INTRODUCTION

The literature on second-generation South Asians living in Britain has historically positioned them as “caught between two cultures.” Contemporary research, however, focuses on how identities are contingent and contextual due to the dynamics of gender, ethnicity, age, and place (Baumann, 1996; Alexander, 2002). And yet, the concerns addressed in this more recent literature—for example marriage, musical productions, gangs—are pertinent mainly to young people and adults, with the result that little is known about issues that are directly relevant to children’s experiences. Instead, where there is a focus on the children of migrants, it tends to be upon them as markers of integration and often hones in on their educational performance (Crozier & Davis, 2007).

Through a series of case studies, this article explores the intersection between home and school as social and physical spaces through which children understand, play, and negotiate their identities. The children were approximately ten years old and of Bangladeshi heritage. With the exception of a few, all the children were born in London and involved in travel to and from Sylhet, a northeastern district of Bangladesh. These children are part of families and communities that are generally on the move; although as British school children, at this stage in the life course, their lives are highly localized, with the routines of home and school forming a large part of their lives in London (Mand, 2010). I argue that children’s identities are contextual and embedded according to the ways in which places—in particular, home and school—are constructed and experienced. A key finding of the research is that children think home is in Bangladesh and London simultaneously. (Mand, 2010; Gardner & Mand, 2012, see also Zeitlyn, 2010). In this article, however, I refer to home as the site that is the context of children’s daily lives in Britain. Broadly speaking, as Olwig and Gullov (2003: 3) highlight, home and school are sites within which children are “placed” and these are “defined by adult moral values about a cherished past and a desirable future, clothed in commonsense notions about children’s best interests.” Both home and school are
marked by hierarchies between adult and child (parent-child and teacher-child, respectively), while inequities also exist between children at school in terms of who is the “most popular,” perceived to be “smart,” been to Bangladesh, and so on.

A common outlook amongst policy interventionists and their critics is that they perceive home and school as distinct bounded spheres. The distinction between home and school is central for understanding educational policy and how both parents and community advocates, on the one hand, and schools, social workers, and psychologists, on the other, understand the needs and problems of Bengali transnational children. South Asian children’s experiences of transnationalism have been marginal to academic accounts of transnationalism. Meanwhile, in the context of schools and local educational authorities, children’s transnationalism is perceived as problematic particularly when children are absent from school during term time. Some of the teachers implied that travel to Bangladesh for extended periods meant they “forgot” what they learned in school and this impacted their “English.” The local educational authority operate a strict policy against school absenteeism whereby on their return children can and do lose their place in the school. Children’s transnational mobility feeds into policy assumptions that attribute Bangladeshi children’s “failure” to achieve particular standards in schools on account of cultural differences between home and school; in other words, the values of “home” based on ethnicity and culture are seen as being incommensurate with those of schools. The notion that “cultural difference” is why children underperform fails to account for the ways in which Bangladeshi parents felt unable to “play a direct role in their children’s education” and instead “saw their role, rather, as providing a supportive home and family background and as giving encouragement” (Crozier & Davies, 2007: 303; Gillies, 2007; Edwards, 2002). At public forums, community workers, parents, and the like have adamantly contested the ideas that the “failure” of Bangladeshi children at school is attributable to parents’ “culture”.1 Characterizing children’s failure on account of a “cultural difference” leads to policy interventions that seek to collapse the boundary between home and school in order to promote partnership and maximize educational achievement. Such interventions have been critiqued for positioning children as passive members of society and as adults in the making,2 and, as a result, children’s agency and negotiations between home and school are negated (Edwards, et al., 2002). In its stead, critics of these policy interventions propose that the specificities of class, gender, and ethnic positions lead to a diversity of children’s experiences of the home-school division, noting that there is a sharper boundary between home and school amongst ethnic minority families (Edwards, 2002).

The majority of Bangladeshi children saw clear differences in their lives at home and at school. At home, in London, they are often expected to and do activities like caring for their siblings and performing domestic tasks, and these activities are influenced by ideals based on gendered norms (Mand, 2010). For example, girls spoke about the amount of housework with which they were charged and, while complaining that their brothers didn’t “do as much,” girls rationalized the situation on account of gender norms within the house that are related to being Bangladeshi. Furthermore, when girls spoke about home they often referred to practices such as “being respectful” as part of their selfhood to be influenced by wanting to be good Muslims.3

The children’s illustrations, diaries, and interview accounts give a clear indication that school is something they enjoyed and, contrary to expectation, holidays were boring in contrast to the stimulation provided by school (Mand, 2010). While not all learning that occurs in school was seen as enjoyable (in

---

1 Panel comment at Brick Lane Circle meetings (www.bricklanecircle.org).
2 By contrast another model (and one which is closely associated with childhood studies) focuses on the child’s perspective, takes into consideration their experience, and examines issues of autonomy and independence. A third model refers to children as active agents who nonetheless operate in structures that they negotiate (Edwards, 2002).
3 It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss religion and socialization. My intention here is to highlight the “home” as a site where children are taught particular values of respect and expectations that are linked to cultural and religious practices.
particular the morning lessons of literacy and numeracy) children stressed informal learning that occurred through drama, sports, and art workshops as a key reason why school was “fun.” Alongside having to meet targets pertaining to core subjects, Victoria School, like others in Britain, stresses informal learning situations, which includes taking school trips as a key way through which children’s achievements can be bolstered and learning accelerated (for a fuller discussion on the policy surrounding informal learning, see Zeitlyn, 2010).

I argue, however, that while there may be different ideologies that inform sociability within different spaces, the case studies illustrate how the ideas and practices within these spaces are dynamic. Furthermore, children are active agents who are involved in carving out spaces and creating meaning relevant to their gender and stage in the life course.

BACKGROUND

The discussion here draws from a wider research project funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council under the “Diasporas, Migration, and Identities” program. The research is concerned with understanding the experiences of British-born children of Bangladeshi heritage and their location within transnational networks and diasporic spaces. I began working with seven-year-old children (school year three) in 2006 at an East London primary school, although the bulk of the research activities took place when they were about ten years old (school year five). One of the aims was to bring to the fore children’s voices, given the absence in migration research within the United Kingdom of South Asian children’s experiences and role in diasporic communities. Hence, I did not seek to write an ethnography about the school; rather, my focus on home and school takes its departure point from children’s representations presented during participatory activities.

From the onset, I viewed childhood as a category that is relational and variable in meanings across place and time. Hence, childhood is not a universal category in which children pass through a series of predefined developmental “stages.” While there remains a tendency in international policy and pedagogic practice of assuming that children are everywhere the same, such a stance fails to account for the unique experiences of children who are of migrant backgrounds. The children of this research are part of families where ideas of what it means to be a child is influenced by ideals and practices of Sylhet, or what is imagined or recalled to be the case. Writing about the “West,” James argues that ideas about “the home” and “the family” have come to intermesh with “the child” historically, resulting in the placement of children on a “twin dependency” based on their nature, that needs controlling, and their need for nurture (James, 1998:142). These ideas differ among the Bangladeshis, as children as well as adults are perceived less as individuals but more as part of collectivities like families, although this does not necessary result in a “twin dependency” (James, 1998). Rather, in the Bangladeshi context, “beyond the stage of infancy, distinctions in entitlements and types and levels of responsibility are usually made according to a child’s size, gender and competence, commonly expressed in how much they ‘understand’” (Haider, 2008: 51–52; quoting Blanchet, 1996: 48). “Understanding” is not limited to physical maturity and/or biological age but instead is related to a child’s management of social circumstances and gender identity (Blanchet, 1996). It is not my intention to suggest that ideas of childhood are fixed to a particular locality but rather to draw attention to the ways in which children can be positioned in a particular way according to the setting. Ideas of what it means to be a child can and do vary across generations—in the “home” setting as well as at school (Gardner & Mand, 2012).

Living within walking distance of Victoria School, the children’s school day begins at 8.50 AM and ends at 3.30 PM. Their accompanied journeys back home may involve going to the local park, shops, the homes of relatives or attending “Arabic/Koran” lessons. Some 98 percent of children in year five at Victoria School were born in the London borough and are of Bangladeshi heritage. Other ethnicities within the class group included Somali, White British, and
African Caribbean. The parents or grandparents of
the Bangladeshi children arrived in large numbers
from Sylhet around the time of the industrial boom
in the 1960s. Following the end of the industrial
boom, many Bangladeshis moved to Tower Hamlets,
and today census figures indicate that one-third (33
percent) of the population in Tower Hamlets is Ben-
gali. In particular areas of the borough the percent-
age of Bengali rises to 45 percent, amongst whom
74 percent are children under the age of seventeen
(Dench, et al., 2006: 57). Living in Tower Hamlets,
these children are part of an ethnic minority com-

munity who are living in poverty, a situation exacer-
bated by high unemployment rates and poor housing
in the poorest borough in England. For these British-
born children of Bangladeshi heritage, the immediate
locality is marked by social and economic contrasts.
For example, while they live in overcrowded high rise
blocks of flats, their view is of the opulent buildings
that house the financial heart of London.

What follows are a set of case studies that dif-
ferently illustrate the intersection between home
and school as experienced by children during their
daily lives in London. In the first case study, I focus
on Mad Max’s\(^4\) “play” in the school playground, the
space in which I (first) undertook participatory ac-
tivities with children: playing games, running around,
and talking to them informally in smaller groups.
This case study illustrates the playground as a space
within which children perform emerging identities

\(^{4}\) The children chose their own pseudonyms.

that they present in the classroom and at home, away
from “adult” eyes. This is not to say that the play-
ground is beyond school rules, although it is notable
that children are able to behave in a different manner
in the playground than the classroom.

My second case study focuses on tensions that
arise when children wish to attend trips organized by
the school and the necessity of getting parental con-
tent to go. In this section, we hear from Reema, who
is reflecting back as an adult, about wanting to go to
Paris at the age of eight on a school trip. The account
illustrates the ways in which children are involved
in translating the values of one sphere (school) to
families. In doing so I wish to draw attention to the
active ways children negotiate their sense of self by
altering relations to the social position they occupy
within household hierarchies.

Finally, in a third example, I turn to Kylie’s ac-
count of wearing a headscarf in and out of school.
The headscarf is an important symbol for Muslim
gendered identity and the implications of wearing
these are increasingly politicized in Europe. For ex-
ample, the wearing of a headscarf in French and Brit-
ish schools has resulted in debate within academia
and in the public sphere in relation to the ideals of
“freedom” and secularism (Molokotis Leiderman,
2000). In the narrative given by Kylie, we can begin
to address whether children are “caught between
cultures” or are active agents as they maneuver be-
tween spheres. I approach these questions through
the discussion I had with Kylie about when she wears
or does not wear the head scarf, revealing the multi-
plicity of positions children occupy and their under-
standing of norms associated with home and school.
Let us turn now to the case studies beginning with
Mad Max.

**CASE STUDIES**

**Mad Max and His Declaration of Love**

On the board covering up a derelict outbuilding in the
school playground, Mad Max wrote in black marker
his initials and those of his playground girlfriend:
“T and M 100%”. He called out to me across the noisy
playground and asked me to take a picture. When I asked Mad Max if I could show the picture to other people he said, “Yes—but don’t show it to my mum.” Mad Max, like many of his peers in the playground, was involved in playing with and performing a gendered identity that increasingly involved being interested in the opposite sex. The performances of these identities are linked to gendered norms of behavior. However, while Mad Max took on the bold step of writing about his “love” on the wall, the apple of his eye publicly refuted such interest although she was never physically far from him and often engaged in whispered plots with other girls in how to trip Mad Max and so forth. Even through Mad Max was eventually reprimanded by the headmaster for defacing school property, at the time he was less concerned with rebellious vandalism and more with what his love interest signified and the interpretation his mother might make. Mad Max knew that his mother would disapprove of the activity and the sentiments. Indeed, Mad Max’s mother, like many others, expressed a disdain for television channels like MTV because she found the morality dubious, particularly in terms of the sexualized content of programs. This is not to say that these families rebut all engagement with the media—children are exposed to a host of images and messages. On the whole, however, children spoke of being allowed to watch only specific channels such as Bengali “S channel,” Bangla TV, other Asian channels, and Disney.

When they are in class, children’s movement within the school space is heavily monitored and centered around discipline and learning. In contrast, out in the playground and during rainy days, when classrooms took on the qualities of open play spaces at play time, children’s activities are unstructured. This expectation—or culture—of unstructured and structured activity was in place even though that year the school playground was renovated to include a football pitch, swings, climbing frames and sheltered areas. The boundaries of the playground were literally transferred to indoor classrooms as they became spaces for children to relate to one another in play. Play times were central to forging relationships since, despite living in close proximity to one another, the majority of children who spent time together in school did not do so out of school. Exceptions were children related to one another, siblings, and cousins from extended networks, while some children noted friendships with neighboring families. The space of the playground is a grey area between the rigid boundaries between home and school and one that enables children to experiment with emerging identity, like the one symbolized by Mad Max’s graffiti.

Away from the school playground, there were limited opportunities for children to interact and “play” outside the control of their families: independent roaming around streets for these children was limited. Although some children spoke about playing outdoors in communal areas allocated to their blocks of flats, most said that they were not allowed outside. The parents further confirmed this, stating that their estates were dangerous and they were concerned about their children’s safety. Nevertheless, children did speak of being mobile in the company of their families, notably older siblings, and most children were keen observers and were knowledgeable of what was going on in the street. The ideal of keeping children away from “danger”—namely crime and drugs—however well-intentioned by parents and the school context, remains difficult given the deprived urban environment that forms the context of these children’s daily lives. A dramatic example of this was an incident involving the older brother of an ex-pupil. The action took place during one lunch break: a young
Bangladeshi boy climbed up the metal gates of the schoolyard while being pursued by the police and sniffer dogs. "It was drugs, that's what they get him for," said one child. "Yeah, did you see him trying to climb up the school walls?" perked up another. "The police, man, they were going for him." This episode reveals that, although children's lives are highly regulated and they remain for the large part within the care of adults, be it their family members or school staff, they are nevertheless members of the community and exposed to elements deemed inappropriate.

Peterson argues that what is considered suitable for children is closely related to the ways in which childhood is constructed within families and “its place in the larger universe” (Peterson 2005: 180). Keeping children away from negative influences suggests that, for the parents of Bangladeshi children, childhood is a time when they need to be instructed and protected from particular influences. Many parents told me that they feared the influence of the “streets,” especially drugs and television stations such as MTV that they perceived as morally dubious. Nevertheless children are mobile both locally and transnationally and are involved in different sites of belonging: Mad Max’s graffiti incident indicates how experimentation with gender and gender relations outside the aegis of family and official school activities is inevitable. Moreover, on account of being school children in an inner city neighborhood, they can observe, have access to, and be inspired by different stimuli. This is often the substance of their conversations in the school playground.

**Traverse the Familiar to the Unfamiliar**

In this section, I explore the intersection between home and school through the lens of school trips. Trips are organized and instigated by schools and are associated with a particular version of educating the child based on cross-cultural exchanges. School trips can range from day trips to local museums right through to trips involving a journey and temporary residence away from home. For some children, gaining permission for these trips is an anxious time as parents can and do refuse to give permission and sometimes object to the school ideal behind such trips. When handing out consent forms, knowing that some parents will be wary of such activities, teachers encourage children to explain the purpose of the trip and at times literally translate the value of attending such trips. As we shall see in Reema’s case, children are involved in a process of negotiation in their homes on behalf of their schools based on their desire to take the school trip. For children, being able to voice what is unspoken in these exchanges is difficult, and, for this purpose, I have resorted to using the voice of Reema, who is the thirty-year-old mother of one of the children at school whom I interviewed. In the extract below, she is reflecting on her position as a member of a migrant family and being the eldest of eight children in the 1980s.

**REEMA:** I remember this very clearly, when we had trips like going away on field trips and stuff like that my parents were against it. Being a, being a Muslim, no way, they weren’t having any of it. Even the school spoke to them and everything, and, erm, I just pleaded with them [her parents] I really wanted to go because all the other kids are going as well and I don’t want to be left out. I think somewhere along the line you have to come to that extreme in order for them to let me go. . . . But they weren’t like that, "no way," so I had my ways of battling it

**KANWAL:** And what did you do?

**REEMA:** I’d say to them, like I said, I’d explain to them why, "I’m going to be the left out child." And I suppose being the oldest, having other siblings, the cost as well, parents being on low income and everything, and everything mattered, every penny counted at that time, so I said it’s not going to cost much, a few quid for like pocket money. I remember we went to Kent or something like that, one of those areas, I did end up going but it was to the level [that] I had to plead to them. [She said to her parents] “it was something that everyone was looking forward to” . . . [Telling me] I wanted to be part of the group, it’s never nice for anyone to be left out and neglected sort of thing.

**KANWAL:** Yeah.
Reema:

I remember, yeah, that’s the (adopting a parental tone) “only last time we’re going to let you go.” We were doing a project about France and Paris and all that, and we went on another trip, for about three or four days to Paris accommodated and all of that and when that came and we had to work. We were going to go and visit a school and they were going to give us something and in exchange and we were going to give them something from London.

[There then followed a discussion on being allowed to go only once on a school trip]

Reema:

You know, so there was all of that building up, again, and I remember, this is so funny, yeah, I remember this is so funny I went into the corner, the only place I could have my space and I prayed and hoped, “you know if Allah has that power, to make me and go to that trip.” I remember, it was just so funny now looking back at it, how pathetic I was, but, I remember, the fact that my parents had said that it was the last trip you’re going to and you’re not going,

* * * *

The idea of going on a school trip was exciting for Reema. At the same time, there existed the real possibility of exclusion because of her family background. The school trip is based on an ideal of learning, outside the classroom/school, whereby children are exposed to avenues of cultural capital that in turn are expected to feed into their education (Edwards, 2002; Zeitlyn, 2010). In contrast, Bangladeshi parents’ ideas about what is valuable to learn differs from school cultures that are embedded in western liberal conceptions of personhood (Edwards, 2002). This, as we see in Reema’s experience, can and does present conflict for children of Bangladeshi heritage who want to attend trips. In order to be able to do so they are involved in a process of negotiation between home and school. These spheres differ in the notion of what it means to be a child, in notions of autonomy, and in activities perceived to be educational. Expressing her frustration, Reema recalled her pleas to parents and to Allah, naming these, as an adult, as “pathetic,” highlighting the powerlessness she felt in such a situation. Her narrative draws attention to the power of institutions such as schools and of families in the lives of children and to the strategies children use to negotiate between them. Children are involved in the negotiations between the ideals of home and school while also seeking to carve a space for themselves.

While we may be able to suggest that Bangladeshi parents place a different onus on education than the school does (Zeitlyn, 2010), it is worth underscoring the dynamic nature of Bangladeshi families whereby Reema’s experience of schooling in Britain results in intergenerational changes in experiences of education. Her account also indicates the necessity of understanding children’s positions within household hierarchy (she was the oldest of eight siblings) and household economics given her parents were newly arrived migrants who were struggling financially and living in an overcrowded flat—facts that influenced the decision-making regarding school trips. She points to her parents’ lack of knowledge about British schooling—and by extension school trips—given their rural background and limited experience of life in Britain. In contrast, as a parent of a ten-year old son, Reema is well-versed with the expectations of British schooling and can identify with the wishes of her child. Reema thought it a valuable and necessary component of her children’s education to go on school trips. Nonetheless, as a child, not being able to go on a trip is recalled as being “left out” and experienced as an exclusion.

**Intersecting Identities**

Over the two years I spent at Victoria School, where the majority of children are Bangladeshi, the numbers of girls wearing a head scarf to school increased. Wearing a headscarf can and does mean different things, and the age at which girls start the practice varies. With the exception of one child, all girls who wore a headscarf said that it was something their mothers also did in public. The wearing of headscarves is a female practice, and it was notable that, although boys are also able to wear skullcaps, they
never did (an exception being a seven-year-old Bangladeshi boy during Eid). Outside of school, however, boys from the school who are on route to the Madrassa wear skullcaps. Children spoke about the importance of “being good,” not questioning authority, listening to parents, how “Allah watches,” and what with the day of judgment one better be careful. Religious values and practices were clearly a part of children’s lives.

Below is Kylie’s response to my question about when she started to wear a headscarf.

KYLIE: Well, erm, I started in, it stared in year three [ages seven to eight]. Muslim people when they’re older or when they’re an adult they start wearing scarf and that’s like a way of saying that you’re a Muslim. When I was in year three my mum asked me question of “do you want to wear a scarf” and first I thinking, I was thinking of saying yes or no and then when I started year three I said to my mum “actually I do want to wear a scarf from now on.” So I started in year three my other friend she started in reception [class age five]. Wearing a scarf is really important, sometimes I don’t wear a scarf, I have to wear a scarf or sometimes I don’t wear a scarf but there has to be a reason. . . . there can’t be no reason. Sometimes I don’t wear no scarf cause there’s PE or I don’t wear a scarf cause we’re going on a trip, definitely when I go on trips I don’t wear a scarf.

KANWAL: Why’s that?
KYLIE: Erm, it’s because I think it’s different from school cause school is er, for some reason I wear scarf when I go to school but I don’t wear a scarf when I go out, I don’t know why. . . .

KANWAL: You mean school trips or out with your family?
KYLIE: Out with my family. I don’t know why I don’t wear a scarf but I just wait till school because you know when you’re at school you’re individual and show the way you are and the way I am. I like to wear scarf and I do have to wear scarf so everyone’s different in a way and I’ve made a decision of, decision of wearing a scarf from the rest, I don’t know why that’s different when I go out on school trips, it’s like I feel that it’s not school so I shouldn’t be wearing a scarf.

KANWAL: So when you’re out on a school trip, like when you went, if you went to London zoo on a school trip you wouldn’t wear a scarf.
KYLIE: I didn’t wear a scarf.
KANWAL: But if you went to London Zoo with your mum would you wear a scarf?
KYLIE: If it was a school trip?
KANWAL: No, just you and your mum and your family?
KYLIE: No I wouldn’t wear a scarf. I wouldn’t wear a scarf, it’s only in school when I’m staying in school.

* * *

As we note from Kylie’s narrative, the distinctions between home and school are destabilized through the practice of wearing a headscarf. Although one readily associates the school as a public space and hence wearing a scarf, it is interesting to note that visiting a very public arena like the London Zoo with her family is not a place where she would wear a scarf.

To begin with, Kylie draws attention to different markers of age. In the British educational context, stages in children’s lives are marked by numerical age; at home, these are marked by religious observation. Kylie stresses an element of choice given by her mother, who was brought up in Britain and also wears a headscarf. The onus on choice is remarkable in her account, bringing about a distinction that was not apparent to the interviewer at first. When she speaks about reasons not to wear a scarf, Kylie refers to the school context. Hence, practical reasons such as doing PE and trips are put forward as times and areas when not to wear a scarf. Indeed, a discarded scarf at the edges of the playground was a common sight as girls running around discard their scarves to keep cool.

Kylie’s account about wearing a scarf further destabilizes and reinterprets the ideological distinctions concerning home and school when she tells me that since she is an individual in school she chooses to represent this by wearing a headscarf. Kylie is
revealing her understanding of the dominant discourse of schools as arenas where individualism is valued. In the act of wearing a headscarf just in school, as opposed to out of school with her family, she is re-interpreting the liberal notions of individualism that underpin the ethos of British schools (Edwards 2002). The headscarf is a symbol of a collective Muslim identity for Kylie. At the same time, the broader public discourse on Islam and the issue of headscarves associates the veil (headscarf) to be associated with religious values that are associated with “home” culture. In the case of Kylie, the headscarf becomes a marker of her very British individuality.

**Conclusion**

Kylie’s explanation of where and when she wears a headscarf underlines children’s experiences of cultural translation and innovation as they actively reinterpret ideals that are associated with the particular spheres of home and school. Reema’s account demonstrates some of the tensions that can and do arise in relation to engaging with the expectations of home and school. In this case, the interface between home and school, through the practice of taking trips, can and does result in children being under significant stress as they seek parental permission. This case study illustrates the influences that institutions have upon children.

At the same time, institutions contain multiple spaces, the more informal of which allow children to perform experimental identities, neither of the school nor of the home. By focusing closely on children's place-making, we found home and school are places that position children in different ways as well as being arenas within which children experiment with, perform, and reflect their multiple identities. Although, overall, we noted that children maneuver between home and school somewhat seamlessly, the intersection between home and school is at times experienced as a site of conflict. This is not to say that children are in some pathological condition of being caught between two cultures; rather, it is the construction of these two spheres by families and by public discourses as distinct, with diametrical ideologies, that positions children in particular ways. Children’s “straddling,” translation, and innovations at the interface of home and school arise from their social locations in household hierarchies and the wider socio-economic context of the family. Furthermore, although home is an important site of identification, children are also involved in other sites, based on their engagements in and out of school, in which they seek to fit in and belong. Finally, although distinctions between home and school abound in the literature, our children indicate that such distinctions are open to reinterpretations. Their experiences question the representation of home and school as spheres in public and policy discourses that are culturally incommensurable. Instead, an exploration of home and school reveals the “culturally complex position” children hold and negotiate (Olwig & Gullov, 2003:226).
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