman et al. (2001) note, geography may impact their ability to do so. Although working from a very different paradigm, medical professionals are engaging with conceptualizations of health and literacies in the context of community and making connections between communities and health in relation to intergenerational cycles and the “root causes of health disparities” (Cheng, Emmanuel, Levy & Jenkins, 2015, p. 961), not unlike the OECD (2006b) discussions of root causes of poverty that, according to their work have potential to be addressed through social policies.

Parent and child programming may be one way to address the issue of core health for families, but newcomer families may face challenges linguistically. Martinez et al. (2013) write about connections between what they conceptualize as low health literacy, cancer health disparities, and many members of medically underserved communities being non-English speakers. In order to address this issue, an ESL curriculum intervention was created – Healthy Eating for Life (HE4L). The intervention was “designed to promote healthy eating for cancer prevention while improving English language skill and health literacy” (p. 426). The authors, again working from a more traditional and medical paradigm, argue that this program demonstrates “how evidence-based practices can be incorporated into a real-life context where they have the potential to impact a population in need of effective cancer prevention interventions” (p. 431). Consider also Waterhouse’s (2011) work with the LINC program, experimenting with observations and interviews, and noting that “that there is more going on in LINC than its mandate implies” (p. ii); perhaps there is more, and the opportunity for more to go on in our language programming in relation to topics of literacies in the context of family relationships and health. Like the connection of family literacy to community health

programs, community health programs are also connected to the practice of literacies; literacies in a variety of contexts are part of much larger assemblages of families, cultures, and communities.

Language may not be the only challenge a newcomer might face in a new country. In the Springfield region, there is a multicultural centre that sends representatives out to parenting groups to provide assistance to newcomer parents.

Michelle states:

In our group, they come out twice a month. So they spend a lot of time helping parents navigate those, the potential barriers, LINC classes, getting their PR card, getting their, completing their visas, their paperwork, passport applications, trying to really address those barriers. When parents are stressed and preoccupied with all of that, it's hard to be available to your child. So they work very hard on trying to reduce those stressors.

Zanchetta et al. (2012), as stated in more detail in Chapter 3, note the difficulty that some newcomer face accessing health services due to linguistic challenges. Might community health connections, such as the addition of multicultural volunteers, perhaps provide an opportunity for FLIPs to engage in a variety of literacies as opposed to a more traditional school-readiness focus?

Returning to the HE4L program (Martinez et al, 2013), despite the structured nature of the program, if it were used by both FLIPs like HIPPY **and** LINC language classes, while also tying into other community groups, what might those interactions produce? If we think differently and position literacies in the context of family relationships as a part of literacies in the context of community health, how might services be different, in their location, organization, and even in content? Considering literacies in the context of family relationships and community health, reading with reading the world and self in an assemblage, perhaps this might include reading the variety of elements in an assemblage providing opportunities for becomings to occur.

Thinking With Deleuze: How Might Things Be Different If...?

Deleuzian research thinks differently, and Multiple Literacies Theory responds to problems that arise in a world disrupted by literacies. How might things be different if literacies in the context of family relationships was released from its fixed solitary

position of “family literacy” and allowed to connect as a part of overall community health? Perhaps community and public health professionals might engage with families differently, and different kinds of programming might be produced. If literacies in the context of family relationships and associated interventions were not about traditional views of “education” and “school readiness” relating solely to a child, might they be positioned as being about the entire family, including the adult participant? This might open up potentialities for multiple literacies in a variety of ways, such as in multicultural and multilingual social settings. As Masny (2009b) asks, “If we can conceive understandings that permit and encourage different ways of living in the world, can we consider the case of multiple literacies as ways to provide different and differing educational opportunities?” (p. 13).

What are the ways in which HIPPY home visitors engage in literacy practices with immigrant families? How does this engagement function in an assemblage (i.e. parents, program, home visitors, HIPPY materials, researcher)? What becomings might this engagement produce in relationship with elements in an assemblage? HIPPY home visitors may engage in a multiplicity of literacy practices, perhaps even operating as a connective hub linking newcomer families to a variety of resources available to them. As home visits take place, elements in an assemblage of home visitor, parent, program, community and more disrupt, and de- and reterritorialize takes place. Home visits may become spaces of rhizocurriculum, rhizo-teaching, and rhizo-home-visiting. Home visitors, at any moment, might become language teachers, sharers of Canadian culture, or a bridge between home and school practices.

The line of flight leading to these last pages was a rupture, a total deterritorialization; a dissertation on the adult participants of a family literacy intervention changes, shifts, and begins to engage with the concept of community health. Working in a rhizome may lead in unexpected directions, to areas of experimentation yet to come. In terms of this dissertation: “Writing has nothing to do with signifying. It has to do with surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come”(Deleuze & Guattari, 1989, p. 5).

REFERENCES

- Albanese, P. (2010). *Child Poverty in Canada*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Ali, M. (2008). Loss of parenting self-efficacy among immigrant parents. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood Education*, 9(2) 148-160.
- Ball, J. (2010). Centring community services around early childhood care and development: Promising practices in indigenous communities in Canada. *Child Health and Education* 2(2) 28-51.
- BarHava-Monteith, G., Harré & Field, J. (2003). An evaluation of a HIPPY early intervention program: Can parents benefit too? In M. Westheimer, (Ed.), *Parents making a difference: International research on the home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters (HIPPY) program* (pp. 192-206). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Bastien, M. (2014, May). Parental involvement in family literacy interventions: Contributing to the care and education of young Canadians. Unpublished posterpresented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Conference, St. Catharines, ON.
- Bastien, M. & Masny, D. (2015) Family literacy interventions in Canada: Meeting the needs of newcomer parents with young children. *Education Review*, Spring, 2-6.
- Bernhard, J. (2013). Immigrant parents taking part in their children's education: A practical experiment. In V. Pacini-Ketchabaw & L. Prochner, (Eds.), *Re-situating Canadian early childhood education* (pp. 106-124). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Bierman, K., Nix, R., Domitrovich, C.E., Welsh, J.A., & Gest, S.D. (2015). The Head Start REDI Project and school readiness. Chapter 8. *Health and Education in Early Childhood: Predictors, Interventions, and Policies*. Edited by Arthur J. Reynolds Edited by Arthur J. Rolnick Edited by Judy A. TemplePublisher: Cambridge University
- Bierman, K. L., Welsh, J. A., Heinrichs, B. S., Nix, R. L., & Mathis, E. T. (2015). Helping Head Start Parents Promote Their Children's Kindergarten Adjustment: The Research Based Developmentally Informed Parent Program. *Child development*, 86(6), 1877-1891.

- Blommaert, J., Creve, L., & Willaert, E. (2006). On being declared illiterate: Language-ideological disqualification in Dutch classes for immigrants in Belgium. *Language & Communication*, 26(1), 34-54.
- Bogue, R. (2009). Preface to multiple literacies theory. In D. Masny & D. Cole (Eds.) *Multiple literacies theory: A Deleuzian perspective* (pp. 13-30). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Bradley, R. & Gilkey, B. (2003). The impact of HIPPY on school performance. In M. Westheimer, (Ed.), *Parents making a difference: International research on the home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters (HIPPY) program* (pp. 91-101). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Brand, S.T., Marchand, J., Lilly, E., and Child, M. (2014). Home-school literacy bags for twenty-first century preschoolers. *Early childhood education journal*, (42), 63-170.
- Brown, A. L. & Lee, J. (2015). Evaluating the efficacy of children participating in Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters and Head Start. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 1-12. DOI: 10.1177/1476718X15577006
- Burke, A. & Hardware, S. (2015). Honouring ESL students' lived experiences in school learning with multiliteracies pedagogy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(2) 143-157.
- Bylund, A., & Bjork-Willen, P. (2012). Multilingual becoming in reading: A picture storybook-reading-assemblage in early years education. In B. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (2nd ed., 78-91). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chatterji, S. (May 2014). The Long-Term Effect of the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program on Academic Achievement: Evidence from a School District in Texas. Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0d0b/c5d312b55ce79056f0087f49d410ef28b482.pdf>
- Chowdry, A. (July 3, 2014). 'Reading Rainbow' Closes Kickstarter Campaign At Over \$5.4 Million. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/amitchowdhry/2014/07/03/reading-rainbow-closes-kickstarter-crowdfunding-campaign-at-over-5-4-million/#40c935a72890>

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2015) Early Childhood. Retrieved from:
http://www.edsc.gc.ca/eng/child_family/childhood/index.shtml
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (May, 2013). Minister Kenney announces funding for newcomer integration through HIPPY Program. Retrieved from:
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/departement/media/releases/2013/2013-05-01c.asp>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012). Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship. Retrieved from:
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp>
- Colebrook, C. (2002). *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge.
- Cole, D. R. (2013). Deleuze and narrative investigation: The multiple literacies of Sudanese families in Australia. *Literacy*, 47(1), 35-41.
- Cole, D. (2012). Latino families becoming-literate in Australia: Deleuze, literacy and the politics of immigration. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 33(1) 33-46.
- Coleman and Ringrose (2014). Introduction: Deleuze and research methodologies. In R. Coleman and J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (1-22). Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Colman, F. (2010). *Affect*. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary* (Rev. ed.). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Compton-Lilly, C., Rogers, R., & Lewis, T.Y. (2012). Analyzing epistemological considerations related to diversity: An integrative critical literature review of family literacy scholarship. *Reading Research Quarterly* 47(1), p. 33-60.
- Conley, T. (2010a). Space. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (260-262). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164-195.
- Collier, D. R., & Rowsell, J. (2014). A Room with a View: Revisiting the Multiliteracies Manifesto, Twenty Years On. *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen 2014*, (2), 12.
- Crawford, P.A. & Zygorious-Coe, V. (2006). All in the family: Connecting home and school with family literacy. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(4), p. 261-267.

- Crosby, S.A., Yildirim, K., Rasinski, T., & Padak, N. (2015). A 3-year study of a school-based parental involvement program in early literacy. *The Journal of Educational Research, (108)*, 165-172.
- Crosnoe, R. (2010). *Two generation strategies and involving immigrant parents in children's education*. The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412204-Immigrant-Parents-Childrens-Education.pdf?RSSFeed=UI_Immigrants.xml
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage.
- Cusset, F. (2008). *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*. (J. Fort, Trans.) U of Minnesota Press. (Original work published in 2003)
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations: 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. "What is philosophy?", trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell." (1994).
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987) *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980)
- DeLoatche, K.J., Bradley-Klug, K.L., Ogg, J., Kromrey, J.D., & Sundman-Wheat, A.N. (2015). Increasing parent involvement among Head Start families: A randomized control group study. *Early Childhood Education Journal (43)*, 271-279.
- Delpit, L. D. (2012). *"Multiplication is for White People": Raising Expectations for Other People's Children*. New York: New Press.
- Dixon L. Q. & Wu, S. (2014). Home language and literacy practices among immigrant second-language learners. *Language Teaching, 47(4)* 414-449.
- Dolly Parton's Imagination Library (2016). <http://imaginationlibrary.com/>
- Dosse, F. (2010). *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*. (D. Glassman, Trans.) Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 2007)
- Eakle, J. (2007). Literacy spaces of a Christian faith-based school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42(4)*, 472-510. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20068317>
- Ferns, C., & Friendly, M. (2014). *The state of early childhood education and care in*

Canada 2012.

- Friendly, M., Halfon, S., Beach, J., & Forer, B. (2013). Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada 2012. *Childcare Resource and Research Unit.*
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *The new literacy studies and the “social turn”*.
<http://www.schools.ash.org.au/litweb/page300.html>
- Gregoriou, Z. (2008), Commencing the rhizome: Towards a minor philosophy of education. In Semetsky, I. (Ed.) *Nomadic education: Variations on a theme* (pp. 91-110). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Guo, Y. & Hébert, Y. (2014). Educational integration of immigrant children and youth: Policy ineffectiveness and its consequences for learners and society. In K. Kilbride, (Ed.), *Immigrant integration: Research implications for future policy* (pp. 171-188). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Haynes, G. W., Neuman, D., Hook, C., Haynes, D. C., Steeley, J. M., Kelley, M., ... & Paine, M. (2015). Comparing child and family outcomes between two home visitation programs. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 43(3), 209-228.
- HIPPY Canada. (2004). Hippy Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.hippycanada.ca/>
- HIPPY Canada. (2016a). Hippy Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.hippycanada.ca/>
- HIPPY Canada (2016b). HIPPY Canada’s 2015-2016 Annual Report . Retrieved from: <http://hippicanada.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Annual-Report-2015-2016.pdf>
- HIPPY Canada (2016c). HIPPY HIPPY Canada’s Performance Management Results. Retrieved from: <http://hippicanada.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/HC-PMP-Result-2015-2016.pdf>
- HIPPY International. (n.d.) Tribute to Avima Lombard. Retrieved from: http://hippy-international.org/images/broch_Avima.pdf
- Ellingsen , K., Boone, D., Myers, L. (2013). Research Brief #2: Summary of Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Parent Outcome Research. HIPPY USA National Research & Evaluation Center.
- Hippy Ottawa. (n.d.) Hippy Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://hippyottawa.ca/en/home>
- Hernandez, D.J., Takanishi, R. & Marotz, K.G. (2009). Life circumstances and public

- policies for young children in immigrant families. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24(4), 487-501.
- Honan, E. (2007). Writing a rhizome: an (im)plausible methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(5), 531-546. doi: 10.1080/09518390600923735
- Honan, E. & Sellers, M. (2008). (E)merging methodologies: Putting rhizomes to work. In Semetsky, I. (Ed.) *Nomadic education: Variations on a theme* (pp. 111-128). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Howard, K. S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2009). The role of home-visiting programs in preventing child abuse and neglect. *The future of Children*, 19(2), 119-146.
- Huntsinger, C.S. & Jose, P.E. (2009). Parental involvement in children's schooling: Different meanings in different cultures. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24(4), 398-410.
- Hussein, S., Idris, M., Faiz, N., Ahmad, N., and Minaz, M. (2016) The role of multiple literacies in developing interdisciplinary research. *Journal of Applied Environmental Biological Sciences*, 6(2S) 1-8.
- Hwu, Wen-Song. (2004). Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Daignault: Understanding curriculum as difference and sense. In W. M. Reynolds & J. A. Webber (Eds.), *Expanding curriculum theory: dis/positions and lines of flight* (pp.181-202).
- Independent (Feb 2, 2008). Egalité! Liberté! Sexualité!: Paris, May 1968. Independent. Retrieved from: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/egalit-libert-sexualit-paris-may-1968-784703.html>
- Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Jackson, A. Y. (2013). Data-as-machine: A Deleuzian becoming. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.) *Deleuze and research methodologies* (111-124). Edinburgh UP: Great Britain.
- Jacobs, G.E. (2013). Reimagining multiliteracies: a response to Leander and Boldt. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 57(4) 270-273.
- Kalil, A. (2015). Inequality begins at home: The role of parenting in the diverging destinies of rich and poor children. In *Families in an era of increasing inequality* (pp. 63-82). Springer International Publishing.

- Keels, M. (2009). Ethnic group differences in early head start parents' parenting beliefs and practices and links to children's early cognitive development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 24*(4), 381-397.
- Kim, J. (2003). Challenges to NLS: Response to – What's 'new' in New Literacy Studies. *Current issues in comparative education, 5*(2), 118-121.
- Kovinthan, T. (2016) Learning and Teaching With Loss: Meeting the Needs of Refugee Children Through Narrative Inquiry, *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 10*:3, 141-155, DOI: 10.1080/15595692.2015.1137282
- Kyzer, A., Whiteside-Mansell, L., McKelvey, L., & Swindle, T. (2016). Supporting Family Engagement in Home Visiting With the Family Map Inventories. *Infants and young children, 29*(1), 37.
- Lane, V., Vatanparast, H., & White, J. (2014). Health Status of Newcomer Children: From Research to Policy. *Immigrant Integration: Research Implications for Future Policy, 213*.
- Laucius, J. (2009, April 3) HIPPY program gets children off to good start. Ottawa Citizen. Retrieved from <http://www.hippycanada.ca/library.php#01>
- Lather, P. (2007). Getting lost: Feminist practices toward a double(d) science. *Albany: SUNY*.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2011). *New literacies*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2012). 'New' literacies: technologies and values. *Revista Teknokultura, 9*(1) 45-69.
- Lankshear, C., Knobel, M., & Curran, C. (2013). Conceptualizing and researching "new literacies". *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Ed. C. A. Chapelle. Blackwell Publishing.
- Le Mare, L. & Audet, K. (2003). The Vancouver Hippy project: Preliminary evaluation. In M. Westheimer, (Ed.), *Parents making a difference: International research on the home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters (HIPPY) program* (pp. 169-177). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Leander, K., & Boldt, G. (2012). Rereading "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies" Bodies, Texts, and Emergence. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(1), 22-46.

- Leander, K. M., & Rowe, D. W. (2006). Mapping literacy spaces in motion: A rhizomatic analysis of a classroom literacy performance. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(4), 428-460.
- Le Mare, L., & Audet, K. (2003). The Vancouver HIPPY Project: Preliminary evaluation findings from a multicultural program. In M. Westheimer, (Ed.), *Parents making a difference: International research on the home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters (HIPPY) program* (pp. 169-177). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Livesey, G. (2010). Assemblage. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (18-19). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lotherington, H. (2013). Creating Third Spaces in the Linguistically Heterogeneous Classroom for the Advancement of Plurilingualism. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3) 619-625.
- Lombard, A. (1981). *Success Begins at Home*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Love, J. M., Kisker, E. E., Ross, C., Raikes, H., Constantine, J., Boller, K., ... & Vogel, C. (2005). The effectiveness of Early Head Start for 3-year-old children and their parents: Lessons for policy and programs. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(6), 885-901.
- MacDonald, M., Moore, D., Stone, J. & Buse, A. (2010). Elders, Family, Teachers: Models in Stó:lō Cultural Transmission. *Child Health and Education, 2*(2) 76-96.
- MacLeod, J. & Nelson, G. (2000). Programs for the promotion of family wellness and the prevention of child maltreatment: A meta-analytic review. *Child abuse & neglect, 24*(9), 1127-1149.
- McGee, L. M., & Morrow, L. M. (2005). *Teaching literacy in kindergarten*. Guilford Press.
- Marks, J. (2010) Francis Bacon. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (23-25). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Masny, D. (2016). Problematizing qualitative research: Reading a data assemblage with rhizoanalysis. *Qualitative Inquiry, 22*(8), 666-675.

- Masny, D. (2015). Problematizing qualitative educational research: Reading observations and interviews through rhizoanalysis and multiple literacies. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 6(1).
- Masny, D. (2014). Disrupting ethnography through rhizoanalysis. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 3(3), 345-363.
- Masny, D. (2013a) Becoming thousand little sexes: this is not my father's paradigm. In D. Masny (Ed.) *Cartographies of Becoming in Education* (pp. 221-235). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Masny, D. (2013b). Multiple literacies theory: exploring spaces. In I. Semetsky & D. Masny (Eds.) *Deleuze and education* (pp. 74-93). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Masny, D. (2013c) Rhizoanalytic pathways in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Issue, In Press.
- Masny, D. (2012). Multiple Literacies Theory: Discourse, sensation, resonance and becoming. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 33(1), 113-128.
- Masny, D. (2011). Multiple literacies theory: exploring futures. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(4), 494-504.
- Masny, D. (2009a). Literacies as becoming: A child's conceptualization of writing systems. In D. Masny & D. Cole (Eds.) *Multiple literacies theory: A Deleuzian perspective* (pp. 13-30). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Masny, D. (2009b). What's in a name?: Multiple Literacies Theory. *Multiple literacies theory: A Deleuzian perspective* (pp. 180-192). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Masny, D. (2008). *Hand in Hand*. Ottawa, ON: Coalition francophone pour l'alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario.
- Masny, D. (2006). Learning and creative process. *International Journal of Learning*, 12(5), 147-155.
- Masny, D., & Bastien, M. L. (2016). My Chinese Is in a Tiny Box With a Roof, My French and English Vocabulary Are in Boxes With No Roof. The Wind Blows Them Away Creation and Resistance—Reconceptualizing Learning With

- Multilingual Children. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1532708616674995.
- Masny, D., Bastien, M. & Hashi, M. (June, 2013) *Mapping Adolescent Immigrant Literacies: Disrupting Binaries*. Unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Conference, Victoria, BC.
- Masny, D., & Waterhouse, M. (2016). Capitalism, immigration, language and literacy: Mapping a politicized reading of a policy assemblage. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(7), 1005-1019.
- Masny, D., & Waterhouse, M. (2011). Mapping territories and creating nomadic pathways with Multiple Literacies Theory. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(3).
- Martinez, J. L., Rivers, S. E., Duncan, L. R., Bertoli, M., Domingo, S., Latimer-Cheung, A. E., & Salovey, P. (2013). Healthy eating for life: rationale and development of an English as a second language (ESL) curriculum for promoting healthy nutrition. *Translational behavioral medicine*, 3(4), 426-433.
- Massumi, B. (1987). Translator's foreword: Pleasures of philosophy. In G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (pp. ix–xv). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mathis, E.T.B., & Bierman, K.L. (2015). Effects of parent and child pre-intervention characteristics on child skill acquisition during a school readiness intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 33, p. 87-97.
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: an introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Melhuish, E., Phan, M., Sylva, K., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Taggart, B. (2008). Effects of the home learning environment and preschool center experience upon literacy and numeracy development in early primary school. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(1), 95-114.
- Mills, K. (2010). A review of the “digital turn” in the New Literacy Studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(2) pp. 246-271.
- Mills, K. A. (2009). Multiliteracies: interrogating competing discourses. *Language and Education*, 23(2) 103-116.

- New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (Eds.) *Multiliteracies*. South Yarra, Australia: Macmillan.
- Nickse, R. (1990). *Family and Intergenerational Literacy Programs: An Update of "The Noises of Literacy"*. Columbus, OH: Center on Education and Training for Employment
- Nickse, R. S. (1993). A typology of family and intergenerational literacy programs: Implications for evaluation. *Viewpoints*, 15, 34-40.
- Ontario Literacy Coalition (2011). Partnership Framework for Integrated Family Literacy Planning: research findings. Retrieved from:
http://www.essentialskillsontario.ca/sites/www.essentialskillsontario.ca/files/PDF_%20Partnership_Framework_for_Integrated_Family%20Literacy_Planning_Research_Findings.pdf
- Orellana, M. F., Reynolds, J., Dorner, L., & Meza, M. (2003). In other words: Translating or "para-phrasing" as a family literacy practice in immigrant households. *Reading research quarterly*, 38(1), 12-34.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016). How's Life in Canada? Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/canada/Better-Life-Initiative-country-note-Canada.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006a). *Early Childhood Education and Care Policy, Canada, Country Note*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/preschoolandschool/33850725.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006b). *Policy brief: Economic survey of Canada, 2006*. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/eco/surveys/36996670.pdf
- Østern, A-L. (2016). Multiple Arts Literacies in Worldmaking Education. In A.B. Saebo (ed.). *International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education* (vol 4 p. 99-112). New York: Waxman.
- Padak, N., & Rasinski, T. (2003). Family Literacy Programs: Who Benefits? (ERIC document No. ED480716)
- Pascal, C. (2009). *With our best future in mind: Implementing early learning in Ontario*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario

- Parr, A. (2010). Deterritorialisation/Reterrotrialisation. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (69-72). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Peters, M. A., & Burbules, N. C. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Prins, E. (2016). Digital storytelling in adult education and family literacy: a case study from rural Ireland. *Learning, Media and Technology*, DOI:10.1080/17439884.2016.1154075
- Purcell-Gates, V. (2007). Family Literacy and Community Literacy. P. 123-138 *Literacy for the new millennium, Vol. 4. Adult Literacy*. Edited by Barbara J. Guzzetti. Praeger Publishers.
- Raikes, H., Green, B. L., Atwater, J., Kisker, E., Constantine, J., & Chazan-Cohen, R. (2006). Involvement in Early Head Start home visiting services: Demographic predictors and relations to child and parent outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21*(1), 2-24.
- Riddle, S. (2014), Musicking as literacies: possibilities and pragmatism of language learning. *Language Arts, 231-249*
- Roffe, J. (2010). Multiplicity. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (181-182). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rogers, A., & Street, B. (2011). Using Ethnographic Approaches for Understanding and Teaching Literacy: Perspectives from Both Developing and Western Contexts. *Viden om Læsning (Knowledge About Reading) special issue, Jorden læser (Literacy Around the World)*, (10), 38-47.
- Roggman, L. A., Boyce, L. K., Cook, G. A., & Jump, V. K. (2001). Inside home visits: A collaborative look at process and quality. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 16*(1), 53-71.
- Salvatori, M. (2013). New Literacy Studies: Some Matters of Concern. *Literacy In Composition Studies, 66*.
- Sellers, M. (2015). “working with (a) rhizoanalysis” and working (with) a rhizoanalysis. *Complicity, 12*(1).
- settlement.org (2016). What is the language instruction for newcomers to Canada LINC program. Retrieved from: <http://settlement.org/ontario/education/>

- english-as-a-second-language-esl/linc-program/what-is-the-language-instruction-for-newcomers-to-canada-linc-program/
- Shan, H. (2012). Articulating the self to the engineering market: Chinese immigrants' experiences from a critical transformative learning perspective. In H. Bauder, (Ed.), *Immigration and settlement: Challenges, experiences, and opportunities* (pp. 95-108). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Shohet, L. (2012). Family literacy in Canada. B. Hanna (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Literacy*, 2nd Ed. (307-324).
- Singh, S., Sylvia, M. R., & Ridzi, F. (2015). Exploring the literacy practices of refugee families enrolled in a book distribution program and an intergenerational family literacy program. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43(1), 37-45.
- Skage, S. (1995). *A Practical Guide to Family Literacy-Definitions and discussions*. Family Literacy Action Group Alberta.
- Social Planning Council of Ottawa. (2010, March). *Immigrant children, youth, and families: A qualitative analysis of the challenges of integration*. Retrieved from <http://www.spcottawa.on.ca/sites/all/files/pdf/2010/Publications/Immigrant-Family-Report-English.pdf>
- Statistics Canada (2015a). *Generation status: Canadian-born children of immigrants*. Retrieved from: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-010-x/99-010-x2011003_2-eng.cfm
- Statistics Canada (2015b) *Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in Canada*. Retrieved from: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-010-x/99-010-x2011001-eng.cfm#a2>
- Steinfels, P. (May 11, 2011). Paris, May 1968: The revolution that never was. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/11/world/europe/11iht-paris.4.12777919.html>
- Stewart, M. A. (2014). Social networking, workplace, and entertainment literacies: The out-of-school literate lives of newcomer adolescent immigrants. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 53(4), 347-371

- Stone, L. (2005). Perspective 9: Poststructuralism. In J. L. Paul (Ed.) *Introduction to the Philosophies of Research and Criticisms in Education the the Social Sciences* (p 260-266). Pearson.
- Street, B. (2003). What's new in literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5, p. 1-14.
- Taylor, D. (1993). Family literacy: Resisting deficit models. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27(3), 550-553.
- Underwood, K., & Trent-Kratz, M. (2015). Contributions of School-Based Parenting and Family Literacy Centres in an Early Childhood Service System. *School Community Journal*, 25(1), 95.
- UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. (2010). Innocenti Report Card 10. Florence, Italy: P. Adamson.
- UNICEF Office of Research (2016). 'Fairness for Children: A league table of inequality in child well-being in rich countries', Innocenti Report Card 13, UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, Florence.
- Votruba-Drzal, E., Coley, R. L., Collins, M., & Miller, P. (2015). Center-Based Preschool and School Readiness Skills of Children From Immigrant Families. *Early Education and Development*, 26(4), 549-573.
- Wallin, J. (2010). *A Deleuzian approach to curriculum: Essays on a pedagogical life*. Springer.
- Waterhouse, M. (2011). *Experiences of Multiple Literacies and Peace: a rhizoanalysis of becoming in immigrant language classrooms*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa).
- Waterhouse, M. (2009). Reading peace as text: Multiple literacies theory as a lens on learning in LINC. In D. Masny & D. Cole (Eds.) *Multiple literacies theory: A Deleuzian perspective* (pp. 133-149). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Waterhouse, M., & Arnott, S. (2016). Affective Disruptions of the Immigrant Experience: Becomings in Official Language Education Research in Canada. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(2), 121-136.

- Westheimer, M. (2003). Ready or not: One home-based response to the school readiness dilemma. In M. Westheimer, (Ed.), *Parents making a difference: International research on the home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters (HIPPY) program* (pp. 49-62). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Zanchetta, M. S., Kaszap, M., Mohamed, M., Racine, L., Maheu, C., Masny, D., Cèsar, I., Maltais, C., Sangwa-Lugoma, G., Lussiers, N. et Kinsli, D. (2012). Construction of Francophone families' health literacy in a linguistic minority situation. *Alterstice*, 2(2), 47-62.
- Zhang, Y., & Guo, Y. (2017). Exceeding boundaries: Chinese children's playful use of languages in their literacy practices in a Mandarin-English bilingual program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(1), 52-68.

Appendix A

Certificate of Ethical Approval

File Number: 05-14-12

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 09/10/2014



Université d'Ottawa **University of Ottawa**
 Bureau d'éthique et d'intégrité de la recherche Office of Research Ethics and Integrity

Ethics Approval Notice
Social Sciences and Humanities REB

Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Co-investigator(s) / Student(s)

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Role</u>
Diana	Masny	Education / Education	Supervisor
Maria	Bastien	Education / Education	Student Researcher

File Number: 05-14-12

Type of Project: PhD Thesis

Title: Mapping family literacies through Home Instruction for Immigrant families with Preschool Youngsters - HI(T)PPY

Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Expiry Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Approval Type
09/10/2014	09/09/2015	Ia

(Ia: Approval, Ib: Approval for initial stage only)



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Appendix B Home Visitor Recruitment Letter

Date

Ms. Maria Bastien, PhD Candidate
Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Dear Paraprofessional Home Visitor,

This letter is to ask you to participate in a research project. This project is to learn about the experiences of HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors. Many projects have been done about parents and children in the HIPPY program, but there is not very much information about you! I want to study how HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors work with immigrant families, and how paraprofessional home visitors and parents work together with literacies. This project will be from September 2014 to June 2015.

To do this project, I need to ask permission from the HIPPY program and the program coordinator, the paraprofessional home visitors, and the parents. My study focuses on 1) how you, paraprofessional home visitors, use literacies with immigrant families, and 2) what happens when you do this.

First, I ask your permission to observe you during your training sessions with the program coordinator. Between October and May, I will come two times. (I will arrange the date with the program coordinator.) I will video record these observations. Later on the day of the observation, or when it is convenient for you, I will show you some of the video, or point out an exercise in your training book, and ask you to talk about it. This will become an interview that I will video record. In the fall, I will interview you by yourself. This will take about 45 minutes. In the spring, I would like to interview all participating paraprofessional home visitors together. This interview will probably be about an hour.

I also ask your permission to come with you on a home visit with a participating family two times this year – once in the fall and once in the spring. When I do this, I will videotape you and the parent working with the HIPPY materials. After the first home visit we can meet at a time that is convenient and have an interview where we will look at some of the video and talk about it. This will take about 45 minutes. After the second home visit I will interview you and the parent together. This interview will probably be about an hour. When I interview you, I will make a video recording.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY Canada and HIPPY Springfield.

Possible benefits and risks

I will observe and interview you only at times that are convenient for you. I don't want to disturb your schedule. One benefit of this project is that you will have an



Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

opportunity to talk about your experiences with the HIPPY program. It will also help us learn more about paraprofessional home visitors.

Information is confidential

All information will be confidential. This means that I will never tell anyone that you participated in the study. This means that if I talk about things you have said, I will give you a fake name. I will also not tell people that I did my study in Springfield. I will only say that it was a HIPPY program in Ontario.

At the end of the study I will invite you to take part in a group interview with other paraprofessional home visitors. This means that they will be aware of your responses and limits the confidentiality of this particular interview. If you would prefer, you may ask to be interviewed alone.

The video recordings that I make will be kept safe. I will store them on a computer in my home with a password. I will keep an extra copy in a locked office at the university of Ottawa, too. If there are any paper documents, I will lock them in a safe in my house to keep them safe. After a minimum of five years I will destroy all of these things.

If later in the study you decide that you do not want to participate any more you can tell me and I will not use the information you gave me and I will destroy it. I do need to keep the videos because they will be of more than one person.

Questions

If you have questions, you may contact me at NUMBER.

If you have questions regarding the ethics of this study or if you wish to make a complaint, you may contact:

Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall, Room 154
(613) 562-5387

I thank you for your attention, your time, and your collaboration,

Maria Bastien
PhD Candidate
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

Appendix C
Home Visitor Consent Form



Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

**University of Ottawa
Consent Form**

Project title: Mapping family literacies through Home Instruction for Immigrant families with Preschool Youngsters - HI(I)PPY

Student conducting research:

Maria Bastien tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Professor supervising research:

Diana Masny tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Invitation to Participate: I have been invited to participate in a research project conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien (under the supervision of Professor Masny) for the completion of her doctoral dissertation at the University of Ottawa.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to explore the experiences of immigrant parents and paraprofessional home visitors in the HIPPY program.

Participation: My participation will consist of participating in 1 interview about the programs and services available for parents in the Springfield Region. The time needed for this in total is approximately 1 hour. This will take place at a time and location convenient for me. Ms. Bastien will film the interview.

My participation in the research is entirely voluntary and I am free to withdraw at any time. I may ask Ms. Bastien questions at any time and I may refuse to answer any of the questions without any negative consequences.

Assessment of risks: My participation in this study entails no foreseeable risks. However, if I experience any discomfort, Ms. Bastien has assured me that she will make every effort to minimize this discomfort. I may decide to stop an observation or interview at any time.

Benefits: By sharing my knowledge about local programs and services I will contribute to an enlarged understanding of HIPPY and other similar programs for newcomers to Canada with young children.



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Privacy of participants: I have received assurance from Ms. Bastien that the information I share will remain strictly confidential. My identity will be protected. One of the ways Ms. Bastien will do this is to use a pseudonym to describe me. Interviews will be filmed. If parts of the film are used (such as still images) for publication in the thesis or when presenting information at a conference or in a publication, Ms. Bastien will remove any identifying features.

Confidentiality and conservation of data: The data will be used for the purpose of Ms. Bastien's doctoral dissertation. I have been assured that filmed observations and interviews will be kept securely on a password protected computer and external hard drive at Ms. Bastien's home. This data will be securely safeguarded for a minimum of five years along with the any other data collected for the dissertation.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, individual interviews will be destroyed unless I grant permission for Ms. Bastien to use them. Observations will not be destroyed as they have more than one participant.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY.

Acceptance: I, [*Name of participant*], agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien as part of her doctoral dissertation, at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Professor Masny.

- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos recordings in her thesis.
- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos for publication or presentation.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the Ms. Bastien or Professor Masny.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Office for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 154, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
Tel.: [613] 562-5387
Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's name Signature: Date:

Maria Bastien

Researcher's name Signature: Date:



Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Appendix D
Parent Interest Form & Recruitment Letter
Research Project Interest Form – Parents

Name: _____

Assigned Paraprofessional Home Visitor:

Year in HIPPY Program: **1st** or **2nd**

I participate in HIPPY in: **English** or **French**

Gender: **Male** or **Female**

Country of Origin:

First Language:

Please note that while all interest is appreciated, only a limited number of parents will be able to participate in the study.



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Dear Parent,

This letter is to ask you to participate in a research project. This project is to learn about the experiences of HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors. This project will be from September 2014 to June 2015. I want to study how HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors work with immigrant families, and how home visitors and parents work together with literacies.

I would like parents who are in their second year with HIPPY. I understand that English may not be your first language. I am an ESL teacher at the University of Ottawa and am able to assess language. I would like parents to be able to speak and understand English at the intermediate level.

To do this project, I need to ask permission from the HIPPY program and program coordinator, the paraprofessional home visitors, and the parents. My study focuses on 1) how paraprofessional home visitors use literacies with immigrant families, and 2) what happens when they do this.

I ask your permission to come to your home with the paraprofessional home visitor two times this year – once in the fall and once in the spring. When I do this, I will videotape you and your paraprofessional home visitor working with the HIPPY materials. After our second visit in the spring, I want to interview you with your paraprofessional home visitor. A few days later, I would like to visit you again and interview you alone. When I interview you, I will videotape our conversation.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY Canada and HIPPY Springfield.

Possible benefits and risks

I will come to observe and interview you only at times that are convenient for you. I don't want to disturb your schedule. One benefit of this project is that you will have an opportunity to talk about your experiences with the HIPPY program. It will also help us learn more about paraprofessional home visitors.

Information is confidential

All information will be confidential. This means that I will never tell anyone that you participated in the study. This means that if I talk about things you have said, I will give you a fake name. I will also not tell people that I did my study in Springfield. I will only say that it was a HIPPY program in Ontario.

The video recordings that I make will be kept safe. I will store them on a computer in my home with a password. I will keep an extra copy in a locked office at the University of Ottawa, too. If there are any paper documents, I will lock them in a safe in my house to keep them safe. After a minimum of five years I will destroy all of these things.

If later in the study you decide that you do not want to participate anymore you can tell me and I will not use the information you gave me and I will destroy it. I do need to keep the videos because they will be of more than one person.

☎ 613-562-5800 (4892)
📠 613-562-5144

145 Jean-Jacques-Lussier (385)
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada
www.uOttawa.ca



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Questions

If you have questions, you may contact me at NUMBER.

If you have questions regarding the ethics of this study or if you wish to make a complaint, you may contact:

Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall, Room 154
(613) 562-5387

I thank you for your attention, your time, and your collaboration,

Maria Bastien
PhD Candidate
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

☎ 613-562-5800 (4892)
🏠 613-562-5144

145 Jean-Jacques-Lussier (385)
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada
www.uOttawa.ca

Appendix E Parent Consent Form

University of Ottawa Consent Form for HIPPY Parents



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Project title: Mapping family literacies through Home Instruction for Immigrant families with Preschool Youngsters - HI(I)PPY

Student conducting research:

Maria Bastien tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Professor supervising research:

Diana Masny tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Invitation to Participate: I have been invited to participate in a research project conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien (under the supervision of Professor Masny) for the completion of her doctoral dissertation at the University of Ottawa.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to explore the experiences of immigrant parents and paraprofessional home visitors in the HIPPY program.

Participation: My participation will consist of participating in 2 observations and 2 interviews about my experiences with the HIPPY program. The time needed for this in total is approximately 4 hours. This will take place at a time and location convenient for me. Ms. Bastien will film the observations and interviews.

My participation in the research is entirely voluntary and I am free to withdraw at any time. I may ask Ms. Bastien questions at any time and I may refuse to answer any of the questions without any negative consequences.

Assessment of risks: My participation in this study entails no foreseeable risks. However, if I experience any discomfort, Ms. Bastien has assured me that she will make every effort to minimize this discomfort. I may decide to stop an observation or interview at any time. If after we stop I still feel discomfort, Ms. Bastien will give me the contact information for counseling services from Family Services in Springfield where I can go to receive counseling from professionals.

Benefits: By expressing my experiences as an immigrant participating in the HIPPY program I will contribute to an enlarged understanding of HIPPY and other similar programs for newcomers to Canada with young children.

Privacy of participants: I have received assurance from Ms. Bastien that the information I share will remain strictly confidential. My identity will be protected. One of the ways Ms. Bastien will do this is to use a fake name to describe me. Observations and interviews will be filmed. If parts of the film are used (such as still images) for publication in the thesis or when presenting information at a conference or in a publication, Ms. Bastien will remove any identifying features.



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
 Faculté d'éducation
 Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
 Faculty of Education
 Office of the Vice-Dean

Accidental Video/Audio Recording of Child: I understand that when the researcher visits my home my child may be in the home with me. When the researcher audio or video records an observation or interview, my child may be accidentally recorded. What they say or do, however, will not be included in the research data.

Confidentiality and conservation of data: The data will be used for the purpose of Ms. Bastien's doctoral dissertation. I have been assured that filmed observations and interviews will be kept securely on a password protected computer and external hard drive at Ms. Bastien's home. This data will be securely safeguarded for a minimum of five years along with the any other data collected for the dissertation.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, individual interviews will be destroyed unless I grant permission for Ms. Bastien to use them. Observations will not be destroyed as they have more than one participant.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY.

Acceptance: I, [*Name of participant*], agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien as part of her doctoral dissertation, at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Professor Masny.

- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos in her thesis.
- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos for publication or presentation.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the Ms. Bastien or Professor Masny.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Office for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 154, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
 Tel.: [613] 562-5387
 Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's name Signature: Date:

Maria Bastien

Researcher's name Signature: Date:

Appendix F

Program Coordinator Recruitment Letter & Consent Form



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

Ms. Maria Bastien, PhD Candidate
Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Dear HIPPY Program Coordinator,

I am writing with the goal of soliciting your collaboration to undertake a research project focusing on the experiences of HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors. More precisely, I am conducting a study using Multiple Literacies Theory to explore the ways in which HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors engage in literacy practices with immigrant families. I am most interested in current HIPPY paraprofessional home visitors and families in their second year of participation. This project will take place from September 2014 to June 2015.

To undertake this research, I must first obtain the consent of the local HIPPY program and program coordinator, the paraprofessional home visitors, and the parents. My study focuses on 1) how the engagement of paraprofessional home visitors in literacy practices with immigrant families functions, and 2) what it might produce.

I ask your permission to observe and film paraprofessional home visitors participating in this project during their professional development activities with HIPPY. I also ask you to participate in the project as a person in interaction with the paraprofessional home visitors. The exchanges which take place between you and the paraprofessional home visitor during professional development training will produce the data that will be useful to the study. Between October and May, there will be two video-recorded observation sessions. The date and time of the observations will be determined in consultation with you.

Later in the day or the day following the observation period, the paraprofessional home visitor will participate in a filmed interview. There will be two interviews related to these observations for the year. Here are the tasks that the paraprofessional home visitors will do during the interviews. He/she will watch part of the video taken in the classroom and describe in his/her own words his/her perception of the actions that take place in the interaction between you, the materials, and he/she. This exchange becomes the interview which is filmed.

Moreover, I hope you will consent to an interview of approximately one hour. This interview will be filmed. In addition to questions arising from observations of paraprofessional home visitors training sessions, topics for interview discussion may include: involvement in the HIPPY program; experiences with paraprofessional home visitors; and the perceived impact of the HIPPY program particularly in relation to paraprofessional home visitors.

There is one further component to this study. Over the course of the project, I will observe and film each paraprofessional home visitor performing a home visit with a family two times (Fall and Spring). Each home visit will be followed by a filmed interview with the paraprofessional home visitor, but parents will only be



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

interviewed after the second home visit (twice – once with the paraprofessional home visitor, and once alone). Therefore, related to the home visits, there will be two filmed observation sessions followed by interviews. I will solicit the participation of the families to study through a brief information session in the fall at a HIPPY enrichment evening of your choosing. I am an ESL teacher at the University of Ottawa and am able to assess language. I would like parents to be able to speak and understand English at the intermediate level.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY Canada and HIPPY Springfield.

Possible benefits and risks

The observations and interviews will be done at a time that disrupts as little as possible the participant's schedules. One of the benefits is to better understand the currently under-researched experiences of paraprofessional home visitors in the HIPPY program and their engagement in literacy practices with the immigrant families HIPPY serves.

Information is confidential

All information will be confidential. The names of participants and the sites remain anonymous (the site will be described in the thesis and publications/presentations as an Ontario HIPPY Site and given a pseudonym). Individuals will have pseudonyms.

Data (including video files) will be stored on a password-protected computer in the researchers home, as well as on a backup hard-drive that will also be password protected located in a locked office at the University of Ottawa. Any physical documents will be stored in a safe in the researcher's home. The researcher and her supervisor will be the only people to have access to this data. Data will be destroyed after a minimum of years. If a participant decides to withdraw from the study, his/her individual audio data will be excluded from the study and destroyed, however observations will not be destroyed as they have more than one participant.

Questions

If you have questions, you may contact me at NUMBER. If you have questions regarding the ethics of this study or if you wish to make a complaint, you may contact:

Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall, Room 154
(613) 562-5387

I thank you for your attention, your time, and your collaboration,

Maria Bastien
PhD Candidate
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa



Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

**University of Ottawa
Consent Form for HIPPY Program Coordinator**

Project title: Mapping family literacies through Home Instruction for Immigrant families with Preschool Youngsters - HI(I)PPY

Student conducting research:

Maria Bastien tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Professor supervising research:

Diana Masny tel:
Faculty of Education email:
University of Ottawa

Invitation to Participate: I have been invited to participate in a research project conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien (under the supervision of Professor Masny) for the completion of her doctoral dissertation at the University of Ottawa.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to explore the experiences of immigrant parents and paraprofessional home visitors in the HIPPY program.

Participation: My participation will consist of participating in 2 observations and 1 interview about my experiences with the HIPPY program. The time needed for this in total is approximately 5 hours. This will take place at a time and location convenient for me. Ms. Bastien will film the observations and interviews.

My participation in the research is entirely voluntary and I am free to withdraw at any time. I may ask Ms. Bastien questions at any time and I may refuse to answer any of the questions without any negative consequences.

Assessment of risks: My participation in this study entails no foreseeable risks. However, if I experience any discomfort, Ms. Bastien has assured me that she will make every effort to minimize this discomfort. I may decide to stop an observation or interview at any time.

Benefits: By expressing my experiences as the program coordinator of a HIPPY program I will contribute to an enlarged understanding of HIPPY and other similar programs for newcomers to Canada with young children.

Privacy of participants: I have received assurance from Ms. Bastien that the information I share will remain strictly confidential. My identity will be protected. One of the ways Ms. Bastien will do this is to use a pseudonym to describe me. Observations and interviews will be filmed. If parts of the film are used (such as still images) for publication in the thesis or when presenting information at a conference or in a publication, Ms. Bastien will remove any identifying features.

Confidentiality and conservation of data: The data will be used for the purpose of Ms. Bastien's doctoral dissertation. I have been assured that filmed observations and interviews will be kept securely on a password protected computer and external hard



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté d'éducation
Cabinet du vice-doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
Office of the Vice-Dean

drive at Ms. Bastien's home. This data will be securely safeguarded for a minimum of five years along with the any other data collected for the dissertation.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, individual interviews will be destroyed unless I grant permission for Ms. Bastien to use them. Observations will not be destroyed as they have more than one participant.

Please note that this research project is conducted independently from HIPPY Springfield.

Acceptance: I, [*Name of participant*], agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Ms. Maria Bastien as part of her doctoral dissertation, at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Professor Masny.

- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos recordings in her thesis.
- Ms. Bastien may use de-identified images or short clips from observation and interview videos for publication or presentation.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the Ms. Bastien or Professor Masny.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Office for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 154, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
Tel.: [613] 562-5387
Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

	Signature:	Date:
--	------------	-------

Maria Bastien	Signature:	Date:
Researcher's name	Signature:	Date:

Appendix G

Semi-structured Interview Protocols

Questions for Paraprofessionals *(Some questions will flow from observations)*

- What languages do you speak?
- What is your ethnic background?
- What is your country of origin?
- Since arriving in Canada I'm sure you've had many new experiences. Could you tell me about one related to being a parent?
- Could you tell me a little bit about your educational experiences in your home country? Perhaps you could tell me about what you studied most recently?
- Have you taken any courses or workshops in Canada? Is there anything special that you remember that was very different from courses you've taken in the past?
- Part of the HIPPY program involves training. If you had the opportunity to do more training or education in the future, what would you like to learn about?
- What are your hobbies? What hobbies do you do as family?
- Do you do any activities in Canada that are different from what you have done in previous countries?
- Do you listen to music, watch TV and movies? How often?
- What genres/kind of music, TV programs and movies do you watch?
- Could you tell me about your experiences in HIPPY professional development training?
- Would you like to share some of your views about how your family feels about participating in HIPPY?
- As a paraprofessional you have probably had many interesting experiences. Can you think of anything special that you've learned from these experiences? Could you tell me about them?
- I wonder about the differences between being a parent in the HIPPY program and being a paraprofessional. Is there anything you would like to share about these experiences?
- Joining a program like HIPPY can change parts of your life. Do you think your life has changed since joining the HIPPY program? Since becoming a paraprofessional?

Questions for Parents *(Some questions will flow from observations)*

- What languages do you speak?
- What is your ethnic background?
- What is your country of origin?
- Since arriving in Canada I'm sure you've had many new experiences. Could you tell me about one related to being a parent??
- Could you tell me a little bit about your educational experiences in your home country? Perhaps you could tell me about what you studied most recently?
- Have you taken any courses or workshops in Canada? Is there anything special that you remember that was very different from courses you've taken in the past?
- Do you think you would like to do more training or education in the future?

- Coming to Canada has probably changed how you imagined your child would grow up. What do you hope your child will do in the future?
- Do you do any activities in Canada that are different from what you have done in previous countries?
- Can you describe a typical day for you and your child?
- Do you listen to music, watch TV and movies? How often?
- What genres/kind of music, TV programs and movies do you watch?
- You have been working with your paraprofessional for several months now. Could you tell me about what that experience has been like?
- If we talked in a few years, what do you think you would tell me about working with your paraprofessional? What special things do you think you might remember?
- The HIPPY program has extra activities once a month. Did you have a favorite activity? Could you tell me about it?
- Joining a program like HIPPY can change parts of your life. How do you think your life has changed since joining the HIPPY program?
- Now that you are coming to the end of your second year in the program you might qualify to become a paraprofessional in the future. How would you feel about becoming a paraprofessional?

Questions for the Program Coordinator

(Some questions will flow from observations)

- Could you tell me a little bit about your background?
- The HIPPY program puts a lot of emphasis on personal and professional development for paraprofessionals. Is this something that you have an interest in for yourself as well?
- As the program coordinator you spend a portion of your time training new paraprofessionals. Many of these paraprofessionals are new to Canada and may have very different levels and kinds of education. Has this experience changed how you think about education or learning? In what ways?
- Could you tell me about how you came to work with HIPPY?
- Reading about HIPPY, it seems like it is a program that has transformed lives all around the world. Do you think that working with the HIPPY program has changed you?
- Here at the local level, what do you think are the key objectives of HIPPY?
- Could you tell me about the enrichment activities and explain their purpose? How do you think the HIPPY program affects parents? Families? Please feel free to share any stories you have relating to this.
- Could you tell me about the professional development and training opportunities for paraprofessionals?
- When I first encountered the HIPPY program I heard a lot about the transformation of participants' lives. How do you think the HIPPY program affects paraprofessionals? How do you think the HIPPY program affects parents?
- Could you tell me about your experiences interacting with HIPPY program participants?
- Would you like to share your hopes for this local HIPPY program?