



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

FOREIGNERS, IMMIGRANTS, OTHERNESS:
A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPLICATIONS, DELIGHTS AND
TENSIONS

Sonja Arndt

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Education,

The University of Auckland, 2012

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a theoretical analysis of the complexities of immigrant otherness in the discourse surrounding early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The aim of my study is to reconceptualise notions of otherness and to open up fresh perspectives of living with and being other in the social and political condition in which this discourse is situated. I use philosophical and feminist paradigms to provoke a critical ontology of otherness, by examining key tensions that emphasise the sensitivity and rawness of being or engaging with an other. Kristeva's utopian challenge to live together, with others and as others within ourselves, without ostracism and levelling, is central to my study. Her insights into foreigners and foreignness provide a freeing lens through which I conceptualise influences on and consequences of immigrant otherness, whilst creating a conflicting space of uncertainty within the early childhood discourse. Through a critical undoing of *Te Whariki*, the early childhood curriculum guidelines in Aotearoa/New Zealand, I highlight dominant orientations towards and engagements with immigrant others. Finally, my analysis argues that Kristeva's challenge remains an on-going quest towards a utopian future in education, that is not yet, or perhaps ever, achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Within each of us there is a foreigner. Julia Kristeva's insistence on us confronting this inner unknown provoked this study. My fascination with her insights into foreignness arose from remarkable connections between her foreigners and the foreigners that I knew. I am grateful for this inspiration.

A number of other people have motivated this thesis. I thank my outstanding supervisor Dr. Iris Duhn for her critical input into my thoughts and my writing. Iris interested and provoked me with literature that always challenged and extended me. She was the perfect sounding board and guide throughout the conceptual changes I had to make. I will always appreciate our great conversations, her high expectations, and the feeling that I can always go back and do a better job.

Dr. Maxine Stephenson joined me as a second supervisor for a short period at the end of my writing. Her contribution was perfectly timed. She was the critical outsider I needed in the final phases and her guidance with my flow and connections was invaluable. Many great writers have enthused and encouraged me throughout my writing in this thesis, and in my earlier work which led me to it. I especially thank Marek for his unfailing encouragement, support and critical discussions. I appreciate him and Mel for their patient proofreading in the final stages of this work. And, for her enthusiastic and gruesome clarity with which she has enthused me, I thank Professor Alison Jones, and I am pleased to say that I learnt how to 'kill my darlings' and to freely use the delete button.

I thank and acknowledge my students, and their generous sharing during our classes, and my close friends who are foreigners with me. All of us are mirrored in Kristeva's writing. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my children, Anja and Sascha, and my wider family, for their constant support and for raising me as a foreigner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1 – Introduction: The utopian challenge	1
Tensions and concerns	2
Theoretical framework	3
Chapter overview	3
Chapter 2 – Rationale: conceptualising immigrant otherness	7
Troubling otherness: The concerns and tensions	7
The genesis of my research	7
Powerlessness and resignation – immigrant teachers’ concerns	9
Concerns in the early childhood discourse	11
Critical multiculturalism	12
Political concerns	12
Methodological framework	12
Discourse analysis	12
Theoretical frameworks	13
Political framework: The liquid modern condition	13
The early childhood education context	14
Philosophical framework	15
Critical feminist framework	17
Concluding comments	18
Chapter 3 - Knowledge and ignorance	19
Kristeva’s foreigners	19
Intoxicatingly free	19
Masked and protected	19
Who is the other: The concerns with knowledge	20
Immigrant teacher concerns	20
Concerns with the early childhood discourse	20
Contesting knowledge – an analysis	22
A political, liquid modern context of knowing the other	22
Bicultural knowing	23
A philosophical analysis of knowing the other	24
Ignorance, not knowledge – a feminist analysis	25
Concluding comments	27
Chapter 4 - Home and homelessness	29
Kristeva’s foreigners	29
In between homes	29
Concerns and tensions of home	30
The significance of home	30

Contextualising home	31
Analysing constructs of home	32
The political context	32
Philosophical constructions of home	35
Feminist constructions of home	36
Concluding comments: Reconceptualising homelessness	38
Chapter 5 - Speech and silences	40
Foreigners' language	40
Escape to silence	40
The concerns with speech ... and silence	41
Revelatory speech - the key concern	41
Analysing speech, dialogue and silence	43
Speech as a political action	43
Philosophical constructs of speech, dialogue and silence	46
Critical feminist analysis of speech and silence	48
Concluding comments	49
Chapter 6 - Imagining Community: living with others	51
Kristeva's foreigners alone and in communities	51
Foreigners in community	51
Relentless hard work and aggravation	52
Concerns and tensions of otherness and community	52
Imagining communities and immigrant others – an analysis	54
Political constructions of community	54
Biculturalism and community	55
Philosophical notions of community	56
Feminist constructs of community	58
Concluding comments – Social butterflies, sceptical cynics	60
Chapter 7 – Conclusion: without ostracism and without levelling	62
Kristeva's foreigners	62
Reframing the study: The aims and concerns	62
Theoretical Framework: a summary of the analysis	63
The political context of immigrant early childhood teachers	64
Philosophical lenses	65
Critical feminist lenses	66
No victory, no conclusion	67
Further towards utopia	67
References	68

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION: THE UTOPIAN CHALLENGE

A society without foreigners can barely be imagined. In a utopian challenge of living and being with foreigners in an increasingly diverse globalised political and cultural landscape, Julia Kristeva (1991) asks whether natives will ever be able to intimately “live with the others, to live *as others*, without ostracism but also without levelling?” (p. 2, emphasis in the original). Kristeva’s confrontation of foreigners and, in particular, this question inspires my study. I respond to it throughout my thesis, in a critical investigation of ways of living with and as others, drawing on my own experiences of otherness, and on the experiences of my immigrant student teachers’ otherness, which they have shared incidentally during their studies. My research is located in the early childhood education context of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Throughout this study, Kristeva’s (1991) challenge and her stark illustrations of distinct abstract foreigners, drive my problematisation and analysis of the notion of otherness in relation to the fluid, neoliberal context of early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I examine and contest political, philosophical and feminist conceptions of being other and living with otherness, to provoke a critical consciousness of immigrant teachers’ otherness within the diversity and uncertainty of the early childhood education discourse. I use this analysis to explore Kristeva’s insistence on living with others, by becoming other to ourselves, and to expose notions of ostracism and levelling, two binary poles, of isolation or rejection at one extreme and superficial sameness at the other end of the scale. The specific aims of my analysis are to highlight the complexity of immigrant otherness in the politically complicated and unstable context; to theorise and reconceptualise otherness through philosophical and feminist lenses; to contest common ideologies; and to complicate the way otherness is conceived and represented in the early childhood discourse. In conceptualising these aims, I propose that a critical consciousness of otherness can arise only when difference is no longer merely acknowledged or celebrated, but, following Mohanty (2003), that it must be accepted as an on-going struggle of past, present and future possibilities.

Kristeva’s attention to the “multiple selves” of foreignness, to the “light and dark, loving and hating, always incomplete” (Stone, 2004, p. 131), strikes at an intimate foreignness in myself, and thus motivates this study on an eerily personal level. Through the experiences disclosed in class, it is clear that an intricate attention to foreignness strikes also at my students. As an early childhood teacher educator, I experience many of my students as freshly re-located immigrants in their new jobs in early childhood settings. These students’ informally shared stories of their struggles with the wider culture of the foreign society and country in which they are now situated are at the root of the tensions and concerns to which my study responds. My students’ life experiences of their own otherness and on-going formation as teachers in their new context, and my experiences as an immigrant teacher

myself, underpin the personal relevance of this study and of Kristeva's (1991) utopian challenge. My thesis is thus driven by my encounters with my own and my students' attempts to engage across differences, receptive to others, and constantly confronted by our own otherness.

TENSIONS AND CONCERNS

My thesis responds to tensions and concerns emerging from my teaching encounters with immigrant early childhood student teachers, and their relentless effort to belong in their new context. Conceptualising their turmoil reflects the difficulties involved in and the sheer complexity of my students' attempts to be part of a new early childhood environment. They are filled with the anxiety of being misunderstood and misrepresented. Their anecdotal stories raise concerns about how otherness is conceptualised in general, by their colleagues and in the wider discourse of the early childhood sector. These students' struggles are reflected in the nature of this study as a theoretical discourse analysis. Rather than being based on actual empirical evidence, my analysis draws on the incidental stories shared by students during my teaching. These immigrant students were not participants in my study, and I rely on their stories as no more than an inspiration. As such I refer to them merely as an indication of possibilities, to inform my philosophical and theoretical analysis. I can only assume that their reluctance to commit to a more formal participation in this research project, in their raw, new immigrant stage of life, hints at the very complexity I aim to expose and deconstruct.

I am a foreigner. My own experiences and interpretations of immigrant otherness are deeply embedded in this research and further complicate and direct this study. Born in Australia into a German family, I have grown up in Aotearoa/New Zealand and have been living and teaching at various times in different cultures. I belong to different countries and continents, and everywhere I am other. Simultaneously craving homes and lives left behind and a new sense of home in new places, I feel myself in my students' stories. Our experiences together inform the tensions and concerns that urge my investigation.

The neoliberal social and political climate of the early childhood sector heightens the tensions and concerns in my research. Immigrant teachers embody a complex interplay between the neoliberal climate and the issues and discourse in which they are immersed. Each is simultaneously impacted by, and further impacts on, the other. Whilst my study is located within the wider early childhood education discourse, my analysis of tensions and concerns primarily focuses on *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), the Aotearoa/New Zealand national early childhood curriculum guidelines. I use *Te Whāriki* to represent the early childhood discourse, and I deconstruct elements of the text to analyse ways in which the discourse engages with the complex struggles of immigrant teachers' otherness. To acknowledge the breadth of immigrant struggles and the different elements of this

foundational educational document, each chapter of my thesis draws on specific sections of *Te Whāriki* to examine powerful, individually complex issues and tensions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The analysis in this study is situated in a feminist, philosophical paradigm. I examine diverse conceptualisations of otherness, and recognise the transformative effect of complex contextual factors by which they are impacted. My analysis is structured by a political, philosophical and feminist framework and the contributions of key authors through which I contest the dominant discourse, in relation to the concerns of each chapter. The following chapter overview outlines the theoretical frameworks and focus of each section of my thesis, as they respond to Kristeva's challenge.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

In Chapter 2, I provide a rationale for this study. This chapter highlights the importance of critically conceptualising otherness in early childhood education, and explains the genesis and development of my research. It locates the study in the practical and political context of Aotearoa/New Zealand, as a product of globalisation and migration and the diversity and complexity of teaching and teacher relationships in this bicultural and multicultural public and private realm (Ministry of Education, 1996; Nuttal, 2003; Ritchie & Rau, 2006). It further outlines my study as underpinned and impacted by the rapid expansion of early childhood education services and recognises some current political and economic tensions that shape policy and pedagogy, in relation to immigrant teachers and teaching teams (Duhn, 2010; Urban, 2008). The rationale emphasises the multiple contexts of the tensions and concerns that immigrant teachers struggle with.

The specific tensions and concerns outlined in this chapter and my orientation towards the overarching concern for immigrant teachers' formation as subjects are the point of departure for the analysis in the chapters that follow. This chapter provides an overview of the political, philosophical and critical feminist theoretical frameworks applied and of the contributions of specific key authors that complicate and facilitate the problematisation in the analysis. In this chapter, I relate the discourse analysis and my theoretical framework to the aims and context within which my study is grounded.

Kristeva's foreigners provide a philosophical entry point into the specific focus of each chapter, and Chapter 3, which is about knowledge and ignorance, marks the beginning of that relationship. Revealing the remarkableness and "non-banality in human beings" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 3), these foreigners illustrate the intensity of otherness. At times, they are totally exuberant, exhilaratingly free from their previous home, and, at other times, they are disconnected, depressed in their release from responsibility and earlier cares. This chapter

is the beginning of my engagement with Kristeva's seminal philosophical work in my theoretical analysis and conceptualisation of immigrant teachers' otherness.

The reverence of knowledge as a foundation for living with otherness is a key concern. My analysis of the notion of knowledge and the way it is understood as a necessary ground-stone for living with and being other reveals a dominant focus on knowledge in the early childhood discourse, in the critical multicultural literature and in *Te Whāriki* (Chan, 2009, 2011; May & Sleeter, 2010; Ministry of Education, 1996). In this chapter, I contest this reverence of knowledge and argue instead that it is absurd and impossible to presume that one can know the life of an other. This argument contradicts the way knowledge is presented in *Te Whāriki*: as an attribute that enables adults to effectively work with and celebrate diversity. I concur with Todd's (2004) suggestion that adopting a stance of ignorance, and suspending the presumption or expectation that we can, do or should know, may become a more responsible form of engagement with otherness. The tension between knowledge and ignorance critically disturbs the dominant aim of managing diversity by building knowledge.

In Chapter 4, I analyse the notions of home and homelessness. Kristeva's (1991) foreigners expose passionate and intense relationships with places and feelings of home, in a brief vignette introducing this chapter. Such relationships and notions of home are theorised in this chapter through informal stories of immigrant teachers' struggles and self-formation in their new early childhood settings. Indigenous relationships with the land are related to in this analysis, as the soils of significance binding groups of people, in a spiritual sense, to their physical home. Such relationships affirm the notion of home as an actual geographic place, and help to explicate an important tension around the notion of home. Throughout the analysis, home is variously conceptualised as a specific physical location, or alternatively, as a personally intrinsic sense of safety and comfort, created individually, intimately, within an individuals' soul and being (hooks, 2009; MacEinri, 1994; Silva, 2009; Wise, 2000).

In unsettling *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) representation of home as strongly embedded within the dominant interpretation of home as a physical location, I argue that there is scant recognition of the importance of the intrinsic value of an intimate personal sense of home. In conceptualising home as a place of comfort amidst the instability and chaos of immigrant otherness, I suggest that the absence of a sense of home indicates, in essence, an intimate sense, instead, of homelessness (Wise, 2000).

The focus of Chapter 5 is speech, and the use of dialogue as a tool for managing diversity. Kristeva's (1991) foreigners' fear of using speech, and reverting to silence in rejection or frustration, represents the concern emerging throughout my analysis, that engaging in dialogue is risky and revealing. A critical examination of the early childhood discourse, in relation to the nature and purpose of dialogue as a way of learning about and working with others, reveals a dominant fascination with dialogue as the magic cure for the problem of

diversity (Besley & Peters, 2011; Kilito, 1994; Todd, 2011). In this chapter, I examine a range of orientations, and expose a further tension. This tension reveals an opposing orientation to diversity, where it is seen as a natural part of social existence and a condition to be lived and worked with, rather than eliminated and overcome (Todd, 2011).

The analysis in this chapter highlights the vulnerability of engaging in dialogue, and of adopting dialogue as a safe and convenient cure for overcoming, or even engaging with, diversity. Different conceptualisations reveal dialogue as a risky encounter, which, if engaged with at a more than superficial level, may be too difficult to engage with at all. On the other hand, I suggest, dialogue may become relegated to convenient, easy surface level engagements with otherness, to avoid the commitment and exposure involved in making it meaningful. Furthermore, the analysis of dialogue reveals speech as an unpredictable communicative tool, in that a speaker's message is conveyed only once and as it is interpreted by the listener. I analyse conceptions of dialogue in relation to the early childhood discourse, highlighting the personal commitment and responsibility necessary for significant dialogic encounters.

Chapter 6 focuses on the notion of community and on concerns that mirror Kristeva's (1991) original challenge, of how to live and engage with and as others. In my analysis of conceptualisations of community, I draw on Benedict Anderson's (1991, 2006) notion of imagined communities as a foundation. His communities are always entities grounded in certain ideologies, geographies, membership or history, in contrast to another perspective arising in my analysis. This alternative view suggests that, rather than being an entity with certain ideological boundaries, community can be seen as an act of engagement, a "continuously on-going practice that negotiates a difficult ethical path" (Todd, 2004, p. 342). Conceptualised in this way, community is the actual act of the encounter, rather than the outcome of an encounter, or a state of belonging to a group.

The gravity of the tension emerging in this chapter becomes apparent in my analysis of the early childhood discourse and its recognition and promotion of community. Political and bicultural contextual lenses further complicate and add an indigenous dimension to understandings of community. A philosophical analysis of power relations in responsible acts of community further confounds the examination of community as a relational commitment and engagement.

In Chapter 7, the final chapter of this thesis, I re-confront Kristeva's (1991) utopian challenge to consider whether we can or cannot "live with the others, to live as *others*, without ostracism but also without levelling?" (p. 2, emphasis in the original). I summarise the aims, concerns and tensions explicated throughout the chapters of my study, in a final attempt to respond to her challenge. In particular response to Kristeva's emphatic suggestion that individuals' recognition of the foreigner within themselves spares them from detesting other foreigners is intensified in the summary of the tensions that emerge throughout this analysis.

Consciously or unconsciously, accepting immigrant others as Kristeva suggests, without ostracism and without levelling, remains an elusive aim, as I conclude that differences remain “genuinely complex and often contradictory” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 9). Presuming that there are straightforward solutions for living with and being other therefore also remains problematic. In what becomes neither victory nor conclusion, Kristeva’s suggestion lingers as a utopian quest for confronting otherness. The most frightening task of confronting ourselves as others persists as the transformative insight through which we may, perhaps, avoid ostracising or levelling in encounters with others.

CHAPTER 2 – RATIONALE: CONCEPTUALISING IMMIGRANT OTHERNESS

High levels of anxiety and distrust punctuate experiences of living with and as others (Ansley, 2010; Lewin et al., 2011; Rivalland & Nuttal, 2010; Silva, 2009). This chapter highlights the importance and urgency of critically conceptualising immigrant otherness in early childhood education. It outlines the issues underpinning my study and how they arose, and it contextualises them within the early childhood discourse of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In this rationale I introduce the theoretical and philosophical frameworks which I use to analyse the issues and concerns and the further tensions that they raise. The overlapping frameworks reflect the entangled and complex nature of the multiple discourses related to otherness. Together, they underpin the critical analysis from different epistemological perspectives, including the political and policy context; a philosophical perspective and a critical feminist perspective. Each of the theoretical perspectives contributes in a specific way, reciprocally informing and extending the concepts and the analysis. None of the frameworks is thus complete in itself, nor can they collectively be seen as addressing all political, philosophical or theoretical factors. I follow Foucault's idea of a critical ontology (Peters, 2007; Wong, 2007) in my examination of ideas to provoke different ways of thinking and acting. The selected perspectives are applied to disrupt conceptualisations of immigrant otherness, and to trigger fresh approaches within the context of early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

TROUBLING OTHERNESS: THE CONCERNS AND TENSIONS

THE GENESIS OF MY RESEARCH

In my classes, immigrant student teachers frequently share stories of their lives as others. One story recalled how one of them was sitting at the playdough table, with a three year old girl next to her rolling her dough into a flat shape. The student teacher commented that this reminded her of *roti*, and explained to the girl that that is the kind of bread she eats in her family, in her culture. When she realised what she had done, she quickly apologised to the girl and made sure that she could see her dad when he picked her up, to apologise to him for using her home language with his daughter, just in case the little girl used the word *roti* at home. On this occasion, other Indian early childhood student teachers who overheard her narration rallied around, eagerly sharing their own experiences. They spoke of feeling as if they could not speak their home language in their teaching, of trying to be somebody they really were not, just to fit in, in front of the children and families, and even more so, in front of the other teachers. A pressing urgency seemed to drive them, to tell more and more stories, about how it is for them, being Indian in Aotearoa/New Zealand, away from their old home, having chosen to create a new home here. Inspired by each other's stories, they seemed to be encouraged by the moment in which *they* were the natives, and I was the other, the alien,

separate from their shared consciousness and experiences. I was their lecturer, and I had a different story. These students' concerns, for their sense of themselves in their new teaching environments, shared in this and many discussions that followed, are the genesis of my research.

In a field where much of the existing literature recognises issues of diversity in early childhood settings, particularly amongst children, it seemed that there was a lot to learn about how immigrant teachers experience their cultural otherness in this context. I was interested in the impact of their experiences on their formation and reformation as teachers in this new non-home environment. As a lecturer, it is crucial to confront my own otherness, before I can endeavour to understand anybody else's, and I argue that this applies equally to early childhood teachers and the children they teach (Kristeva, 1991; Walsh, 2007). Still affected by the students' stories shared in class, and focusing on one major cultural group represented at our College as a starting point, I embarked on this research project. I framed it around two key aims, to develop an understanding of ways in which otherness is experienced by Indian immigrant teachers in early childhood education teaching teams; and to examine how the early childhood education discourse theorises otherness, and apply this to the teachers' experiences.

On the basis of these aims, I applied for and was granted ethics approval from the University and from the College where I teach, to involve Indian immigrant student teachers using focus groups and visual methodologies to explore their experiences, as an empirical grounding for my research. When only one student offered to participate, I lodged a second round of ethics applications seeking to support the study by involving immigrant student teachers from all nationalities. This attempt led to no further participants. I resolved, at this point, to focus on a philosophical and theoretical analysis of the discourse, and on contesting some of the tensions and concerns that were emerging in my immigrant students' informal stories in class. Perhaps these immigrant students' unwillingness to share their stories in a more formal way, through my research, was a further reflection of their struggles?

The theoretical nature of this research is thus a critical response to my initial attempts at involving participants in an empirical study. It embodies the uncertainty and frailty entangling immigrants' contexts, and resulting in the very tensions that become evident through my analysis of the concerns in my students' anecdotal stories. Perhaps their entire context inhibited their interest in committing to any further pressure (represented by my research project) than is absolutely necessary? I draw on my memories of their incidental stories, however, my immigrant students' non-participation in this research has necessitated that I occasionally refer to other research conducted in Aotearoa/New Zealand to support and ground my analysis.

Three research reports are of particular relevance. The New Zealand Council for Educational Research reports findings from a broad study of a range of early childhood settings in

Aotearoa/New Zealand (Mitchell & Brooking, 2007). This study provides me with some very general information about the attention given to multiculturalism in various settings. In addition, I draw on some of the findings of a research study jointly conducted by Massey University and the University of Waikato, which focuses on Indian immigrants' experiences of migrating to Aotearoa/New Zealand (Lewin et al., 2011). Whilst the participants in this study are not early childhood teachers, they nevertheless explicate some of the experiences of immigrant otherness, upheaval and regrouping that relates to my own and my students' experiences, and in this way they support my theorising of such experiences in my study. A third report to which I refer is a literature review and guidelines for appropriate practices for multicultural classrooms prepared for the Ministry of Education and Education New Zealand (Ho, Holmes, & Cooper, 2004). This report is concerned with practices in schools, and it is, therefore, relevant to my study in terms of the pedagogical constructs it examines, rather than in terms of the actual contextual considerations it promotes.

POWERLESSNESS AND RESIGNATION – IMMIGRANT TEACHERS' CONCERNS

My students' "powerlessness and fatalistic resignation" (Osgood, 2006, p.7), inferred from their stories shared in our classes, permeate my engagements with them in their work and studies. This study responds to concerns arising for me as I connect these immigrant teachers' struggles and overwhelming sensations of being new and different with the early childhood education discourse by which they are surrounded. My research is an analytical attempt to disturb and reconstruct epistemological insights into immigrant otherness and subject formation, in the early childhood context of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This study theorises aspects of the stories shared by students and of my own experiences as an immigrant teacher, as underpinnings for my analysis of the discourse. As a teacher with a range of cultural backgrounds and family connections, having grown up speaking my German mother tongue and living within Australian, German and New Zealand cultural and educational histories, beliefs and rituals, my students' concerns resonate with me. The early childhood teacher referred to in the following story is thus a metaphorical representation of myself and my students, and of our collective and individual experiences as strangers in our own teaching.

My memories of students' stories include many more situations similar to that retold above, where the immigrant student teacher is unable to use her own language with the children, ostensibly, to avoid confusing children's language development. Such exclusion causes her to feel increasingly alienated, so that she no longer trusts herself or her judgement. Her language represents her selfhood, creates and characterises her, and connects her to her origins. It is a significant part of her. Teaching is also a significant part of her; in many cases, it is her reason for shifting to this country. She is passionately committed to children's learning, to sharing her own learning, and to creating opportunities to stimulate children's curiosity and connections. All of these elements are vital in her teaching.

The stories speak of cultural rituals being similarly discouraged. Disheartened, the immigrant teacher must now reconsider her approaches to almost all daily practices: eating habits, dress, hygiene and toileting habits, and religious rituals. Underneath these visible cultural differences, she constantly grapples with very different orientations to ways of life and teaching young children, something she thought she already knew well. With growing uncertainty, she nervously reconsiders on a daily basis what she can and cannot allow herself to do or be, with the children. Her energy goes into fearfully analysing what might be considered too strange, and what might be allowed. Acceptably strange acts become quirky enrichments of the curriculum, rather than valued as genuine pedagogical contributions. She would like to give herself fully to the activity of teaching children to become confident contributors to their (increasingly diverse) society, as desired by the curriculum guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1996), and she sees developing connections with children on the basis of cultural similarities, across differences, as a reciprocally rewarding and terribly important relational and educational activity.

Now, however, she feels she must create a barrier. She feels that her world must not be shared with the children. Real or imaginary restrictions imposed by others who do not or cannot accept her ways, or share her interest in her language, culture or heritage, force her into deep uncertainty. Surrendering to her insecurity, as she forms herself as a teacher and citizen in her new environment, she nostalgically remembers her abandoned home and people. And yet she desperately seeks to feel at home in her new country. She feels less alien when she can connect with others from her homeland, is excited by opportunities to share, relate and relax, just for a moment of connected familiarity. Feeling powerless, she seems to seek not only affirmation, but direction, belonging and a little stability. Only with trepidation does she feel able to discuss her concerns with her colleagues, and most certainly she feels unable to approach her superiors. In most cases in her culture, she has learnt that she must accept the ways of superiors, regardless of the inner turmoil this causes her. She is grateful to them for employing her as a teacher; however, she finds herself increasingly riding on a precipice of uncertainty and doubt. Is her teaching unvalued? What contribution is she allowed to make and when is she overstepping the established boundaries of the known and the comfortable? What is the point of her teaching, when she must mask her own self, and teach at a superficial, easy, false level that appears not to threaten others? All of the fears and uncertainties that arise as a result of our joint stories, about how to know oneself, about a sense of belonging and home, about speaking with others and being listened to, and about being able to live with and as others in a new environment, thus underpin and drive this study.

On the basis of my experiences of these stories, I am concerned with recognising the practical and ontological implications of the everyday struggles of being other. These struggles are reflected in the stories about early childhood settings, where these immigrant

teachers are foreign to others, and becoming increasingly foreign to themselves, but where they keenly want to feel at home. The stories shared reflect teachers who are nervous about serving food to children, singing songs to children, playing games and nursery rhymes with children, which do not reflect, or at times even oppose, the values and rituals they know from their previous homes and lives.

CONCERNS IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD DISCOURSE

Concerns within the early childhood discourse exacerbate the concerns relating to immigrant student teachers' anecdotal stories noted above. These concerns highlight what appears to be a lack of attention to the struggles and complexities of immigrant teachers' otherness in the early childhood education sector in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In this study, I focus on *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), the national early childhood curriculum guidelines, supported by a range of literature, to represent the early childhood discourse in ways that are relevant to the specific focus of the analysis in each chapter. In terms of recognising immigrant teachers' struggles, *Te Whāriki*, for example, acknowledges that adults must "recognise their own beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes" (p. 30), that children's wellbeing is dependent on adults' "wellbeing and culture" (p. 42), and that adults should have a "clear understanding of the context in which they are working" (p. 41). Some recognition of the implications of teachers' conceptions of themselves and of their setting is thus evident, even though there is no specific consideration of teachers as distinct from other adults in the setting. In addition, there appears to be an assumption that adults (teachers) who recognise their own beliefs and attitudes have a certain level of wellbeing that is conducive to fostering children's wellbeing. My crucial argument is that there is a lack of recognition of and provision for the particular issues and concerns of immigrant teachers and their otherness. Specific concerns relating to *Te Whāriki* and the early childhood discourse are detailed in the chapters that follow, framing the problematisation of otherness arising in each.

One key concern that permeates the early childhood discourse, and that specifically arises in *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), is the call for celebrating diversity. The analysis throughout this study demonstrates that a critical consciousness of otherness depends on differences being seen as more than "benign variation (diversity)" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 193), which bypasses power, history and socio-political reality in favour of an empty, comfortable, harmonious acknowledgement. I argue, therefore, that celebrations and a superficial recognition of diversity barely skim the surface of the complexities involved in living with and being other. Instead, I suggest that they serve and represent the hegemonic realities and ideologies of those in power, and result in further othering of the subjugated foreigners ostensibly being celebrated (Ahmed, 2000; hooks, 2009; Kristeva, 1991). The fluidity of the concerns with this orientation in the early childhood discourse is emphasised by the way this argument relates to and is expanded on throughout my analysis.

CRITICAL MULTICULTURALISM

The early childhood education concerns within my study are heightened by aspects of the critical multiculturalism literature, which largely rely on and promote knowledge building and developing cross cultural understanding as an orientation and strategy for working within culturally diverse contexts (Chan, 2009; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May & Sleeter, 2010; K. H. Robinson & Diaz, 2006; Walsh, 2007). In this investigation, I argue that this is a futile aim, as the complex differences and unpredictable realities of multiple and diverse cultures are essentially unknowable, and that such an expectation thus sabotages the outcomes simultaneously espoused by the literature. The critical multicultural educational discourse is also largely concerned with children's cultural otherness, thus intensifying the urgency of an investigation into teachers' cultural otherness. The focus of critical multicultural literature is thus not only a concern but also a theoretical point of departure for contesting common conceptualisations and expectations, and for highlighting the intricacy and unpredictability of immigrant teachers' otherness. This focus is the foundation point for questioning conceptions of otherness in terms of the politics, philosophy and relationships in early childhood education.

POLITICAL CONCERNS

From a political perspective, my research is concerned with and responds to the globalised, neoliberal condition in which it is situated in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I recognise and acknowledge political and societal influences on the rapid expansion of early childhood education services, as both economically and educationally driven machines, leading to uncertainty and tensions in policy and pedagogy that affect teachers and teaching teams (Codd, 2008; Duhn, 2010; Urban, 2008). A critical awareness of this contextual condition is necessary to consciously and critically interact with and within it. The concern for immigrant teachers and their formation as subjects within such a fundamentally and continually changing environment underlies the examinations of the contextual uncertainty and unpredictability within this study. Zygmunt Bauman (2009) conceptualises the fluid, postmodern nature of this condition through a notion he calls liquid modernity. This condition heightens the concerns of my study through its influence on the relationships within which others are situated, known about, recognised, lived and worked with.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

My focus on specific experiences and situations, pathways and processes of becoming and being the other in a new country locates my research within a third wave feminist and critical ontology paradigm, or within what Mohanty (2003) considers as feminism without borders, concerned not with set parameters of belonging, but with questions of solidarity, experience and identity (Gillis, Howie, & Munford, 2004; Mohanty, 2003; Peters, 2007; Rockler-Gladen, 2007). I apply feminist, philosophical constructs by drawing on a Foucauldian interpretation

of discourse, as representing not only texts, policy and literature but also, where possible, the “ideological influences and ambitions of the texts” (Doherty, 2007, p. 195), to shape my use of discourse analysis. My theoretical frameworks are critically applied in relation to various discourses surrounding cultural otherness and the political and professional landscape in which it occurs. Informed by elements of critical theory and critical constructivist paradigms (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), I focus on the discourse rather than on specific linguistic features of the literature, to reframe conceptions of being and living with otherness. From a critical constructivist perspective, the outcomes of this discourse analysis support the reconceptualisation of otherness, and urge further on-going critique to accommodate the constant evolution of the discourses. By placing the research within these methodological paradigms, I acknowledge the ineluctable influence of certain truths and values, including my own, in the research aims, overall intention, analysis of the literature, and conclusions reached (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

The discourses I analyse arise throughout the literature, curriculum guidelines and associated research I use to support my political, philosophical and feminist theoretical frameworks. I recognise the non-universality of discourse, the possibility of tensions between discourses, and their hierarchical, power driven nature (Punch, 2009). Throughout my study, discourses can thus be seen as inextricably interwoven situations and contexts of immigrant otherness, and theories which engage with these contexts. The perspectives, conflicts and hierarchies arising in these discourses force me to view them as a wide and evolving structure in which to contest the complex meanings of otherness and immigrant teachers’ subject formation, and, also, to recognise the limitations of time and space on this current project.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

POLITICAL FRAMEWORK: THE LIQUID MODERN CONDITION

The importance of Bauman’s (2009) work in my research is his interpretation and explanation of the neoliberal postmodern condition as liquid modernity. He describes this condition as embodying the unpredictable, unreliable nature of society, where stiff standards are abandoned, all tastes are catered for, but none privileged or perfected, and fitfulness and flexibility are encouraged, to the detriment of perseverance, consistency and long term commitments. In this condition, education holds on precariously to its importance in raising future citizens and preparing them for life in a society, which itself is barely able to adjust to the rapidly changing circumstances with which it is surrounded. In liquid modernity, the very art of life itself is in constant disarray, over-saturated with unprocessed information, in constant competition with itself in its complicated variations and seductions. This notion encompasses the philosophical and theoretical lenses in my analysis, drawing them together and compensating for their inability to be applied individually or in strictly separated categories.

Bauman's liquid modern condition provides a useful backdrop to the societal, political and economic influences in my study. Culture, he says, for example, is becoming an "all you need and might dream of department store" (Bauman, 2009, p. 158), designed to seduce the consumer-citizens with ever improved goods, which they are convinced they need.

Purposely un-durable, the commodities of life are designed to support a throw away culture, where life decisions are revocable, and long term commitments are rare, and avoided as too final. Reversibility and flexibility are key and settled stable habits or preferences become handicaps, in this volatile world of erratic change and momentary relevance. Similar to postmodernity, Bauman sees liquid modernity as a contrast to solid modernity, which is a condition focused on order, predictability and consistency. In a state of solid modernity, government policy provides a stable environment in which life determining decisions can be made in the knowledge that conditions and rules are dependable and consistent (Bauman, 2009; Marotta, 2002). In contrast, the dominant state of post-, or liquid modernity, requires citizens to constantly transcend fluid boundaries, to embrace or at least cope with the ambivalence, unknowability or non-existence of fixed, stable ideals and standards.

THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CONTEXT

Neoliberal government policy exacerbates my fundamental concern for immigrant early childhood education teachers. For many, such policy, for example, encouraged the diasporic shift to Aotearoa/New Zealand, to fulfil the demand for teachers in a rapidly expanding early childhood education sector (Immigration New Zealand, 2010; Tan, 2011). An intention to promote participation and professionalism in early childhood education, and accompanying government promises and policy in the past decade, demonstrate the impact of the liquid modern, consumer oriented educational environment. Recent policy shifts and amendments have altered the terrain for immigrant early childhood teachers, reinforcing and overtly illustrating this neoliberally fickle landscape (Codd, 2008; Duhn, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2002). An original expectation of 100% fully qualified teachers in early childhood centres, has recently been downgraded to 80% of all teachers (Ministry of Education, 2011). Furthermore, in November 2011, early childhood teachers were removed from their priority position on the immigration authority's essential skills in demand list (Immigration New Zealand, 2011). True to the condition, little appears to be fixed or stable in space or time, and the changing professional arena appears to be, above all, a "theatre of self-invention" and "the migrant ... the exemplar of postmodernist humanity" (MacEinri, 1994, p. 3).

I use *Te Whāriki* as the voice of the political orientation to early childhood education and practice. Whilst my analysis is not an in-depth critique of the curriculum document or its intentions, it is, nevertheless, an undoing of certain parts of the text (Ministry of Education, 1996; Rhedding-Jones, 2002). More specifically, it is an undoing of interpretations of the meanings of the text, by which I aim to trigger fresh orientations and approaches to otherness in early childhood education. The concerns and tensions to which this study responds frame this undoing in the political, public discourse, and its apparent acceptance of

diversity as simple, rich and valuable. The critical, specific intensities of immigrant otherness that are lost in such an orientation, and that complicate how it should or should not be celebrated, reinforce the importance of raising consciousness and broadening awareness of its concerns, struggles and contexts.

Undeniably impacted by the historical and political context, my analysis is rooted in the bi- and multicultural public and private realm of Aotearoa/New Zealand, specifically linked with the early childhood discourse through the curriculum guidelines and supporting literature (Ministry of Education, 1996; Nuttal, 2003; Ritchie & Rau, 2006). The bicultural foundations and obligations inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi reflect indigenous conceptions of relationships and belonging and of the milieu within which my analysis is embedded (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2008). My investigation is complicated and grounded by indigenous conceptions of belonging to spaces and places, and to *Te Ao Māori* (Māori world views) of relational responsibilities and engagements (Ritchie & Rau, 2006).

PHILOSOPHICAL FRAMEWORK

My research is complicated by specific philosophical notions, which I draw on to open cracks and fissures in commonly applied understandings and practices of living with and being other. I do so, on the basis that the task of philosophy is to critically analyse the world and the places and spaces of individuals and communities within it (Foucault, 1982). I adopt Marshall's (2007) interpretation of problematisation as the treatment of thought as a problem by which to contest certain domains, fields or actions. He suggests that the notion of problematisation provides alternative ways forward, leading to reconceptualisations and enabling a sidestepping of common ideologies and polemics. I use a problematising lens in this study to contest and rethink conceptions of otherness, non-linear encounters and living or working with otherness. This philosophical orientation adds criticality to my examination of ideas about the nature and manifestations of immigrant teachers' otherness. The philosophical contributions of Kristeva and Foucault are particularly significant in my analysis.

JULIA KRISTEVA: PHILOSOPHICAL FOREIGNNESS

Kristeva's foreigners are embedded throughout my investigation as a "polyphony of voices" (Schultz, 1994, p. 316), illustrating the intimate rawness, frustrations and delights of foreignness. They are juxtaposed with notions of immigrant otherness in the liquid modern context, in an interplay intended to contest and challenge conceptions and understandings of foreigners and otherness. In Kristeva's (1991) positioning of foreigners against those who belong, she refers to those who are not foreign as the natives. Without intending to misrepresent indigeneity (Smith, 2007), nor to "negatively normalise" (Rhedding-Jones, 2001, p. 141) the term, I follow her use of the term natives in this study.

The urgency arising from Kristeva's (1991) study of foreignness reinforces the importance of this study (Lechte & Zournazi, 2003; Schultz, 1994; Stone, 2004). In her chapter *Toccata*

and fugue for the foreigner, she juxtaposes foreigners delighting in their freedom with others despairing in their displacement (alluding strongly to the overall subject of the book in which it appears, *Strangers to Ourselves*, and leading relentlessly towards the utopian task of recognising the foreigner within). Kristeva's (1991) defined ontological positioning of foreigners directly opposes the fluid, undefined neoliberal constructs of otherness and liquid modernity. By framing my chapters with Kristeva's abstract, defined foreigners, I intentionally create this conflictual space between the strength and certainty of their wildly contrasting perceptions and the uncertainty of Bauman's (2009) liquid modernity with which they are opposed. It is within this space that the tensions concerning immigrant otherness in early childhood education are played out in each chapter of this thesis. I acknowledge that Kristeva's study of foreigners represents only a portion of her wider work, however, her polyphonic foreigners are central to my analysis as crucial catalysts for my confrontation and theorising of otherness (Stone, 2004).

In her examination, Kristeva uses 'he' to describe all foreigners, and I adhere to this in the illustrations of her foreigners with which I begin each chapter (Johnson, 2002). In recognition of the highly gendered nature of the discourse and the strongly female dominated practice of early childhood education, I use 'she' to refer to immigrant teachers in this study (Gunn et al., 2004; Ministry of Education, 2010; M. Robinson, 2010). In taking this stance, I recognise also that experiences of otherness are themselves often extremely gendered and complicated (Ahmed, 2000; Deutscher, 2002; Gunn et al., 2004; Mohanty, 2003).

MICHEL FOUCAULT: ON-GOING SUBJECT FORMATION

The importance of Foucault's work in this research lies in his study of individuals' subject formation. According to Foucault (1982), "[t]here are two meanings of the word 'subject': subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge" (p. 781). I follow Foucault's position on the subject, to refer to immigrant others in my analysis as constituted and formed by their own backgrounds and norms, and by the specific conditions in which they are immersed (Juniper & Jose, 2008). My concerns with how the immigrant others form themselves and their lives in their new situations are analysed through these conceptions.

Foucault's (1982) engagement with power relations also guides the ways in which I analyse the discourse. He identifies three forms of struggle inherent in power relations, as struggles against domination, exploitation, and subjection. These struggles inform my study as they relate to tales of immigrant teachers struggling with being bound by their own decisions, and thus to the conditions within which they are located as a result of their decisions. All three forms of struggle are embedded in my thesis. I concur with Foucault (1982) in considering power as inherently complicated and requiring constant critical engagement, and my analysis recognises the inescapable power relations subjecting individuals to and over one another in their encounters.

CRITICAL FEMINIST FRAMEWORK

The theoretical frameworks through which I conduct my analysis draw on critical feminist literature to complicate specific concerns examined in each chapter. The feminist perspectives I use complement the critical lens offered by the political and philosophical perspectives, by theorising anecdotal stories of immigrant otherness as a source of knowledge (Braidotti, 2009). I use these perspectives to add to Western early childhood education scholarship, by applying non-Western feminist voices to the analysis. Mohanty (2003) promotes this orientation. She values feminist theory and practices on three levels, on a day to day practical level in the development of identities and community; in collective actions and visions aimed at social transformation; and in applying a creative and critical edge at a theoretical, scholarly level. In the absence of participants and empirical data in this study, the powerful “conjunction between personal experience and theorizing” (Braidotti, 2009, p. 4) presented by these feminist theories is applied to intensify the theoretical conceptions and critical conceptualisations of belonging, being other, acceptance, appreciation and rejection with which this study is concerned. My use of feminist approaches to inform my study is not intended specifically to draw attention to male/female binary oppositions, but to take from them the respect for detail and personal implications that they offer.

Several authors contribute significantly to the feminist perspectives informing this analysis. Sharon Todd (2004, 2007, 2011) critiques and engages with the dominant discourse and policy, focusing on ethical and moral issues of social justice, freedom, commitment and responsibility in education and in encounters with difference. Her critical integration of feminist and philosophical principles significantly contributes to my analysis by disturbing conceptions of knowledge and the unknowable, speech and silences and of notions of community. Jeanette Rhedding-Jones' (2001, 2002) concerns with issues of inherited localised otherness inform this analysis, through her argument for transformational conceptualisations, rather than superficial integration. Through her study of immigrant teacher otherness in Norway, she represents the complex realities of otherness in an early childhood and academic context, thus aligning closely with the experiences of immigrant otherness that I am concerned with. Her contribution to this study also underlies the undoing of *Te Whāriki* as a ministerial policy and text. Kumarini Silva (2009) and Macgregor Wise (2000) add critical perspectives to my analysis of home and conceptualisations of a sense of home, exposing complex issues and contesting the dominant understandings of home as a physical place.

Instead of seeking collective simplicity or homogenous sameness, these critical feminist perspectives urge a conscious acknowledgement of and engagement with difference as an inevitable complicated connection amongst others. They adopt an unreservedly critical approach towards dominant perspectives and offer insights to the examination of the issues and tensions of being other. These perspectives offer critical narratives of historical, political

and social experiences, moving beyond race and ethnicity, and promoting sensitive engagements with complex, murky otherness.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The importance of a critical engagement with the proliferation of difference that multicultural settings generate is heightened by concerns with the impact of apparently simplistic dominant practices, norms and assumptions on immigrant realities. In this rationale, I have highlighted the urgency of this study and shown how I will attend to my analysis of the concerns and tensions outlined throughout the following chapters. The analysis in this study reflects and responds to my central focus on perceptions and experiences of otherness within the early childhood education discourse. It contests specific contexts and “feelings of powerlessness and fatalistic resignation” (Osgood, 2006, p. 7) and critically disturbs the acceptance of simple and easy solutions to solve the problem of diversity. My study is driven by Kristeva’s striking explications of foreignness and the impact they have on conceptions of otherness, and by a relentless search for appropriate engagements with and as the other.

CHAPTER 3 - KNOWLEDGE AND IGNORANCE

Foreigner: a choked up rage deep down in my throat, a black angel clouding transparency, opaque, unfathomable spur. The image of hatred and of the other, a foreigner is neither the romantic victim of our clannish indolence nor the intruder responsible for all the ills of the polis (Kristeva, 1991, p. 1).

Kristeva's (1991) foreigners introduce the delights and concerns of otherness, which are analysed throughout this and the following chapters. Her ruminations are mirrored by Foucault's (1982) claim that "[f]inally, all ... struggles revolve around the question: Who are we" (p. 781)? This chapter draws the focus to the intricate interplay of Kristeva's abstract foreigners, with the examination of concerns and tensions of immigrant otherness in the early childhood discourse that follows. The analysis in this chapter contests the importance of knowing and understanding the other and proposes an alternative orientation instead, of ignorance.

KRISTEVA'S FOREIGNERS

INTOXICATINGLY FREE

Totally immersed in the "happiness of tearing away, of racing, the space of a promised infinite" (Hoffman, as cited in Kristeva, 1991, p. 9), the newly independent foreigner has already transcended what previously was, abandoned familiarity and is now a self disengaged by his uprooting. Instead of mourning his loss, this newly independent foreigner has become other, engulfed in the intoxication of independence, freedom from orders, responsibilities, inhibitions and restrictions by which he was previously controlled. Off the rails now, he loosely follows unknown, previously unimagined tracks, inventing, coping with, trying, failing and reinventing new ways of being.

Whether he is a nomad, escaping or in exile, he is permanently on tour. He may originate from different places, having cut loose, from a time, place and life, to escape and start fresh, from nothing. He revels in being a nobody in a new place, paying scant attention to his history, records, or direction. With an unclear or, as yet, undefined new life purpose, the nomadic loose foreigner lives by different meanings to the natives (Kristeva, 1991).

MASKED AND PROTECTED

Kristeva's (1991) foreigner masks his sensitivity, whilst internally he "bleeds body and soul" (p. 6) from the humiliation, isolation, degradation, of a new world where he is the underdog. Is his mask an image to the outer world, sheltering the thickening skin growing beneath, protecting him in a bubble as he develops new emotional strength and immunity to see him through? Unattached and uncaring, he can then allow himself to make judgements, secure in his own superiority. Neither really true, nor completely false, underneath his mask, he

revels in chaotic states of transience, freely attuning to new loves and hates, short term commitments and tasks, deeply self-absorbed and narcissistic, with no one public or private identity. In love with his distance, for now he remains blissfully foreign, blissfully depressed, constantly roaming, un-belonging and commitment free. Riding out the highs and lows associated with becoming in a new context, struggling with remnants of the past, and integrating them into his ever evolving present, Kristeva's foreigner reveals the remarkableness and "non-banality in human beings" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 3). His essential unknowability is central to this chapter.

WHO IS THE OTHER: THE CONCERNS WITH KNOWLEDGE

IMMIGRANT TEACHER CONCERNS

The concerns arising from my engagements with immigrant teachers' anecdotal stories tell similarly non-banal tales of complicated struggles, of constantly constructing and reconstructing themselves as teachers. Their new early childhood contexts range from superficially accepting these teachers' differences, to reacting with overt hostility and rejection. Their struggles are the key concern underpinning this analysis of the importance of knowledge, for living with and being other.

"I can never speak my own language with the children", "I have to apologise to her father, for using my home language with his girl, just in case he hears her repeat it at home", "I wanted to make my roti bread today, but I can't because they don't know it. So I made scones – that was ok", are some of my memories of my immigrant students' stories. Their frustration comes back to me, as I remember such tales as "they don't understand anything about me and what's important to me...they don't even hear me", and "we have cultural days...and they want me to wear my traditional dress. I don't want to, I already feel so different anyway", frequently shared as snippets of their stories in our class discussions. Many issues arise from my memories of these immigrant teachers' conversations, as they reveal tensions in and across conceptions of difference in their early childhood settings. These tensions raise the possibility that fear and trepidation may underlie immigrant teachers' approaches to their teaching and to all of their acts and engagements in the early childhood setting. Beginning with, but even beyond, stirring resentment, being celebrated as exotic, or being seen as quirky enrichments to the environment, the struggles with which immigrant others wrestle in their new contexts are the key concerns of this chapter. They exemplify the overwhelming and indefinable complexity of each individuals' inherited and constructed self, hardly knowable to themselves, and infinitely too complex to be knowable by another.

CONCERNS WITH THE EARLY CHILDHOOD DISCOURSE

Concerns within the early childhood discourse intensify the concerns raised by my memories of my students' issues with the apparent lack of attention to the complexities of their otherness. As a practical symbol of this discourse, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996)

relies heavily on the development of knowledge to support curriculum activities intended to positively engage with difference. For example, it requires adults to acknowledge “different family styles”, and to have “knowledge of the cultures of the children in the programme” (p. 55). Furthermore, adults must possess certain “knowledge and...a clear understanding of the context in which they are working” (p. 41), and assessment practices rely on “knowledgeable adults” (p. 29) to carry out observations. A broad, all-encompassing knowledge is portrayed in these statements as the vital foundation for appropriate curriculum delivery. Venturing further into the realm of culturally knowing others, it promotes “gaining knowledge of language and cultural tools” (p. 19) to enhance understandings of others, and it states that adults “should have a knowledge of Māori definitions of health and wellbeing” (p. 46) and be able to translate these meanings into practice. I argue that these expectations in the curriculum document are unrealistic, as they insufficiently recognise the complicated reality of culturally knowing others, and the specificity of the knowledge that adults are expected to have. These expectations signal a lack of appreciation of the real and difficult issues and concerns with which immigrant teachers struggle as others in a foreign environment.

In recognising the complexity of difference, a central concern arising in the early childhood curriculum, that is the expectation that diversity in early childhood environments should be celebrated, appears both premature and insensitive. *Te Whāriki* claims that “[t]he early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences, and aims to help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 18). In the analysis in this chapter, I argue that celebrating cultural differences is a premature expectation and of questionable value. Furthermore, I argue that the curriculum guidelines appear unconcerned about teachers’ own cultural wellbeing and stability, which underlie their ability to affirm children’s differences by celebrating them. Therefore my argument is, that presuming to know others well enough for celebrations to be meaningful is an elusive goal, and that such celebrations represent the hegemonic realities and ideologies of those in power in early childhood settings. I suggest that such celebrations are unable to support the wellbeing of all cultural others in the setting, and that they inadvertently become ostracising or levelling practices, instead of the positively inclusive experiences they are (most likely) intended to be. This argument adds to the tension between being able to know the other, and what I argue is a more realistic and sensitive alternative, the acceptance of a state of unknowing and confusion. Through analysing this tension, I explore the quintessential unknowability of otherness, and the alternative orientation of ignorance.

The importance of knowledge is compellingly endorsed in the multicultural discourse on teaching and learning in culturally diverse educational settings. Heightening the concerns arising in this study, knowledge is revered in the multicultural literature as the necessary skill

which will enable teachers to effectively work with and within culturally diverse contexts (Chan, 2009; Ho et al., 2004; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May & Sleeter, 2010; K. H. Robinson & Diaz, 2006; Walsh, 2007). Similarly to the early childhood discourse, the educational critical multicultural discourse promotes celebrations of diversity in educational settings. Following my aim to raise awareness of the complexity and unpredictability of immigrant teachers' otherness, my analysis throughout this chapter thus draws on orientations in this critical multicultural discourse as a foundation point from which I complicate and further problematise the examination.

CONTESTING KNOWLEDGE – AN ANALYSIS

A POLITICAL, LIQUID MODERN CONTEXT OF KNOWING THE OTHER

The neoliberal political backdrop of the liquid modern Aotearoa/New Zealand context underlies and strengthens my analysis and discussion of knowing or not knowing the other in two ways (Bauman, 2009; Codd, 2008). The liquid modern condition embraces and produces a state of unknowing, rather than of knowing, based as it is on constant evolution, disruption and uncertainty. One way in which it impacts on knowing another is that it directly opposes definable boundaries to cultural, social or historical knowledge and thus this entire context is pitted against an epistemological orientation of being able to know and understand an individual. It recognises that “there are no longer fixed categories, whether external realities or in the construction of the self” (MacEinri, 1994, p. 3). Immigrant teachers struggling with the unsteadiness of their new realities and their formation of themselves therefore embody and reinforce the indeterminate nature both of themselves as others and of society.

Similarly, liquid modern society also amplifies my argument of the unknowability of educational contexts, as it symbolises a state where knowledge is constantly redefined and defied with new inventions of the truth. *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) call for adults to know and clearly understand “the context in which they are working” (p. 41), represents a broad expectation for adults to be familiar with their social, cultural and political environment and with its impact on the early childhood setting. Clearly, there is a misalignment between this simple statement and the multifaceted “volatile world of instant and erratic change” (Bauman, 2009, p. 160) representing the contexts and society in which early childhood settings operate. Liquid modernity thus complicates the apparently straight forward expectations of the early childhood discourse. My own and my students' intimate engagements with this uncertain social reality therefore substantiate the futility of presuming to be able to know, in the neoliberal liquid modern context. I argue that a state of liquid modernity defies the aspirations for possessing the knowledge and understanding, whether of individuals or of contexts, that is inherent in “conventional modes of togetherness” (Todd, 2004, p. 349). The early childhood discourse represents such conventional orientations, seemingly contradicting the very condition it seeks to represent.

POLICY SHIFTS

The uncertainty of how the liquid modern condition impacts on the knowability of others, and of society, is demonstrated, for example, in unexpected government policy shifts. Immigrant early childhood teachers experienced this fickleness first hand in a recent shift in immigration policy, which first elevated the profession of early childhood teacher onto the skills based priority list, only to remove it whilst some were still in the throes of immigration (Immigration New Zealand, 2010). In a political climate where there has ostensibly been a central educational aim for democratic citizenship, other similar shifts include changes to requirements in the ratio of qualified teachers in early childhood settings and funding cuts (Codd, 2008; McLachlan, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2011). The erratic unsettledness and need to change personal plans caused by these policy shifts demonstrated vividly the necessity to adapt to short term commitments, adaptable rules and fluidity, which characterise the liquid modern society (Bauman, 2009; Marotta, 2002). Immigrant teachers are the actors in the early childhood “theatre of self-invention” (MacEinri, 1994, p. 3) and they must act within fluctuating policy statements focused increasingly on economic rather than citizenship objectives. Knowledge cannot be universalised in such a context, which not only welcomes, but depends on, complex cultural others to affirm and perpetuate the ambivalence of its fundamentally unknowable condition (Bauman, 2009; Marotta, 2002). To reify knowledge in this condition is to suggest the impossible, and could result in a lack of concern for knowledge, and an unintended lack of commitment to any policy objectives at all.

BICULTURAL KNOWING

The question of knowing the other is firmly embedded within the indigenesness of the bicultural socio-political landscape of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Kolig, 2006; Nuttal, 2003; Ritchie & Rau, 2006). Increasing emphasis is placed on redefining the boundaries of Māoriness, reaffirming *te reo Māori* as the indigenous language, and on developing distinctly bicultural practices in educational contexts (Ritchie & Rau, 2006; State Services Commission, n.d.). Immigrant early childhood teachers are thus thrust into a dichotomous landscape where the ordered ideals of bicultural aspirations, focused on developing particular skills and knowledge, contrast with the blurred and uncertain expectations of the neoliberal, liquid modern educational climate (Codd, 2008; Duhn, 2010; Urban, 2008). Conflicting spaces thus arise not only between knowing and not knowing, but between the poles of indigenous knowledge and *Māori* protocols and dominant *Pakeha* early childhood contexts.

This analysis of knowing immigrant otherness and the context of immigrant teachers’ otherness, in the political arena of liquid modern society, is further complicated by obligations to infuse it with this bicultural knowledge (Ministry of Education, 1996). The tension between the knowable and the unknowable supports the argument that even suggesting the possibility of one specific important knowledge for early childhood settings is simplistic and disrespectful of others. In this environment, multiple truths and situations, and unpredictable,

uncertain protocols and policy produce unpredictable and unknowable subjects (Duhn, 2010; Fenech & Sumsion, 2007; Marotta, 2002; Moss, 2006). Their on-going formation epitomises this disequilibrium of the surrounding political context.

A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF KNOWING THE OTHER

IMMIGRANT TEACHERS' SUBJECT FORMATION

Nietzsche (as cited in Peters, 2007), stated “of ourselves we are not ‘knowers’...” (p. 181), a point reinforced by engagement with my students’ anecdotal stories and by Kristeva’s (1991) utopian challenge to become other to ourselves. Kristeva’s foreigner and immigrant others in Aotearoa/New Zealand embody not only the border-crossing (Ponzanesi, 2002), shifting norms and continuing re-categorisation by which the liquid modern social order is defined (Bauman, 2009), but also the impermanent and on-going nature and formation of individual subjects, influenced and constituted by the power and government within which they are situated (Juniper & Jose, 2008). Foucault refers to the constant formation and critique of one’s self as a subject as critical ontology, and suggests that such inquiry can take a number of forms, including inquiry into how individuals constitute themselves as subjects, how they are constituted by the power relations with which they are surrounded, and how they form themselves as subjects by their own actions (Wong, 2007). All of these categories indicate an engagement with a transient form of knowledge about the subject. They highlight the unfixed nature of power relations and truths, and the complex, individualised historical, social and political influences on the formation of subjects. “How are we constituted as subjects of our own knowledge?” Foucault posits, and “How are we constituted as subjects who exercise or submit to power relations?” and also “How are we constituted as moral subjects of our own actions?” (Foucault, as cited in Wong, 2007, p. 77), demonstrating in this constant critical enquiry the interrelated influences on the formation of individual subjects.

Immigrant teachers are formed as subjects by their own inherited, personal, moral manner and beliefs, as well as by the ways in which they are governed within their context (for example, by *Te Whāriki*), in this on-going process of becoming and self-formation (Besley, 2007). Villenas (2000) claims, that individuals are subjugated to social and political influences, and constantly written by their culture, in a process of normalising the acceptable, and othering what is not. To illustrate, for example, instead of writing themselves, bare-breasted women are written by the dominant culture as acceptably exotic and photographable, to be displayed in National Geographic magazines, but not as writers, anthropologists, or any other valued contributor to Western normalised society. If we privilege knowing and knowledge, which part of this othered subject should we expect to know? At which point of their formation would we value this knowledge, which, in the liquid modern minimal attention span, will shortly be superseded and obsolete? Which would we act upon, for example, with celebrations? And how could we know what is worthy of celebration, and for whom it will be valuable? Following Foucault, the understanding and

determination of subjects themselves and the power relationships by which immigrant subjects are constituted are constantly shifting and being redefined. Both Kristeva's (1991) nomadic and masked foreigners, and their indeterminate, directionless, still-becoming lives illustrate these points and help to refute the notion of knowledge as a requirement for being and living with others.

Echoing the focus of the liquid modern condition, Foucault's approach to subject formation and to change demands flexibility and acceptance of uncertainty. Following this, any knowledge of the subject must thus be seen as impermanent and constantly evolving, rather than as certain and unchanging. His suggestion for a permanent attitude of experimentation and critique supports individuals' adaptations of their habitual thoughts and actions to keep pace with shifts and changes in themselves and in society (Wong, 2007). It illustrates how, at the same time as their formation of themselves as subjects remains incomplete due to the constantly shifting societal conditions, immigrant teachers' very presence in the society disturbs the stability and thus also perpetuates its, and their own, incompleteness.

IGNORANCE, NOT KNOWLEDGE – A FEMINIST ANALYSIS

In this final part of my analysis of the importance of knowledge, I respond to my interpretation of my students' struggles with their complicated realities in early childhood settings, by examining alternative orientations to engagements with difference. I disrupt the dominant focus on transparent ways of acquiring specific, often predetermined, knowledge about others and explore ways of being together and learning about the individual complexities of teachers' cultural otherness (hooks, 2009; Mohanty, 2003). I further problematise the notion of celebrating cultural differences to manage diversity in early childhood education, and theorise this notion in relation to immigrant teachers in their early childhood settings.

In the stories I remember, my students' concerns with their own otherness and with their engagements with other adults in early childhood settings reflected a sense of isolation. The expectations that others had of them, seemed to be perceived as insensitive and disrespectful, and, whilst they were a part of the teaching team in the setting, they did not feel that they belonged. In the previous sections of this chapter, I have critiqued the notion of requiring knowledge of the other as a foundation on which to build togetherness, particularly across differences. In this section, I explore an alternative notion, of adopting instead an orientation of ignorance. Todd (2004) contests the expectation of having knowledge of others as a requirement for effective engagements, and, in keeping with the liquid modern frailty of knowledge, suggests that knowledge alone will always remain insufficient to address all the concerns with otherness. Furthermore, the knowledge one individual has of another can never be as extensive as the complexities of each individual's inherited and lived reality, and is therefore only ever likely to be incomplete, inappropriate or out of date. On this basis, Todd suggests that appealing to knowledge is absurd, and that it

is not for any individual to claim to know another, but, rather, for the other to feel understood. Her radical alternative, then, is to suspend the presumption that it is possible or desirable to know another, and, instead, to approach being together with others with ignorance. In this sense, it is the not-knowing, in that conscious stance of ignorance, that opens up to the complex accidental and contingent revelations arising from individual genealogies, the others' narrated life stories, rather than any removed, predetermined, second hand or short lived truths and certainties (Ailwood, 2004; Mohanty, 2003; Todd, 2004). By consciously not "laying claim to another's experience" (Todd, 2004, p. 349) individuals thus not only maintain, but heighten their responsiveness and receptiveness to others' genealogy, in all its complex, unclaimable intricacy, and avoid the dominant reliance on knowledge.

Approaching encounters with ignorance, and with an orientation and expectation of increased receptiveness and openness to others, could support immigrant teachers in their early childhood settings. Perhaps, forming an attentive commitment to respect the differences in all others would raise immigrant teachers' perceptions of others' recognition of their own singularity and specificity (Mohanty, 2003; Rhedding-Jones, 2001; Todd, 2004). How is it possible, for example, to understand just what a traditional costume means to each individual from a certain country? And who, then, should make a decision about when and how it is worn? And, further, on what basis are decisions to be made about what is acceptable for teachers to bake with the children? What is valued when native teachers are allowed to make their preferred kind of food, and immigrant teachers, whose favourite food may look, taste or smell different, are not allowed to make theirs? The possibilities conceivable by approaching togetherness with ignorance highlight the numerous fluid, contradictory perspectives of truth involved in being other, and the impact of past and present experiences, of comfort or terror, surprise or confusion (Kristeva, 1991; Wong, 2007).

Which truths count and which do not, in relation to new immigrant teachers constructing themselves and their formation of appropriate day to day practices in an early childhood centre? Is an Indian teacher who makes roti bread with the children, sharing herself and giving of herself to her teaching, building bridges between cultures, and, if she is, why should she be expected to work from the margin, positioned somewhere alongside her native colleagues and their standard, approved practices (Rhedding-Jones, 2001)? What does it mean for immigrant teachers to be normal, and do they want to be seen as, or feel, normal? As demonstrated by my interpretation of immigrant students' experiences, where dominant policy or expectations support homogenous sameness and, thus, exclusionary practices, immigrant teachers' personal interest and commitment to their teaching is likely to be confused, if not devastated (Duhn, 2010; Fenech & Sumsion, 2007; Urban, 2008). I agree with Todd (2004), and propose that approaching encounters consciously with ignorance is likely to encourage the commitment and openness required for sensitive, respectful engagements with all individuals' inherited and lived realities (Mohanty, 2003).

Not presuming to know others, in a state of ignorance, opens a minefield of further questions, such as which aspects of difference should be acknowledged, and which can be ignored? If they should be acknowledged, in what ways should that be done? How does an expectation to celebrate diversity support the responsive, responsible commitment to encounters with others that is required to learn from others' stories (Ailwood, 2004; Mohanty, 2003)? Is the intention of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) to promote an orientation that all differences should be seen as easy, comfortable celebratable contributions to the early childhood setting? Perhaps the expectation to celebrate diversity purposely disregards the intricate, intimate, often chaotic experiences of immigrant others, creating, by implication, a further expectation that they actually will be overlooked, levelled, to create precisely that desired simplicity?

Immigrant otherness is mostly not easy, comfortable (Lewin et al., 2011; Silva, 2009), or even clear enough for individual teachers to deal with, much less to celebrate or be celebrated (Li, 2007; Rhedding-Jones, 2001). This analysis affirms Kristeva's (1991) recognition of the brutal complexity of redefining oneself in a new context, and indicates that it is a process too difficult to hide. In addition, teaching itself is an extremely intimate, personal endeavour, and, for immigrant teachers, it is often the reason for their migration to Aotearoa/New Zealand (Immigration New Zealand, 2011). They are, therefore, not likely to be content with "working from the margins" (Rhedding-Jones, 2001, p. 136), being overtly celebrated by others, whilst internally struggling on a daily basis with reconciling multiple positions between their personal and professional formation as teachers. Clearly, then, celebrating differences can ever only be superficial, incomplete and dangerously close to being dominating and meaningless for both the immigrant others and the natives.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Knowing the other is the foundation of many inclusionary practices. Indian immigrants learning to live in Aotearoa/New Zealand, my students yearning to share their own knowledge with the children and families in their centres, and common practices for working with children and families who speak other languages, denote individuals striving for knowledge about explicit features of other cultures, languages, food and dress. There is an expectation that learning to manage diversity is important, and, furthermore, that it depends on knowing the other (Ho et al., 2004; May & Sleeter, 2010; Ministry of Education, 1996).

Given the complexity of the influencing factors outlined throughout this chapter, not only are individual immigrant subjects infinitely complicated, but their contexts and histories, inherited from equally diverse backgrounds, result in vastly divergent present realities, as illustrated in the abstractions of Kristeva's foreigners, hurting and elated, forced and free, all at the same time. Whilst acknowledging that ignorance is not a magic cure for all issues arising from cultural otherness, I argue that the reliance on knowledge as the foundation for living with and being other is absurd and futile. Expecting that an individual could ever significantly

know another thus undermines and devalues the complex and intimate nature of their very being.

Refuting the value placed on knowing the other, and proceeding with ignorance is the foundation on which my analysis of immigrant otherness builds in my next chapter. There I examine a range of conceptualisations and tensions of immigrant otherness and its relationship with understandings and experiences of home and homelessness.

CHAPTER 4 - HOME AND HOMELESSNESS

It's a place where no one questions your right to be; a place of belonging that points to your history, your past, an archive of sorts that metaphorically documents a lineage that marks you as non-alien (Silva, 2009, p. 694).

[It] brings order out of chaos, a space of comfort amidst fear (Wise, 2000, p. 295).

In this chapter, my analysis shifts to exploring notions of home in relation to places and experiences of belonging or not belonging, for immigrant teachers making a fresh start in a new early childhood centre in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I highlight the danger in assuming any universal contemporary concept of home by examining different ways of conceptualising the notion. The key tension in this chapter arises between conceptualising home as a fixed physical locality, or alternatively as an intrinsic, internal and personal state. I use the political, philosophical and feminist theoretical framework of this research to examine various epistemological notions of home, and the personal and societal conditions and transformations which impact on it. The interpretation of home as a physical place is examined as the dominant orientation in the early childhood discourse, represented by *Te Whāriki*. As an alternative orientation, I analyse the individual creation of a personal, intrinsic sense of home, and the suggestion that its absence could result in immigrants experiencing a state of intrinsic homelessness instead.

Kristeva's (1991) foreigners, again, inform my analysis in this chapter, by illustrating through snippets of their abstract stories just how raw and individually complex the process of leaving and recreating homes is. These foreigners' emotional turmoil and triumphs underlie my concern with constructions of settledness and comfort, and the significance of past and present homes for immigrant others. They represent and heighten the complication of my analysis throughout the chapter.

KRISTEVA'S FOREIGNERS

IN BETWEEN HOMES

Ever roaming, the foreigner is both fearful and delightful, mourning the loss of his former home and dizzy in his "happiness in tearing away" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 4). His home, the familiar place of growing up, of belonging in a community, is abandoned, catapulting him into a personal and political, inner and outer, state of flux. The meanings of the characteristics and memories of home and belonging blur, sometimes fixed in time and place, and, at other times, detached, embroiled in constant change and transformation. How did he come to be foreign? Which of the home values, beliefs and behaviours does he carry with him, in his encounters on his travels? Is it possible, or even important, for him to be happy? Yes, he is

burning with happiness, Kristeva (1991) suggests, burning variously with rejoicing, and also with destruction, glowing with fear and with delight. Haunted by memories of both excessive happiness and excessive disaster, he is threatened by the loss of his former home. His happiness, like fire, has no fixed abode. It radiates as it consumes, resting fleetingly, then racing on, avoiding normality and routine, perpetually in transit. Questioning, all the while, his strength in the face of difficulty, he outwardly rises above rejection. Drawn to the inaccessible, this foreigner is constantly ready to flee, curiously happy in his nomadic dichotomy of unsettled discomfort and homelessness.

A melancholic lover of his vanished home, Kristeva's foreigner mourns what he sees as his former paradise, now irretrievably lost. He blames himself, in his rage and torment, for his foreignness and depression, whether or not he is really at fault. The masked foreigner, neither totally true nor completely false, finds that his newfound experiences of freedom and resettling, alongside the depressions, deepen his vision and insight. Through his freshness, he is able to expose truths and revelations about the communities he encounters, which even the natives have failed to see. By recognising his foreignness, he is able to elevate himself to new and previously unattainable heights of loose, unfettered freedom, and to develop profound and visionary insights.

Passionate and intense, Kristeva's foreigner can take root and attach himself to a new home, a new destination, even temporarily. Confused and consumed, he becomes a fusion of the old and the new, freed of everything, but deprived as well, he is haunted both by his origin and by his destiny, incomplete and complete, both at the same time. "[B]lundering fools" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 29) who are oblivious to the pain and torment they cause, remind him of his lost home with their well-meaning, re-haunting questions. Outwardly transformed into a courageous, melancholy cosmopolitan, this foreigner seems to come from nowhere, and from everywhere, learning to live as a citizen of the world, at home, but also not at home, and homeless.

CONCERNS AND TENSIONS OF HOME

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HOME

As tormented, free and melancholic cosmopolitans, Kristeva's (1991) foreigners' intimate experiences of their old home and the new, of their origin and their destiny, refresh the concerns of this study. The key concerns implicated in considerations of home and its significance for immigrant teachers arise from my new immigrant students' anecdotal narrations of their feelings of severed selfhoods. Immigrants are deeply concerned with their own constant perceptions and reconstructions of their physical homes and intimate feelings of being at home. Such concerns highlight the importance of exposing the complex challenges of immigrant otherness, and the way these challenges complicate conceptualisations and creations of home and homelessness.

Immigrant teachers must reconsider their approaches to daily routines, habits and rituals to redefine their understanding and expectations of home in their new context. Connected as they are to their inherited genealogies, they may prefer to construct themselves as bearers of their own culture in their new early childhood settings (Li, 2007; Rhedding-Jones, 2001). Unlike Kristeva's foreigners' distinct severance, this means that their previous home practices and culture cannot be abandoned, but, in most cases, must not only be fondly remembered, but maintained, being redefined and adjusted only as necessary to fit into their new context. Devoted to their own constructions of home, from the tangled remnants of previous homes, immigrant teachers' reconciliation of their pasts must deal with multiple issues and changes, such as "the lack of help with childcare, housework and cooking" (Lewin et al., 2011, p. 36) or with discrimination, which impact on their home making activities. Their stories of powerlessness and resignation in the new environment, and an apparent yearning for important cultural practices from prior homes, thus complicate my analysis and underlie my questioning of home, and homelessness, and of transcending the boundaries between the two (Marotta, 2002; Rivalland & Nuttal, 2010; Silva, 2009).

CONTEXTUALISING HOME

The analysis of constructions of home that follows contextualises the concerns and struggles of this study in the early childhood discourse of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996). The juxtapositions of constructs of home outline the key tension between home as a physically located space and home as a metaphorical construct, where it is an intimate intrinsic sense. Further, they expose the concern that not achieving this intimate sense and, instead, being left without a home leads, as I suggest, to an intrinsic and intimate homelessness.

The discourse in *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) emphasises relationships with home as vital, both as they contribute to and are the outcomes of early childhood curricula. The underlying focus in this influential document reflects the home-centredness of the dominant culture, which considers home as a physical construct, a geographically fixed place and space in which children and adults live and learn (Silva, 2009). The curriculum document states, for example, that children belong to early childhood learning communities, either in "a family home or an early childhood setting outside the home" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 9). It goes on to define "...places where people can interact with each other, for example home" (p. 99) as one of the possible physical settings for early learning. Similarly, early childhood environments can be varied, "such as...home-based" (p. 11), or set "in their own home" (p. 17), again suggesting that it is a physical place. It suggests that links "between home and early childhood education programmes are important" (p. 18), thus affirming the value placed on relationships with this physical home, and hinting at an emotional tie.

The notion of valuing the caring, nurturing home almost indicates a recognition of the intrinsic sense of home, however, the document re-situates the nurturing in the dominant orientation of conceptualising home as a place. It states that the “early childhood education setting should be like a caring home: a secure and safe place” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 54), and that children “experience transitions from home to service” (p. 46), and when they go to school, they may “seek opportunities to share happenings and objects from home” (p. 55). Although there is an underlying suggestion that recognises home as a caring, nurturing environment, overwhelmingly, *Te Whāriki* upholds the dominant orientation, reinforcing the importance of having a physical, emotionally supportive, home with which the early childhood setting can connect. Even in its focus on home as a place, it reinforces the concern that, inevitably, “to be without home in a home-centred culture is a traumatic experience” (Morley, as cited in Silva, 2009, p. 695).

Therefore, the early childhood curriculum document predominantly frames home as a physical construct, with little attention given to the importance of an intimate, intrinsic sense of home. I focus on the concern for immigrant teachers and the trauma of homelessness that exists until they have satisfied the need to create an intrinsic, personal sense of home (Silva, 2009; Wise, 2000). For the purposes of this study, I take the position that, whilst immigrant teachers in Aotearoa/New Zealand may have some difficulties adjusting to their new physical homes, my concern is not with whether or not immigrants have an actual home as a place to live.

ANALYSING CONSTRUCTS OF HOME

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT

Kristeva’s (1991) melancholic foreigner has irretrievably lost his past home, whilst contemporary immigrants are usually able to revisit their homelands, physically, as well as metaphorically, throughout their constructions of their new home in new contexts (MacEinri, 1994). Transcending and challenging the boundaries between old and new, home and temporary homelessness, in the liquid modern context, is the focus of this political analysis.

LIQUID MODERN CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF HOME

Contemporary immigrants’ internal and external turmoil arises amidst the wider tumultuous discourse of intensifying globalisation, shifting, transcending societies and increasingly fluid conceptions of a stable home and place (Bauman, 2009; MacEinri, 1994; Marotta, 2002). The liquid modern inconsistency and unpredictability is the societal, political context within which immigrant teachers in Aotearoa/New Zealand must recreate a place and a sense of home. As suggested above, the key concern emanating from my engagement with students’ stories is not with finding and creating a physical home, but with their feelings of comfort, belonging and a sense of home. The fundamentally, inherently divergent and fragile neoliberal foundation underpins their complex realities, and determines the development of

such an intimate sense of home in the early childhood and societal context in which these immigrant teachers are currently anchored (Bauman, 2009; Duhn, 2010; MacLure, 2010; McLachlan, 2011).

Bauman (2009) speaks of an anchor as a metaphorical representation of liquid modern patterns of immigration and resettlement. He considers it as a provider of a safe, secure hold in one position, always temporary, revocable, able to be drawn and reset in another location as and when desired. Unlike roots, he points out that the anchor represents something that does not die when dislodged, but, rather, the dislodging itself creates further opportunities and another safe lodging at another destiny, in another time and place. Stable, settled expectations become handicaps in the uncertain liquid modern world, as it emphasises not outstaying ones' welcome in any one place or situation. The Aotearoa/New Zealand government demonstrates precisely this attitude in the recent policy changes affecting early childhood teacher immigration, qualifications and staffing levels already described earlier (McLachlan, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2002). Rather than certainty and stability, the volatile, erratic nature of constant change means that what immigrant teachers need to create for themselves must be flexible, functional and transferrable, easy to construct, and equally easy to abandon.

Te Whāriki's (Ministry of Education, 1996) dominant concern with the importance of children's homes demonstrates, in the first instance, a lack of attention to teachers' (or any adults') home. Whilst they must surely be considered as important within the socio-cultural orientation of the curriculum, such an ambiguous implication creates easy opportunities to ignore key influential factors in its implementation. Nevertheless, creating a new home in this liquid modern environment remains a deep seated need for immigrant others (Lewin et al., 2011; Tan, 2011). I further argue the distinction between a home as an actual place of residence, and home as an "art of living" (Bauman, 2009, p. 157). In this I concur with Bauman, suggesting that the deep seated need is for immigrant teachers to develop their own art of living, constructed as a mosaic of past and present meaningful practices, to add meaning to their new physical home.

Some recognition of the importance of a meaningful sense of home is illustrated in *Te Whāriki* in its Whānau Tangata/Family and Community principle, where teachers are expected to know and incorporate the home values and practices of children from all cultures (Ministry of Education, 1996). Whilst this appears to address the intimate need to create a sense of home, it presumes that teachers will know what the children's home values and practices are, and how to implement them. My experiences with immigrant student teachers indicate that they are wholly consumed with themselves and with reconciling the tangled home values and practices of their own old and new homes. To learn about and practise incorporating children's cultures into their teaching is, therefore, a draining and delicate extra task. Individually impacted by prejudices, biases and discrimination themselves, in their own high levels of uncertainty, I thus suggest that immigrant early childhood teachers must pay

attention first to their own internal need, before they can commit to learning about and effectively, sensitively implementing others' home values and practices (Li, 2007; Rhedding-Jones, 2001).

Whilst home is an important construct in the process of settlement and resettlement, in the liquid modern context, fixed obligations are seen increasingly as freedom-constraining burdens, leading to a preference for loosely formed new homes with few emotional ties (Bauman, 2009; MacEinri, 1994). For immigrant teachers calling on their past to form a meaningful sense of home in their new context, this could lead to a shallow engagement with this new context. From my observations and from other research (Lewin et al, 2011), immigrants' comfortable sharing and connections with others from their home country and culture demonstrate a certain reluctance and fear of relinquishing the past and fully immersing themselves in the present context. Fear of further loss as a result of inevitable future unpredictability may inhibit their acceptance of new cultural practices and cause them instead to draw heavily on the old, in their formation of their personal sense of comfort and home.

INDIGENOUS SOILS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The new local and global contexts of cultural and racial relations to otherness impact strongly on immigrants' intimate experiences of resettlement and sense of home (Ansley, 2010; Tan, 2011, 2012). Conceptualisations of home in Aotearoa/New Zealand are unavoidably implicated by indigenous constructions of home. Such indigenous understandings of home relate to a genealogically determined space and place, grounded in history, earth-location, representing a particular place of origin (hooks, 2009; Ritchie & Rau, 2006; Townsend-Cross, 2004). Immigrant others' experiences of displacement from such "soils of significance" (Hoffman, as cited in Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier, & Sheller, 2003, p. 9) influence their otherness and the ways in which they create and inhabit their home in their new place. Conceptualising home through an indigenous lens, as such a significant place of personal grounding, crosses the divide between the two sides of the tension between home as a place and home as a meaningful, personal sense of being.

Politically immersed in a spin of uncertainty, immigrant early childhood teachers' realities are impacted by diverse policy expectations and dispiriting, even embarrassing, governmental shifts (McLachlan, 2011). The liquid modern and bicultural political and social environment clearly heightens the complexity and fluidity of expectations and constructions of home in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This inherent fluidity also underpins Foucault's philosophical inquiry into the construction of the self, on which I draw for the next section of my analysis of reciprocally influential effects of home and subject (Besley, 2007; Foucault, 1988).

PHILOSOPHICAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF HOME

CONSTRUCTIONS OF SELF, CONSTRUCTS OF HOME

Foucault's (1982) concern, as already outlined, is with how individuals are constituted as subjects, by others, and by the individuals themselves. In this section of my analysis, I use his concern to problematise how immigrant teachers' constructions of themselves complicate conceptualisations of home. I adopt a philosophical lens to analyse the tension between conceptualising home as a fixed place, on the one hand, or as an intimate sense of belonging, and I extend the concern to not yet having created an intimate feeling of home. The ways in which immigrant early childhood teachers develop such an intimate feeling of home is complicated by how they ontologise and transform themselves (Schneider, 2012; Wong, 2007). Just as Kristeva's (1991) foreigner is able to elevate himself to new heights through his constructed foreignness, this analysis raises the possibility that immigrant teachers are similarly responsible for transforming themselves, and are, therefore, responsible also for constructing their interim, internal, homelessness.

Living still in the fond memories of their now abandoned previous homes and home habits, rich social lives, extended family support and significant religious and leisure activities, immigrant others' struggles reflect their ontology of the personal, intimate, individual challenges of their transformation (Lewin et al., 2011; Silva, 2009). Already constituted in their context as immigrant early childhood student teachers, immigrant teachers and their struggles represent the on-going challenges and complexity of constructing themselves as subjects, on an on-going quest to create an intimate sense of home (Foucault, 1982; Marotta, 2002). Wise (2000) introduces the concept of territorialisation to characterise the art of developing a sense of home. She argues that territorialisation involves the incorporation of fond life experiences in the construction of a sense of home, to create a memorable, personal presence in the home. Thus, it is "not the space itself, not the house, but the way of inhabiting it that [makes] it a home..." (Boym, as cited in Wise, 2000, p. 299). Recognising the tension between home as a physical location and a sense of home as an intimate, personal experience, this analysis supports my argument of the significance of the latter. It appears then, that acts of territorialisation are crucial to individuals' construction of themselves (Foucault, 1988) and the foundation of personalising their home (Silva, 2009; Wise, 2000). And, furthermore, a lack of territorialisation therefore reinforces the separateness of conceptualisations of home as a place and home as the homely ways of inhabiting that place, and creates the opposite, an un-homely intimate sense of homelessness.

FEMINIST CONSTRUCTIONS OF HOME

GENEALOGIES AND HOME

Genealogies usefully theorise problematisations and complications of home as they expose unlikely connections “accidents, contingencies, overlapping discourses” (Ailwood, 2004, p. 21), rather than identifying fixed truths or certainties. A critical, sensitive engagement with accidents and contingencies is thus useful for exposing previously taken for granted constructions and new conceptualisations of settledness and home (Mohanty, 2003). Kristeva’s (1991) foreigners expose displacement as both a concern and a delight, raising the question of which possibilities and truths to follow, in individual situations, in a world of instantaneous, constant choice and interconnectedness (Bauman, 2009; Braidotti, 2009; Ponzanesi, 2002). In this section, I draw together the analysis of the tension between conceptualising home as a fixed, physical space and place, as is common in the curriculum document *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) and strong in indigenous beliefs (hooks, 2009; Ritchie & Rau, 2006), and home, rather, as a metaphorical in-alien sense of comfort and personal, intrinsic peace and belonging (Silva, 2009; Wise, 2000).

PHYSICAL PLACES OF HOME

Kristeva (1991) refers more conceptually than practically to any familiar places to which foreigners previously belonged and which they have now abandoned, as home. She illustrates how the old begins to blur with the re-grounded new home, resulting in highly complex, muddled sites of foreigners’ otherness and subject formation. Notions of home in Kristeva’s abstract narrations fit with “infinitely complicated” genealogies of politics “identity, geography and history” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 125), and embody what Bauman (as cited in Marotta, 2002) generalises as a “universal strangerhood or rootlessness” (p. 48). Consideration of these multiple standpoints and experiential rifts creates home as a versatile construct, not only of a place left behind, but also of the place of new beginnings, the interim and the destination (Ahmed et al., 2003; Bauman, 2009).

Clearly, homes are constructed as geographically located in a particular place, built on elements of substantial genealogies and histories of nations, communities, families and individuals (hooks, 2009; MacEinri, 1994; Wise, 2000). Rather than being constructed in an emotional vacuum, physical homes also involve affective processes, embodying historicised memories and abandoned previous homes, to evolve as a compilation, a space in between (Ahmed et al., 2003; MacEinri, 1994; Mohanty, 2003). Wise’s (2000) conception of home as an intimate intrinsic act can be related to this latter notion, of an emotional, sensory, passionate compilation with which individuals reassure themselves to “fill a void” (p. 297) in their new home. It can be isolated as the emotional, intrinsic aspect of the physically located space and place. In theorising conceptualisations of home, physical locations thus both contrast and overlap with intrinsic conceptions of home as a personally comforting sense or perception.

PERSONAL INHABITANCE – A SENSE OF HOME, OR HOMELESSNESS

Familiar ways of making bread, a familiar tune, nursery rhyme or story book, such re-imagining habits and favourite experiences of home represent acts of territorialisation (Wise, 2000). As an expression of the self and of individual genealogies of past home experiences, immigrant teachers' attempts to align the two represent their efforts to territorialise their new home. Individually yearning for a less alien place in their new workplace, new home, new context, their efforts represent a search for ways to affirm their presence, in their own spaces, to individualise an intrinsic, comfortable territory that feels like home (Rhedding-Jones, 2001; Silva, 2009). Conceptualising home as a never-ending "creation of a space of comfort" (Wise, 2000, p. 300), offers immigrant others an opportunity for interim, on-going individually tailored relief, constantly adjustable to fit the mood, situation and environment.

Wise (2000) states that home is chaotic, constantly becoming, not static, always in-between, in a theorisation that aligns perfectly with the liquid modern condition (Bauman, 2009). Complicated in such a way, both notions of home represent immigrant teachers' struggles to create home as a territory where they have a positive sense of presence and inhabitation (Lewin et al., 2011; Tan, 2011; Wise, 2000; Wu, 2011). The non-homogenous experiences of immigrant otherness highlight the personal responsibility and commitment necessary to create such an intimate, personally meaningful expression of home (Kristeva, 1991; Lewin et al., 2011; Li, 2007; Rhedding-Jones, 2001; Silva, 2009).

This personal responsibility may be implicated in the ambiguity with which *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) articulates its orientation towards home. Whilst its aspirations are stated in relation to children, perhaps it should be assumed that they equally address the wider, unavoidably influential, adult context (Nuttall, 2003)? If immigrant teachers assume personal responsibility for creating a sense of home to characterise their own home, it could be assumed that the aspirations of *Te Whāriki*, in fact, recognise this personally disciplined commitment, albeit in an ambiguous articulation. Equally, this analysis raises a question of *Te Whāriki's* intent, when it suggests that teachers (adults) include children's familiar home practices within the curriculum. In light of Wise's (2000) notion of territorialisation, perhaps the curriculum guidelines are effectively asking teachers to territorialise the curriculum on behalf of the children? And if this is how it is to be read, does this show, again, an ambiguous expression of the intention that teachers will have learnt how to do this, and, more importantly, have attended to their own territorialisation needs first?

DISCIPLINE AND HABIT

The territorialisation of an intrinsic sense of home represents individuals seeking for and assembling collections of meaningful life practices in the form of comfort forming habits. All individuals are comprised of habits, which arise from their inherited genealogies and realities and which characterise how they have been impacted by their lives and worlds (Mohanty, 2003; Silva, 2009; Wise, 2000). As such, habits are not developed in isolation within each

individual (infinitely complex in itself), but, rather, are developed on the basis of each individuals' on-going engagement with her surroundings, "the 'passionate liaison of our bodies' with a space, a house, a home," (Bachelard, as cited in Wise, 2000, p. 303), and the world. Wise (2000) draws on Foucault's concern with discipline and on the idea that individuals are disciplined through habit. Which habits do individual immigrant teachers use to discipline themselves in their creation of home? Is it possible to have a home without discipline? If home is a sense of comfort and of discipline, are individuals comforted by their own discipline, and do they actively discipline themselves in their pursuit of these seemingly opposite sensations? Perhaps the discipline exerted by immigrant others, in their territorialisation of their new home, at the same time causes them to break their earlier sense of comfort in their former homes, and, as such, territorialisation (of the new) amounts simultaneously to de-territorialisation (of the old)? Reconceptualising territorialisation and de-territorialisation reveals that they are reciprocal actions implicating each other in immigrant teachers' creation and deconstruction of personal presence in their physical homes. As such, if territorialisation creates a sense of home, does de-territorialisation always simultaneously create another type of homelessness?

CONCLUDING COMMENTS: RECONCEPTUALISING HOMELESSNESS

Contesting common truths depends on a willingness to challenge dominant thought and to interrogate underlying genealogies. The analysis in this chapter demonstrates multiple conceptualisations of what home is, as "the most elusive, seductive, and prized possession of the diaspora" (Silva, 2009, p. 694). It exposes how intensely the intricate, intimate processes of constructing a home are influenced by individual genealogies and politics of immigrant otherness. Furthermore, this analysis highlights the overlap between the two notions, of home as a physical place and home as an intrinsic sense. By unravelling and further complicating the tension between these two conceptualisations of home, this analysis has exposed influences of the uncertainty of the liquid modern context on the construction of both a physical home and a metaphoric sense of comfort and pleasure in the home. Flexibility and transferability are crucial elements in this politically unstable neoliberal context, and they instrumentally shape both of these constructions. Indigenous constructions of home, on the other hand, draw together the dichotomy, in places and spaces of significance.

Kristeva's foreigners are seduced by the possibilities offered by imaginary powers and personal, intimate creations of home. Following this analysis, immigrant teachers could be forgiven for equally burning with happiness and for rejoicing in their otherness. It is most likely however, that they would burn also with fear, as the early childhood discourse threatens to overwhelm the powerlessness I feel emanating from their informally shared stories. Ambiguous policy statements, seemingly disregarding their personal spaces of home and the complex challenges they face, would contribute little to a sense of comfort and

stability. The personal obligation and commitment involved in the creation of home has been exposed and analysed, along with further uncertainty, following the suggestion that the important tension is not between the two conceptualisations of home as a physical or intrinsic sense of comfort, but between those two as a whole, and the possibility of neither, of intermittent, temporary homelessness.

CHAPTER 5 - SPEECH AND SILENCES

[E]ach time I come into contact with the situation, where individuals speak to me, they not only speak to me through different language games, but also command from me an obligation by virtue of the fact that they address me (Todd, 2007, pp. 596-597).

For foreigners like me, our reception of the language of the other is much better than our expression of it. So who dares to judge how much we understand when we are silent or refuse to write (Rhedding-Jones, 2002, p. 100)?

In this chapter, I analyse speech, and the use of speech in dialogue, in relation to immigrant teachers' otherness in the early childhood context of Aotearoa/New Zealand. I examine the representational and revelatory impact and inhibitions associated with speech itself, and the alternative (perhaps escapist) possibility of silence. The analysis in this chapter considers perspectives arising in the multicultural discourse related to speech and dialogic engagements, and uses my political, philosophical and critical feminist theoretical framework to interrogate them.

FOREIGNERS' LANGUAGE

Kristeva (1991) proposes that, through a confrontation with the foreigner, we expose the "secret manner in which we face the world" (p. 4), as we become invited surreptitiously through him into the "inaccessible, irritating" (p. 4) muteness of the irregular, insecure encounter. A meeting with the foreigner is a communion of need and desire, a banquet of hunger, nourishment and fulfilment, the foreigners' utopia! Forgetting differences for the moment, stepping out of time, she claims that a brief, intoxicated togetherness occurs, even though all parties know it is temporary and frail. Speech and silences interweave in these encounters as they open possibilities and traps, simultaneously and frighteningly elusive, inviting, dangerous and prosperous.

ESCAPE TO SILENCE

Inviting or frightening, Kristeva's (1991) foreigner's speech and engagement in dialogue rests on his command of language. As a nobody from nowhere, his language lacks social identity, status and influence, and is eventually ensnared either in a massive void, or becomes what Kristeva calls baroque. Whilst natives may appear to listen to him, his language is more often a form of low level amusement than taken seriously. With little effort made or support given, he becomes the laughing stock of the natives (Kilito, 1994) and his speech collapses into the peaceful release of silence, the trap which Kristeva calls the void. Alternatively, as he attempts to make up for not being heard, the foreigner may reveal his utter lack by misplacing and overexerting his linguistic efforts. Already excluded from the

social reality by his otherness, such excessive effort can result in his language becoming overly formal, sophisticated, or baroque. Eventually, even when he speaks the new language grammatically well, the foreigner's baroque speech is separate from himself, arising from an internal emptiness, confined within his mother tongue and fear of failure, never freed completely. He eventually finds he has "[n]othing to say, nothingness, no one on the horizon". Struggling with another language threatens his shifting identity holding his language has "[a]n impervious fullness: cold diamond, secret treasury, carefully protected, out of reach" where he decides that "nothing needs to be said, nothing can be said" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 16).

Swaying between holding on to his mother tongue and familiar traditions of speaking and dialogue, and new language customs, Kristeva's (1991) foreigner recognises his alienation. Lost from the grip of that private, internal connection with home, he perfects his new style and hopes to fit in. Will he, the linguistic other, ever become as fully belonging as those who are native to the language? Or is there invariably a point of anesthesia from too much effort in doing so, resulting in meaningless confusion, of sort of, but not quite, belonging in the new language, but now also no longer really belonging in the same native way in his home language (Kilito, 1994; Kristeva, 1991)? His awkwardness has an exotic charm, however peculiar it feels to him. Freed now from the reins of his mother tongue, he plunges fearlessly into the foreign new language, daringly capable, using words he never used before, audacious, even obscene, freshly unleashed from prior inhibitions. He is in a linguistic no-man's-land, in-between making an effort, being more or less understood and accepted for the linguistic differences that continue to show up every time he speaks, and the state where there seems to be no point, where no natives even care to understand, and the preferred realm between his two languages becomes silence.

THE CONCERNS WITH SPEECH ... AND SILENCE

Language grounds and characterises identity and otherness as Wittgenstein claims, saying that "the limits of my language are the limits of my world" (as cited in Besley & Peters, 2011, p. 3). It is "at once the carrier of national and familial traditions and emblem of cultural and personal identity" (Bammer, 1994, p. xvi), taught, lived by and passed on from one generation to the next (Townsend-Cross, 2004). My analysis of speech is influenced by Kristeva's (1991) abstract illustrations above, and responds to my hearing of immigrant students' concerns in their new early childhood environments and the wider context of early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

REVELATORY SPEECH - THE KEY CONCERN

The key concern, in relation to speech and dialogue, emanates from my perceptions of my students' discomfort with others objecting to their use of their home languages in their teaching. *Te Whāriki* reminds us that "[f]requent communication among all adults who work with children is essential" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 47), and it asks adults to what

extent they are using the children's home languages. The concern here is that little consideration appears to be given to the adults' own home language retention and sharing. My concern relates to the importance of speech, not only as a dialogic, communicative tool in multicultural educational settings, but on a revelatory level, as Wittgenstein (Besley & Peters, 2011) and Bammer (1994) claim, as a representation of a person's selfhood and identity. As immigrant others struggle with the constant reconstruction of themselves as new language users, maintaining also some intimate connection with their inherited self through their home language is crucial (Besley, 2007; MacEinri, 1994; Wise, 2000).

The concerns in this chapter arise from the overarching concern of this thesis, that immigrant otherness, itself, is such an extremely complex emotional state and process, that the vulnerability of physically engaging in dialogue can lead immigrant teachers to adopt, instead, an easier, escapist and subversive path of silence. *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) does not ignore the value of non-verbal communication, asking, for example, that "[a]dults should recognise children's non-verbal communication styles", and that they "should also monitor their own body language so that they interact appropriately with children, using expressive actions, songs, poems, and dance to aid communication" (p. 73). There is, however, scant recognition of the weaknesses that can underlie speech encounters, or of the internal muteness and insecurity that Kristeva (1991) claims arise in these encounters: teachers' experiences of discomfort or alienation in such non-verbal communication appear to be immaterial in the curriculum document. Whilst *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) asks how aware they are "of their own styles of non-verbal communication" and how effectively they "read each other's body language as a way of improving communication" (p. 74), these reflections are clearly directed at addressing the children's, rather than their own, needs. Immigrant teachers' struggles and insecurities remain invisible.

The concern with the critical multicultural promotion of using dialogue as a tool for managing the problem of diversity adds to the complication of this analysis (Besley & Peters, 2011; Chan, 2009, 2011; May & Sleeter, 2010). Complex influences on the nature and value of dialogue arising throughout this analysis contest this reverence of dialogue as a cure for diversity. The challenge to the promotion of dialogue as a strategy for dealing with diversity is complicated by the location of my research in the early childhood education discourse. There appears to be limited recognition of the difficult spaces in between the physical act of immigrant others' articulated speech and understanding, and the easier realm of silence to which unrecognised problematic, shifting spaces can lead (Ministry of Education, 1996; Todd, 2011).

ANALYSING SPEECH, DIALOGUE AND SILENCE

SPEECH AS A POLITICAL ACTION

To highlight speech (and silences) as political actions, I respond to the promotion of dialogue as a tool for “managing cultural diversity” (Besley & Peters, 2011, p. 2), first, by undoing the early childhood curriculum, in relation to speech and its use as a tool for managing diversity in early childhood environments. I then examine the revelatory nature of speech and listening, to emphasise the implications and obligations involved in engaging in speech or dialogue (Rhedding-Jones, 2002; Todd, 2007).

On the very first page, *Te Whāriki* states that early childhood is a time in which children “growing up in [our] culture” form “conceptions of themselves as social beings, as thinkers, and as language users...” (Donaldson, Grieve, & Pratt, as cited in Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 3). This is a complex aspiration for teachers engaged in delivering the curriculum. To which culture does the document refer? The children’s? The teachers’? The centres’? Or is this intended to be such a general statement, on the basis of where it is positioned within the document (even before the introduction), that it should be taken to apply to all children, all teachers and all cultures explicitly or implicitly represented in early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand? Whichever way this aspiration is interpreted, it does not question whether teachers are comfortable or capable of supporting the children’s conceptions of themselves as language users, nor does it give any indication of what might be required of teachers to do this.

The goals of the Mana Reo/Communication strand in *Te Whāriki* illustrate a little more specifically what is expected in terms of speech. These goals state that children will develop verbal and non-verbal communication skills “for a range of purposes” and that they will “experience the stories and symbols of their own and other cultures” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 16). Is there an inherent presumption that teachers all have the appropriate interest and skills to facilitate children’s linguistic experiences and learning, including symbols not only of their own but of a range of cultures? With the promotion in the wider early childhood discourse, for example, of “shared visions of meaning making together as communities” (Duncan, 2006, p. 36), there appears to be a lack of guidance as to what might be a shared vision, for example, of language use, and how such shared communities should develop. What form could such communities take, and to what extent could teachers be expected to develop a vision of such a complex task as meaning making about language use with children, when they may not even share such a vision amongst themselves? Immigrant early childhood teachers may or may not have made meaning of the children’s and others’ languages and cultures, and, rather than forming such a vision, may revert in alienation or discomfort, like Kristeva’s foreigners’ anesthesia, to silence instead of dialogue.

A further curriculum expectation, that “[e]ach child’s culture is included in the programme through song, language, pictures, playthings, and dance” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p.

67), is alarming. Immigrant early childhood teachers immersed in the liquid modern “shifting values and signs” (MacEinri, 1994, p. 2) are themselves in between being the self who is very other, learning about a new culture and environment, and the settling self, making meaning of her new environment. In such a politically unstable, personally ambivalent state, she herself may not only have insufficient insight into children’s cultures to be able to effectively include them in her teaching, but she may not even be in the position to begin this process (MacEinri, 1994). Releasing her ties from the social and cultural climate she has left behind may involve long term, unpredictable shifts, during which there is no comfortable sliding into other cultures. Anesthesia or silence may again be preferred to teaching from this precariously formed cultural space (Lewin et al., 2011; Silva, 2009). Moreover, the children and families, often immigrant others themselves, may also be uncomfortable with sharing their culture in the early childhood setting. *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) does not suggest any further investigation, nor does it create a space for uncertainty. Instead, it unquestioningly suggests that these cultural elements be included. It is conceivable, then, that the voices of minority immigrant groups may not be heard, and that elements of language and cultures shared remain uncritically superficial and unrepresentative, rather than relevant and meaningful (Chan, 2011; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Wu, 2011).

In addition, *Te Whāriki* requires adults to connect children with the languages and symbols of their own and others’ cultures by asking them to develop children’s awareness of the “richness of communication” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 97). Which richness does the document refer to here? Can we assume that the linguistic environment and communication in each setting is rich? And what does that mean, when communication is rich? Little explanation is given in the text, of a construct which, I argue, appears to be infinitely more complex than just rich (MacEinri, 1994; Rhedding-Jones, 2002; Todd, 2004).

The liquid modern condition is pronounced by whirlwind changes, where knowledge is fit only for temporary use before it becomes obsolete. This raises the question whether it is realistic to expect teachers to gain sufficient insights into other languages and cultures to incorporate them in meaningful ways, given how rapidly they are likely to be superseded. And, conversely, it leads to the question of how such a condition supports native early childhood staff in living with immigrant teachers who speak different languages (Kristeva, 1991). Are teachers in liquid modern early childhood settings valued as themselves, for their own inherited complex selves and languages, or are they valued only to the extent that they can add to the expected ‘richness’ of the team? Bauman (2009) stresses the notion of difference as a strategy for marketing oneself, that difference is what sells best, but how different can or does an early childhood setting allow teachers to be, and what differences are those that are valued, or marketable? Perhaps decisions have already been made in early childhood settings, to determine what the ‘difference’ of each centre will be, meaning

that teachers may be different only to the extent that they fit in with the predetermined theme (Duhn, 2010; Urban, 2008).

Requiring immigrant teachers, unrecognised in their own otherness, to engage in speech and (children's and others') language within the centre environment risks placing them in an extremely vulnerable position of disclosing their still forming selfhood. Arendt (as cited in Todd, 2011) argues that the actual act of speaking exposes the uniqueness of an individual, rather than the content of the speech. Thus, speech places the speaker in a particularly contextualised political space. Furthermore, whilst an individual bares herself and something of her story in her articulation of speech, what is actually revealed is dependent on the interpretation by the listener, in the encounter with the speaker. Hence, the story told is not determined by the speaker (through her choice of words, for example), but revealed only by the listener, as "the speaker/actor is not the author of her story, but the story gets made and retold by others, which rebound back to her" (Arendt, as cited in Todd, 2011, p. 107). *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) aspirations for children merely skim the surface of diverse linguistic interpretations, by categorising language and speech in terms of cultural characteristics (Chan, 2011). There appears to be a failure to address the complexities of individual immigrant linguistic abilities and competence, or particular traps or overexertion as highlighted by Kristeva's (1991) foreigners' void and baroque language outlined above. When speech is a revelatory act by which an individual discloses her intimate self, it is more complex than a superficial "validation of the positive value of otherness (provided it is not seen as too threatening)" (MacEinri, 1994, p. 2). I argue that it is too threatening, and risks becoming so frightening that it also becomes unachievable.

Speaking and acting are not only vulnerable, unpredictable engagements with the moment, but also with its consequences, which last beyond the engagement (Bauman, 2009; Marotta, 2002; Todd, 2004). Dependent as they are on the speaker and the listener, and the engagement in the speech encounter, both of them are bound not only to the experience of the encounter, but also to suffer as a result of the interpretation of it. What the speaker reveals of herself, as re-articulated through the voice of her listeners, is complicated by the reciprocal influence of each of their unpredictable political and personal contexts (Todd, 2011).

Arendt (as cited in Todd, 2011) summarises that "intercultural education exacerbates the problem of equality, precisely because it does not have a framework for thinking through the difficulties that inhere in our relational, political spaces" (p. 110). Whilst *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) clearly intends to support immigrant children and families with generalised aspirations for supporting their languages and cultures, this analysis reveals some potential shortcomings (Chan, 2011; Wu, 2011). Immigrant teachers remain invisible throughout the curriculum, as their otherness is obscured within general expectations of adults, to effortlessly achieve the desired richness of a culturally diverse early childhood environment. This analysis highlights the act of speaking as a revelatory element in

communication, but that its meaning is revealed only once it is interpreted by the listener. Thus faced with their own uncertain engagements across differences in their new settings, immigrant teachers may recoil from the unpredictability and vulnerability of dialogue into a safer state of non-exposure and silence (Todd, 2011).

PHILOSOPHICAL CONSTRUCTS OF SPEECH, DIALOGUE AND SILENCE

Dialogue is a dominant, favoured approach to ‘managing’ and getting to know diversity in the educational discourse (Besley & Peters, 2011; Chan, 2011; May & Sleeter, 2010). In this section of my analysis, I draw on what Besley and Peters (2011) present as the philosophy of dialogue, in relation to intercultural communication and understanding. I apply a range of perspectives from their discussion to the context of early childhood education and to *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) in particular, to further problematise the earlier political conceptualisations of immigrant teachers’ speech and silences.

This analysis draws together elements of different philosophical constructs, to present dialogue as various forms of verbal exchange, always involving a certain emotional engagement. Socratic dialogue is a useful introduction to affective dialogue, conceptualised as a love of language, and a love of searching for the truth (Besley & Peters, 2011). Dialogue is thus a love relationship, based on a common desire. Further adding to Arendt’s analysis of the political and revelatory nature of dialogue in the previous section, a philosophy of dialogue is, therefore, dependent on getting inside another person to understand what she is saying, encompassing, or assuming, the view that it fosters “mutual understanding and respect” (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2010).

A PROCESS OF AWAKENING

The affective aspect of dialogue can be seen in the view that it entails a purposeful and deep commitment to the other person, for instance, that it should involve concern, trust, respect, appreciation, affection and hope for and with each other (Besley & Peters, 2011). Other perspectives of affective dialogue outline interpersonal commitments as a condition for dialogue, such as, that dialogic partners put aside their assumptions, that they consider each other as mutual and equal partners in the dialogic truth-finding, and that they are committed to maintaining the focus of the dialogue. In this view, dialogue is hailed as “a process of awakening” (Bohm, as cited in Besley & Peters, 2011, p. 6), leading to a new consciousness of the other and of the relationship with the other. Whilst this view does not sever the speaker from the meaning of her own speech, it affirms Arendt’s point that the meaning of speech only emerges once it is interpreted and retold by the listener. In this sense, dialogue reflects Foucault’s struggles with the question of “[w]ho are we” (Foucault, 1982, p. 781), as a revelatory awakening. Immigrant others struggling with *Te Whāriki* and with the neoliberal early childhood context must, it seems, work on this task alongside their engagement with the curriculum aspirations and relational demands. To support children in keeping their own

language alive and dynamic, for example, teachers must first learn for themselves what it is to maintain such a relationship to a language and to themselves (MacEinri, 1994; Walsh, 2007).

Dialogue as a process of revelation of certain truths can be played out as a game of truth, reflecting Foucault's notion of language as a game, which by itself neither deceives nor reveals the truths it holds. Rather, it depends again on the on-going constitution of the self in relation to and alongside not only the word games themselves, but the contextualised meanings made of them by the communicating parties involved in the dialogue (Peters, 2007). Todd (2007) refers to speaking and listening as a "language game of justice" (p. 597). The obligation commanded of the listener, to which she refers in the opening quote of this chapter, is not to filter the speaker's message through a set of criteria, but to listen to the other with openness, reflexivity and without judgement.

In a contradictory view, Gadamer's perspective asserts that the content is decisive in delivering the meaning of speech (Besley & Peters, 2011). For immigrant others sliding between Kristeva's (1991) void and baroque speech as they learn new languages, Habermas challenges Gadamer's view and focuses on the wider power relations and contextual factors that complicate the dialogic encounter, and the meaning, or truth, it reveals (Besley & Peters, 2011; Foucault, 1982). Finally, Freire's (1970) perspective usefully summarises these philosophical conceptualisations. He, too, claims that it is the entire engagement in dialogue that creates and consequentially transforms meaning. Immigrant teachers who act on and speak within their new environment can thus be seen as constantly transforming themselves and their reality through their dialogic encounters. Freire draws together the meaning made by the act of speech with the content, claiming that the truth emerges at the same time through words and actions.

Some key points emerge from this brief analysis of philosophical conceptualisations of speech and dialogue. First, all are epistemologically oriented towards communicative engagements as verbal articulations of speech. In line with *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), this coincides with the dominant multicultural orientation to speech and language. This dominant orientation reflects my concern, analysed in Chapter 3, about the value attached to developing knowledge about others, and the expectation that it will improve ways of living with otherness. A critical interpretation of these perspectives emphasises the intricacies involved in dialogic encounters and their interpretation, impact and consequences. It reinforces the concern that dealing with diversity by gaining knowledge is an incomplete and impossible expectation. Furthermore, the examination reveals that these perspectives ignore the importance of silence, rather than speech, as a revelatory, awakening act.

CRITICAL FEMINIST ANALYSIS OF SPEECH AND SILENCE

WHO DARES TO JUDGE?

At the beginning of this chapter, Rhedding-Jones (2002) raised the question of how individual otherness impacts on immigrant others' readiness to understand and express themselves in their new context. Kristeva (1991) also alludes to the idea of recognising, but not judging, the other on the basis that we will not detest the foreigner (or by implication, then, his language), as the importance of his difference "disappears when we all acknowledge ourselves as foreigners" (p. 1). This section of my analysis of immigrant others' speech returns to the concern with the riskiness of engaging in speech. It is fundamentally centred on *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), examined through critical feminist perspectives.

In further undoing *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), I question the supremacy of upholding language and articulated speech as useful counter-racist and counter-prejudice practices. In this examination of how immigrant otherness might impact on teachers' speech and silences, I now return to the notion of dialogue as ostensibly supporting, but actually hiding, others' identities and differences (Todd, 2011). The notion that any articulation of the self is always incomplete and on-going, just as the construction of the self is on-going, is therefore, again, fundamental to my analysis (Foucault, 1982; Schneider, 2012). If the act of speech is seen as revelatory, as suggested earlier, we can deduce that what is revealed of the self through the act of speaking is also always incomplete or unfinished. What value can be placed, then, on what is disclosed by any speech act, when the self being revealed is simultaneously continuing to develop, and is, therefore, revealed only in part? How much can the immigrant other, articulating herself, and the listener reinterpreting her, rely on what is said as any particular truth? Perhaps *Te Whāriki* itself is playing out a game of truth, between speakers and listeners? Maybe its expectations of harmonious dialogue, neither deceiving nor revealing any personal truth, actually imply an (unstated) expectation for a more serious commitment between the speaker and the listener (Todd, 2004, 2007)?

If a more serious commitment is required, immigrant teachers are faced with the possibility of self-revelation through their speech, for example, through *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) expectations of adults to communicate with other adults and with children, and to encourage their languages and cultures. Todd (2004) highlights that engaging in such an act itself creates that uncertainty, where the speaker articulating the story only determines the content, but cannot determine what will be revealed, or deceived, by the story she tells. Weighed down by such vulnerability, the uncertainty arising from possibly revealing something previously unknown even to the speaker herself, could lead to a reluctance to engage in dialogue at all. The fear resulting from expectations to reveal what may be unknown aspects of the self can be imagined as risking complete nakedness. The fear could become so great that it prevents any engagement in speech or dialogue, or at

least that it inhibits any significant commitment to the engagement. As a result, encounters with speech and dialogue risk becoming superficially safe, non-threatening (but also non-revealing), or even non-existent, in both cases non-significant and meaningless (Todd, 2004).

If committing to speech means that immigrant teachers must surrender themselves to interpretation by others, the insights that can be gained into their personal genealogies become, at best, unpredictable (Mohanty, 2003). When the vulnerability and unpredictability of engaging in speech becomes so fearful that it is abandoned in favour of silence, immigrant teachers risk being misunderstood and identified inaccurately by default. Kristeva's (1991) fearful foreigner illustrates this point, exposed and judged for his inappropriate use of language in his attempts to play the local language games of truth. Limiting, generalised categories, representing superficial, unspecific considerations of otherness, are an assault on the integrity and identity of immigrant teachers (Mohanty, 2003). Such shallow recognition of the complexities of otherness suggest an empty, harmonious and easy approach to diversity, and a failure to recognise or respond to the obligations inherent in responsible communication (Todd, 2004).

The discussion in this analysis suggests that what is revealed or disclosed of the speaker's self and of her political, historical or localised genealogies, emerges from the overall act of engagement itself, including speech, and also silence. Importantly, the crucial role of the listener and interpreter of the story must be acknowledged. If individual subjects are formed through engagements with the discourses of power and knowledge within which they are situated, then it can be deduced that immigrant teachers' internal, often still undefined, otherness must be communicated in an appropriate form (Foucault, 1982; Mohanty, 2003; Schneider, 2012). Where the preferred communicative act is silence, this must be recognised not as repressing, but as widening opportunities for revealing the conflicts and struggles of immigrant otherness, unencumbered by discourse, regulations or etiquette that may hinder expression in the dominant expectations of speech and dialogue.

Communicative encounters through speech are the dominant focus in *Te Whāriki* and the wider discourse analysed here. Silence, I suggest, is a subversive counter-discourse, enabling personalised, committed communicative encounters and appropriate revelations of immigrant selves and identities.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Immigrant teachers' exposure of themselves in communicative exchanges is clearly not only impacted by the discourses in which they are immersed, but also impacts intimately on their situation. These immigrants' insecurities in another language, "may create bodily nausea, from which a different bodily relation to an adopted home becomes possible" (Ahmed et al., 2003, p. 11). As a result, it is not a question merely of the immigrant teacher's constitution

and disclosure of herself through her speech, but a far more complex interplay with self-formation, genealogy, revelation and interpretation.

The revelatory disclosure of the actual act of speaking, rather than the content of the speech, and how the articulation of meaning is always dependent on the listener rearticulating the story, have been explored in this analysis. *Te Whāriki's* expectations of adults' engagement with children's language development have been highlighted as largely focused on superficial, harmonious engagements amongst adults, rather than recognising the insecurity and vulnerability inherent in such engagements.

Little attention is paid in *Te Whāriki* to the revelatory nature of different aspects of engaging in speech, nor to the reformulation of articulated stories or the risks of nakedness involved in these processes. A range of philosophical perspectives on dialogue and speaking have highlighted these points. The vulnerability of exposing oneself through speech, as a subject in constant, un-static formation, has emerged as an act possibly involving such a high degree of fear of the unknown (about the self, that unknown foreigner within) that immigrant others may revert to and communicate, rather, through silence. Silence itself, it seems, may enable a more genuine encounter, whereby the complex political, historicised and localised struggles of individual others become exposed through, rather than despite of, the context. It thus amounts to a subversion of the dominant, ostracising or levelling expectations, complicated by the wider implications of otherness, and, importantly, responsive and committed to meaningful revelations and self-formation.

In the following chapter, immigrant experiences of communicative acts, speech and silences are drawn into the notion of living with the other, and of community. There I analyse a range of conceptualisations of community, and of constructs and implications arising from their re-conceptualisation.

CHAPTER 6 - IMAGINING COMMUNITY: LIVING WITH OTHERS

Furthermore, the face that is so other bears the mark of a crossed threshold (Kristeva, 1991, p. 14, emphasis in the original).

Today's world no longer has any kind of stability; it is shifting, straddling, gliding away all the time (Armitage, as cited in Bauman, 2009, p. 162).

...[a]nything may happen at any time yet nothing can be done once and for all (Bauman, 2009, p. 160).

This chapter focuses on thresholds crossed and *otherness* in relation to constructions of community, as emphasised by Kristeva. These communities, Kristeva (1991) goes on, awaken “our most archaic senses through a burning sensation” (p. 4). I draw on two sides of a major tension, in my analysis of community and otherness. On the one hand, the analysis relates to community as a certain group of people, connected in a variety of ways, as an entity. On the other hand, it can be seen as “a responsible mode of social togetherness”... “a signifying encounter with difference” (Todd, 2004, p. 337), as an actual engagement with another or with others. I relate this tension to my concerns with the aspirations in *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) and how they encourage what Todd (2004) describes as “moments where a coming together across differences is made possible” (p. 337). I begin with Kristeva’s (1991) foreigners, to illustrate some of the notions explicated throughout the analysis that follows.

KRISTEVA’S FOREIGNERS ALONE AND IN COMMUNITIES

FOREIGNERS IN COMMUNITY

Kristeva’s (1991) foreigners engage with others in various ways. Some are social foreigners, keen and eager to meet others, who join in all occasions, social butterflies ready to jump into relationships, however brief they may be. Inquisitive and open, they keenly join any new groups. The others are cynics. Sceptical of all encounters, they participate in social events only when they cannot avoid them, without a real desire to do so. They neither seek nor remember encounters or people. Cynical foreigners wear themselves down with avoidance and social deprivation, to the point of total satisfaction with their untouchable solitude.

The hated foreigner is even more intense than the untouchable foreigners. His constant experiences and expectations of hatred, recriminations and rejections define his life. They reinforce the hatred that he feels is all he can ever expect from encounters with others. He is connected with no place, no time, and no love. He finds security in his predictable subjection to hatred, and is resigned to the senselessness of any hope for change. In a

perverse political and emotional twist, he is comforted by this subjugation to elevated superiors and wallows in the familiar, comfortable hatred.

RELENTLESS HARD WORK AND AGGRAVATION

Untouchable, unconnected in his new community, the unfulfilled foreigner could respond by immersing himself in his work. Shut down by the difficulties confronting him, often silent now, this foreigner expresses himself through pure hard work (Kristeva, 1991). His work ethic is the main quality he can transfer from home and export anywhere, duty free. Whilst he intends to fit in and make a name for himself, he achieves the exact opposite, angering the locals with his relentless hard work and the way it shows up their own shortcomings. He aggravates the situation by not being satisfied with lowly, unqualified work. He is well educated, keen and able to excel, willing to make sacrifices and to succeed.

Regardless of opportunities for success, Kristeva's hard working foreigner is a disturbance. He disrupts the local comfort and stability, arousing feelings of inadequacy, misfit and uncertainty. By their foreignness, these foreigners call into question the very structure of existing social norms and hierarchies. My analysis considers immigrant early childhood teachers as others, in a re-conceptualisation of community in their new context of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

CONCERNS AND TENSIONS OF OTHERNESS AND COMMUNITY

In an apparent acknowledgement of Todd's (2004) urgent call for sustaining community, even in the face of "what, at times, appear to be overwhelming odds at getting people to interact and communicate across their differences" (p. 338), *Te Whāriki* suggests that programmes should "actively promote equity of opportunity for children and counter actions or comments that categorise or stereotype people" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 65). The 'guiding' document, however, focuses little on the complexities that underlie what, on the surface, seem to be simple expectations that can be superficially and harmoniously achieved.

One particular concern with such 'equitable' opportunities is *Te Whāriki's* expectation that "[t]he early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 18). I have argued, through this analysis that this expectation is simplistic and idealistic, and I maintain that if "our disparate experiences" mean that "we cannot have first-hand knowledge of another's life" (Todd, 2004, pp. 338-339), it is unrealistic to presume that teachers can have sufficient knowledge to affirm and celebrate other peoples' cultures. Furthermore, the complicated ways of interacting and communicating across diversity have been overlooked, and so has the difficult proposition of actually creating equitable environments, and sustaining community, for diverse others. Instead, immigrant teachers are again invisible amongst generic expectations of adults, and the task of working with their commonalities, and their

individual singularity or difference, is barely recognised. On this basis, I argue that *Te Whāriki*'s expectations to celebrate cultural differences lead to unrealistic and perhaps unwanted outcomes. This concern mirrors my interpretation of students' informal stories, as they told during our classes of little or no concern for their turmoil and trepidation as immigrant teachers. In their early childhood settings, there seemed to be no focus on immigrant others' struggles with their difference or, equally importantly, on those who may not wish for their differences to be celebrated.

The tension between conceptualising community, either as an entity or as an encounter, is reinforced in the aspirations in *Te Whāriki*. Most of the curriculum aspirations indicate a view of community as a recognised group of people, bound together in some way. It claims, for instance, that "[e]ach community that children belong to makes its own specific curriculum demands" in reference to their "community of learners", their "community of children who have individual needs and rights" and "the community of New Zealanders who are gaining knowledge" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 19). Furthermore, it states that communication should occur in culturally appropriate ways with "whānau, parents, extended family, and elders in the community" (p. 42), and that "families and the community" (p. 54) should be empowered by such connections. The document even calls for children to "have some knowledge about the wider community" (p. 55), to support them in taking responsibility for their local environment and in participating equitably in that local community. All of these suggestions focus on the idea of community as a group of individuals, a certain entity, to which the children either belong or should aim to belong, and to which teachers should encourage them to contribute.

The implicit recognition of immigrant teachers throughout the curriculum document, immersed within collective references to adults, is a repeating concern. This could be seen as a demonstration of the extent of the value attributed to these immigrant teachers' interests and wellbeing. It appears that notions of togetherness suggested in the aspirations for all adults represent some of the few occasions where the curriculum aspirations are drawn towards the alternative idea of community as an act of engagement. The document states, for example, that "[a]dults should ... foster harmonious working relationships with other adults" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 55) and claims that "[a]dults, as well as children, need emotional support ... and the opportunity to share and discuss their experiences in a comfortable setting" (p. 47). Whilst they encourage relational acts that could be seen as encounters of community, these expectations remain of concern, as they are extremely general. They speak to a totality of all adults in early childhood settings and gloss over the very differences this analysis exposes as crucial, for living with otherness and for developing a responsible sense of community. These tensions are key to my analysis of conceptualisations of community as ways of living equitably with immigrant others.

IMAGINING COMMUNITIES AND IMMIGRANT OTHERS – AN ANALYSIS

POLITICAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF COMMUNITY

I problematise the construct of community by drawing on Benedict Anderson's (1991, 2006) notion of imagined communities, and on those who have critiqued his ideas (Chasteen, 2003). I complicate this analysis of community by locating it within the context of the 'shifting, straddling, gliding' uncertainty of the liquid modern condition to which Bauman (2009) alludes in the introductory quote to this chapter. All of Anderson's historicised and politicised notions are founded on community as an entity, based on particular ideologies, geographies, membership or history, with more or less flexible, known norms and boundaries within which the members of the community function. From these perspectives, then, communities are a group of people, defined by their beliefs, location or participation, who may or may not know each other well.

Anderson's imagined communities are limited by geographic and membership boundaries. Geographic limits may be defined by the boundaries of a particular physical area, whilst membership limits define who is and who is not a part of these imagined communities, on the basis of particular ideologies, status or other commonalities, to which individuals can imagine themselves belonging (Anderson, 1991, 2006; MacEinri, 1994). Critiqued for its simplicity when applied to actual nation states, and their emergence as political and geographic entities, Anderson's conceptions are seen as falsely simplifying complex, conflicting influences. They are denounced for failing to recognise such factors as the outfall of wars and colonisation, or developments in infrastructure, bureaucracies and institutions (Chasteen, 2003). In terms of my critical analysis of the discourse of immigrant otherness, Anderson's (1991, 2006) fundamental conceptualisations of community nevertheless set some valuable parameters.

Applied to the early childhood context in Aotearoa/New Zealand, one might envision the early childhood field as such an imagined community. This community could have flexible but finite limits, for example, arising on the basis of such parameters as teacher qualifications, particular ideologies or the geographic area. As with imagining a nation, one could imagine the early childhood field also as an overall community, with sub-communities; hence the overall community of early childhood education might involve sub-communities of public and private early childhood settings, parents and families of children attending, managers of early childhood settings, and so on. Membership of such communities would be limited to particular individuals, identifiable by certain characteristics, which would relate to the overall community in some way. Whilst many political, geographical and ideological factors govern membership limitations to early childhood communities, in a certain sense, *Te Whāriki* can be seen as a set of general but "monolithic values" (MacEinri, 1994, p. 3), right for all settings to follow, which the curriculum document "seeks to encompass and celebrate" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 17). I suggest, however, that the complexities

revealed throughout this study, and the presence of immigrant teachers with diverse values explodes this illusion. Thus, whilst the document reflects the dominant orientation towards community as an entity made up of a group of people, these monolithic expectations remain very loosely open for interpretation by individual settings and teachers. I argue that, similarly to Anderson's (1991, 2006) conceptualisations, the curriculum expectations appear overly simplistic and naïve, and that they avoid the issues raised by the shifting, straddling, gliding political condition.

BICULTURALISM AND COMMUNITY

Te Whāriki loosely balances multiple paths, of indigeneity and foreignness. It is a translation of the bicultural obligations inherent in the Treaty signed by the British Crown and *Māori* chiefs of Aotearoa/New Zealand, into pedagogies and practices for early childhood education (Orange, 1989; Ritchie, 2003). Throughout the document, recognition of the reciprocal nature of teaching and learning inherent in the concept of *ako* and bicultural values and beliefs inform the construct of community in early childhood settings (Cameron, Berger, Lovett, & Baker, 2007; Ministry of Education, 1996; Reedy, 2003; Ritchie, 2003). The curriculum document is widely seen as challenging early childhood teachers to inclusively incorporate indigenous knowledge, language and culture within their teaching. Whether or not it is appreciated as such, it represents a political opportunity to challenge dominant colonialist orientations with practices recognising the indigenous and other "cultural particularities and meanings of all participants in the early childhood setting" (Ritchie, 2008, p. 202). It is, thus, also an opportunity to contest and reimagine notions of community, in terms of early childhood settings, relevant to each particular complex cultural context. As such, *Te Whāriki* can be seen as a place where "[m]eeting balances wandering. A crossroad of two othernesses, it welcomes the foreigner without tying him down" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 11), loosely balancing multiple paths.

Whereas Anderson's notions conceptualise community as a group of people, politically and geographically located within more or less fixed boundaries, I suggest that beliefs and values inherent in *Te Ao Māori* strongly support the conceptualisation of community in the early childhood context as a relational encounter. This suggestion rests on the notions of *whanaungatanga*, representing both kinship ties and reciprocal relationships, and *manaakitanga*, representing hospitality, respect and care towards others. I recognise that these concepts have considerably deeper meanings than this study allows me to analyse, however, I appreciate that they are variously woven throughout curricula in early childhood settings, either consciously or unconsciously, and they inform my analysis of immigrant otherness in this sense (Ritchie, 2010; Ritchie & Rau, 2006). By permeating early childhood practices, their orientation towards community as encounters of hospitality and respect balances the dominant conceptualisations of community in *Te Whāriki*, which, like Anderson's, are heavily focused on community as an entity representing a certain group of individuals (Ministry of Education, 1996).

Whilst *whanaungatanga* can, in certain ways, be seen as supporting the idea of community as a group, for example, when it is applied to familial or kinship groups. In an early childhood context such limits are less clearly defined, as children, families and teachers shift the boundaries as they come and go. I embrace *whanaungatanga* as representative of the relational construct of community. To illustrate, the practice of *whanaungatanga* is evident when all children, adults and families collaborate with each other, when they learn and teach alongside one another, and when they share the responsibility for supporting all members of the group. The notion of *whanaungatanga* is supported by *manaakitanga*, which calls for the underlying obligation to care for others, through rituals and daily care practices such as welcoming, eating, praying and singing (Ritchie, 2008). It is this responsibility, inherent in *manaakitanga*, which most strongly leads to Todd's (2004) relational conception of community as not only an engagement with but also a personal responsibility for the other. These conceptions underlie the *Te Ao Māori* notion of early childhood practices as an "*ahua hūmarie*, an 'ethical and spiritual way of being'" (Ritchie, 2008, p. 207). They recognise community as a relational encounter that demands a reciprocal commitment between the parties to the encounter (Todd, 2004).

Constructed through a political lens in Bauman's (2009) liquid modern terms, community as an encounter, just like the overall political condition, is like a "series of stations or road inns" (p. 158) along the personal trajectory of constantly forming individuals. This signifies an orientation quite contrary to the set conceptualisation of Anderson's (1991, 2006) or *Te Whāriki's* dominant interpretations of community as an entity representing certain groups within "the wider world" (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 14) is evident. Liquid modern communities are thus conceived of as encounters arising in the on-going construction of individuals as subjects. In the liquid modern society and the early childhood environment, immigrant teachers' constructions, both by themselves and by others, occur through their encounters in relational community. The uncertainty inherent in the political condition, therefore, simultaneously implicates and is further implicated by the complexity and transience of immigrant teachers' forming selves and their 'road inn' encounters along the way.

PHILOSOPHICAL NOTIONS OF COMMUNITY

A philosophical analysis of conceptions of community and power adds a further layer of complexity to the above political examination. I use a Foucauldian lens, which calls for constant critical thought and contextualisation, to inform these ways of thinking about community with Foucault's (1982) power relations and, particularly, to consider how they are impacted by the on-going formation of the subject. Foucault affirms the incompleteness and insecurity that characterises the liquid modern condition and removes any hope of developing a complete or final understanding of ourselves (Wong, 2007). Since both constructs of community, as an entity or as an encounter, depend on the individuals by which they are constructed, it is equally impossible to assume any complete or final

ontological understanding of community. This impossibility underpins the re-conceptualisation of community and notions of being together, in terms of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) and early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Ostracising and levelling are counterproductive in such an on-going construction of community as a forever evolving engagement, and, as such, it reawakens the crucialness of Kristeva's (1991) utopian dream.

A Foucauldian analysis of social togetherness recognises the influence of power both on individual subjects and over others (Foucault, 1982). It posits regulatory frameworks, such as *Te Whāriki*, as tools of subjectification and control by the state, of the community they govern. In this case, early childhood settings can be seen as the localised sites of the disciplinary power exerted by *Te Whāriki*, and the teachers within the setting become the governed subjects (Fenech & Sumsion, 2007; Foucault, 1982). Foucault's studies of power are not confined to the power of the state, but refer also to the power exercised through "microrelations and micropractices" (Fenech & Sumsion, 2007, p. 111) in all interactions, in all groups of people. *Te Whāriki* can therefore also be construed as a more ideological influence, governing not only the collective actions of teachers in response to the state, but also individual ideologically governed relationships amongst individuals (Ministry of Education, 1996).

Certain patterns of power become familiar and normalised in a community, and, conversely, they are disrupted by change. Whilst immigrant early childhood teachers' presence in early childhood centres (the sites of normalised power) does not evoke reactions quite as dramatic as the fear and hatred experienced by Kristeva's (1991) foreigners, it disturbs known, predictable interpretations of power, and affects relationships with others and with the governing agencies. Immigrant teachers' subject formations are thus complicated by their own presence in early childhood settings, and, at the same time, they disturb the comfortable status quo by forcing a redefinition of power relations and interpersonal encounters (Fenech & Sumsion, 2007; MacEinri, 1994).

Foucault's construct of power described by Fenech and Sumsion (2007) as "fluid and multidirectional, local and unstable" (p. 111) therefore highlights immigrant teachers' simultaneous subjection of themselves to control and dependence, both of themselves, and of others (Besley, 2007; Foucault, 1982; Wong, 2007). This means that, as subjects, in on-going formation and reformation, they are constantly subjugated, as well as subjecting others to certain power in a community, whether it is a group of people, or an encounter. I suspect that the reciprocity of the fluid and unstable power relations described here defeat rather than support the expectations in *Te Whāriki* for certain members of the early childhood community to celebrate others. Particularly when community is seen as an encounter, where both parties are bound also by an individual responsibility towards each other, they are simultaneously and constantly subjugated to and powerful over each other, rather than harmoniously and comfortably sharing commonalities.

Power is complex. Drawing on Foucault, relationships of power can be explained on three levels. First, power encompasses all force relations between individuals amongst whom it is exerted. Secondly, it includes the processes that arise from it, such as the struggle, transformation or disruption it causes. And, thirdly, it is the outcome, that is, the strategies or practices, in which the power exerted crystallizes (Fenech & Sumsion, 2007). So power relates to a process, and to a wide range of outcomes which can be experienced in complex and contradictory ways, for example, similarly to Kristeva's (1991) foreigners', teachers may experience the outcomes as constraining and also at the same time freeing.

Foucault further points out that power can be exerted only over those who are free. Power "needs to be considered as a productive network" (Foucault, as cited in Fenech & Sumsion, 2007, p. 113) and can thus be both freeing and productive, creating struggles and uncertainties followed by new achievements, or, alternatively, by new resistances and different kinds of opportunities (Foucault, 1982). Since immigrant teachers' formation is based on their social and historical realities, they not only exert power over others, but they also have the freedom to choose how they respond to the power exerted over them (Besley, 2007). When *Te Whāriki* calls for them to celebrate all cultures, they may be inspired to expand their own strategies for responsible social togetherness, which may, in turn, lead to more meaningful relationships with others (Ministry of Education, 1996). As subjects who are individually constituted by dominant discourses, immigrant teachers' prior conceptions of early childhood teaching, learning and power inform their responses to the power in their new context (Palmer, 1998). Pedagogical guidelines, such as *Te Whāriki*, should, then, recognise the problematics involved when complex histories and discourses converge in its interpretation, for them to usefully promote responsible immigrant togetherness (Fenech & Sumsion, 2007).

FEMINIST CONSTRUCTS OF COMMUNITY

Finally, I now turn to further examine community as a relational encounter, following Foucault's notion of critical ontology, to examine "those taken-for-granted ways of thinking and acting" (Wong, 2007, p. 72). Todd's (2004) acknowledgement of the difficulties in communicating across differences is a useful platform for "new spaces for thought and action" (Wong, 2007, p. 72). She interrogates conceptualisations of community as an encounter, a "responsible mode of social togetherness" (Todd, 2004, p. 337), and aims for a realisation where "[c]ommunity and responsibility would then seem to arise at the moment difference ceases to be an impediment to mutual understanding" (Todd, 2004, p. 338). I use her platform to draw together, and to open up, the focus of community as an act of encounter, rather than an entity.

Power constructs are integral to this examination, as the ethics of an encounter fundamentally depends on the relationships amongst those directly and indirectly involved. Community is thus an engagement that provokes (and promotes) a coming together across

differences. In this section, I integrate the earlier analysis of community into a wider problematisation, in relation to curriculum aspirations for celebrating those differences, which it is ostensibly expecting to overcome. An ethical treatment of difference reflects *Te Whāriki's* aim to “foster harmonious working relationships” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 55). However, following Todd’s argument, the curriculum document fails to fulfil its own expectation, rendering it, rather, as seeking a superficial “illusion of social wholeness” (Young, as cited in Todd, 2004, p. 338). The aspiration for accepting and respecting the cultural differences it sets out to support submerges them instead under a veil of commonality.

This analysis complicates encounters of community by interrogating the “double structure” (Levinas, as cited in Todd, 2004, p. 340) involved in community, dependent, on the one hand, on individual differences and, on the other, on establishing unity between subjects. Such an intricate togetherness also imposes on each individual subject a “double consequence of signification” (Levinas, as cited in Todd, 2004, p. 341) being at the same time an encounter with another (for example, another teacher); and through that other, with the whole of humanity. The ethical responsibilities inherent in such an encounter, towards the other as well as towards humanity itself, can arise only where the encounter meaningfully engages with difference (Todd, 2004). This is where each individual subject recognises the other, and humanity, as different from herself. In recognising the other as different, the individual engages in such an encounter of community simultaneously questioning and redefining her own self formation, in terms of the other and in terms of the differences within and between them. In this sense, then, individuals must make themselves other to themselves, in order to be redefined, and only by this act of alterity can equality and the desired unity be achieved (Foucault, 1982; Kristeva, 1991).

Following this constant redefinition of the subjects engaged in and by an encounter, community, then, is also a continuous process, an “on-going practice that negotiates a difficult ethical path” (Todd, 2004, p. 342), rather than merely a consequence of an engagement. Whilst Kristeva’s (1991) foreigners and my experiences with my students link to the incompleteness of encounters of community and to the ethical tightrope they walk, *Te Whāriki's* strong focus on community as an entity demonstrates little recognition for such complex ethical encounters and alterity. Todd (2004) outlines Bauman’s modalities of being as a further tool for examining the ethical path of being with others, as others. I extend his conceptions to my analysis of *Te Whāriki's* relationship to ethical togetherness. He outlines notions of being-aside, being-with and being-for, to analyse forms of social togetherness demanding a range of levels of commitment.

Immigrant early childhood teachers immersed in their new setting, together with others, teachers, children and families, can be seen as being-aside those others. They are literally aside each other in the same space, tangentially sharing and expecting little of themselves or of the others in relation to each other. Once they begin engaging with the others around

them, immigrant teachers begin being-with the others. They begin to have superficial, transient relevance to each other. Like Kristeva's (1991) social foreigner, they enjoy the engagements while they last and make the most of the time and place, but give or take nothing substantial. Safe in their superficiality, being-with allows individuals to retreat or participate for as long as they are comfortable in the encounter, hiding behind rules and conventions, focused little on the person, but, rather, on knowledge and transparency. Community as an ethical and on-going encounter is not achieved by this state, as interactions remain on the surface, safe, unthreatening, uncommitted, levelled and easy (Todd, 2004). I argue that notions of community in *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), focused as they are on an entire group of people, most realistically represent encounters of being-with, where individuals harmoniously, fearlessly engage, committing little of themselves, but, consequentially, also achieving little in return (Rhedding-Jones, 2002; Todd, 2007).

A breakthrough occurs for individuals engaged in an encounter where they transcend the constraints of their physical location and situation, to commit to a togetherness implicating them in an ethical relationship and responsibility with and for each other. Bauman calls this kind of encounter being-for another, where "eyes meet other eyes and stay fixed – and a commitment shoots up, apparently from nowhere, certainly not from previous intention, instruction, norm: the emergence of commitment is as much surprising as its presence is commanding" (Bauman, as cited in Todd, 2004, p. 345). Such an engagement is thus an act of community, where knowing about the other is not as important as the nature of the engagement itself. Elevating the importance of the alterity of the individuals engaged in the encounter thus preserves and demands respect for and acceptance of their differences. Even in its apparent recognition of cultural difference and diversity, and in calls for emotional support and comfort for adults and children, *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) aspirations remain at a surface level of being-with others. Associated with feelings of sympathy, empathy and harmony, this level of engagement may build some bridges across cultural divides. However, it appears to fall short of elevating individuals to an intrinsic personal commitment to respectful, ethical community arising from being-for another and accepting, recognising and engaging with and across differences (Rhedding-Jones, 2001; Todd, 2004).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS – SOCIAL BUTTERFLIES, SCEPTICAL CYNICS

Todd's (2004) concerns with coming together across differences in signifying encounters with others affirm Kristeva's (1991) utopian dream in terms of living with and being other. "Is it possible to simply rethink the terms of community differently" she asks, "so that it no longer comes to mean commonality at all" (Todd, 2004, p. 340)? Social butterflies, sceptical cynics, comfortably hated and hardworking, the concept of constantly evolving foreigners has been integral to this analysis of conceptualisations of community. In this chapter, the notion of

community has been examined from a range of perspectives, highlighting the tension between and understanding of community as an entity consisting of a group of people, and as the act of engagement in an encounter between individuals. Most significantly, it has highlighted the value of community as an ethical commitment to maintaining and engaging with alterity, as a personal responsibility towards the other and to the individual as a “*practice of encountering others*” (Todd, 2004, p. 342, emphasis in the original). Arriving at such an insightful understanding of community as a place of togetherness regardless of difference, has emerged as the ultimate outcome of interrogating community.

Te Whāriki predominantly focuses on community as representing a group of people, and only rarely alludes to community as a relational encounter. This analysis leads to my concluding chapter, and to a summary of my response to Kristeva’s challenge, about living with and as others, without ostracism or levelling. The concluding concern crystallises in Todd’s (2004) question: “How do we answer the other(s) in order to promote conditions for future coexistence in ways that address the particularity of the *you*” (p. 342, emphasis in the original)? In summary, it can be deduced, that it is in conceptualising community as an encounter that individual immigrant teachers can commit themselves to others and to humanity, through their engagements, despite and because of their differences.

CHAPTER 7 – CONCLUSION: WITHOUT OSTRACISM AND WITHOUT LEVELLING

My conclusion is a return to the beginning – to Kristeva’s (1991) utopian ideal of ever being able to “live with the others, to live as *others*, without ostracism and without levelling” (p. 2, emphasis in the original) and to the analyses of tensions it raises. This chapter concludes the interplay between Kristeva’s foreigners and tensions of immigrant otherness, and my undoing of *Te Whāriki*, which has represented the discourse in which immigrant early childhood teachers are immersed (Ministry of Education, 1996). In a final examination of conceptualisations of living with and being other, in ways that challenge ostracising and levelling, I summarise the aims and key concerns of the study and outline some critical revelations from the political, philosophical and feminist theoretical perspectives.

KRISTEVA’S FOREIGNERS

Ever roaming, Kristeva’s (1991) foreigners are catapulted into personal and political, inner and outer flux and instability. Their foreignness thrusts them into constant change and transformation, inescapably intertwined in experiences of their abandoned past and present shifting identity. Their unpredictable responses to complex, localised contexts help explain the conditions in which contemporary foreigners are situated, within the wider discourse of escalating globalisation, shifting, transcending societies and increasingly fluid conceptions of a stable home and place (Braidotti, 2009; Kristeva, 1991; MacEinri, 1994; Mohanty, 2003).

Desperately creating new or interim homes and avoiding unnecessary interactions, these foreigners’ polyphonic voices represent experiences of intense engagements across differences, settling and feeling at home (Schultz, 1994). Some are keen to try new languages, others try too hard, and yet others will never even attempt to learn them. The overwhelming gravity of their difference drives some foreigners to hide behind a mask, playing out new personalities, or remaining totally anonymous, untouched and untroubled, all at the same time (Kristeva, 1991). These myriad philosophical impersonations of foreigners have accompanied my analysis, as abstract illustrations of the intricate, raw sensitivities associated with being different, unbelonging, simultaneously, confusingly devastated and exhilarated, and foreign.

REFRAMING THE STUDY: THE AIMS AND CONCERNS

My aim for this study was to raise a critical awareness of immigrant teachers’ complex otherness, and how it plays out in the early childhood context of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In an attempt to achieve this, I have highlighted and disrupted conceptualisations of immigrant otherness and contested common ideologies with which immigrant teachers are confronted, through political, philosophical and feminist theoretical lenses. My analysis has focused on a number of key concerns arising from my incidental engagements with immigrant early

childhood teachers and their experiences of otherness in their new early childhood milieu. My memories of their stories underpin an overpowering state of uncertainty and a perceived lack of recognition of the importance of their beliefs and practices in their teaching. These anecdotal accounts suggest increased feelings of alienation and an inability to judge which culturally determined practices may or may not be allowed in their early childhood environments. Drawing on my students' stories and the early childhood discourse has led to the overarching concern of this research, with immigrant teachers' formation of themselves, confronted with the practical, social and political implications of their everyday struggles.

Further concerns addressed throughout the study are embedded in the early childhood discourse. My own experiences as an immigrant teacher resonate with those of my students, and have thus heightened the urgency of my commitment to a re-conceptualisation of immigrant otherness, and to an examination of Kristeva's challenge. *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) has been analysed as the guiding policy informing practices and expectations in early childhood settings in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It has been applied to represent the dominant early childhood education discourse, and an undoing of this curriculum document has enabled me to analyse the concern with the lack of recognition of and engagement with the complex issues confronting immigrant teachers. A concern arising from *Te Whāriki's* call for celebrations of diversity in early childhood settings is analysed through the dominant promotion, in the critical multicultural literature, of knowledge as a remedy for managing diversity (Besley & Peters, 2011; May & Sleeter, 2010). This becomes a critical concern when diversity is seen as just a "benign variation" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 193), rather than as an entanglement of conflicting realities, imbued with and inseparable from relations of power and history. The concern with such expectations in *Te Whāriki* are that, rather than a situation genuinely considered worthy of celebration, they suggest "a harmonious, empty pluralism" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 193) leading to, rather than avoiding levelling. These concerns permeate my analysis, highlighting the conflict and trepidation of immigrant otherness, and the danger in presuming that diversity could be easy, simple and rich.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: A SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS

The analyses in my chapters inform a final confrontation of Kristeva's challenge. The summaries below draw some thoughts from my analysis of the reverence of knowledge and the alternative adoption of ignorance. They then speak about possibilities of home as a physical place, as well as an intrinsic sense of comfort, or, alternatively, as an intrinsic interim homelessness. Furthermore, they consider engagements with speech or resorting to silence; and, finally, they highlight some conceptualisations of community as an entity or as an ethical encounter with others.

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF IMMIGRANT EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS

A liquid modern reality describes the political condition within which my study is located. Uncertainty, unpredictability and flexibility are pervasive in this condition, which is dominated by erratic change, unstable policies and unpredictable standards (Bauman, 2009). It underpins immigrant teachers' experiences from before their arrival, as fluctuations in the immigration policies governing their migration to this country determine the conditions of their arrival and immigration process. Neoliberal, business driven government policy shifts in who is and who is not recruited through various immigration schemes reinforce the flexibility that is demanded as a hallmark of this liquid modern condition (Immigration New Zealand, 2010, 2011; MacEinri, 1994). In the process of filling the demand for teachers in early childhood centres in Aotearoa/New Zealand, immigrant teachers have established themselves as essential cogs in the neoliberal economic government machine, and are thus impacted by its consequences (Codd, 2008). The wider political context, therefore, clearly demonstrates an intention to live with the other - the first suggestion in Kristeva's challenge.

Throughout my research, immigrant teachers emerge as both impacted by and further influencing this liquid modern state of upheaval, evolution and disruption. In an analysis of a dominant reverence of knowledge as a tool for managing diversity, for example, it seems that their otherness is obscured by a simplistic suggestion to develop knowledge to overcome the problem (Todd, 2011). Dominated by change and volatility, the liquid modern condition, however, emphasises that knowledge can ever only be temporary (Bauman, 2009). Thus, any attempt to know another is riddled with possibilities, for example, that the knowledge will soon be superseded, out-dated or obsolete, and that calls for developing such knowledge are therefore futile and absurd (MacEinri, 1994). My analysis exposes the possibility that, in keeping with the liquid modern fitful and easily abandoned temporary commitments, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) might inadvertently be seducing teachers into believing that surface level encounters will suffice. This would allow them to avoid complex encounters, which would reveal the difficult realities of otherness, and maintain instead the safe, non-committal, unaffected, but also superficial, status quo. Therefore, the analysis of calls for knowledge, as a way of being with others, highlights the absurdity of presuming to ever be able to know an other, and the alternative possibility to adopt a stance of ignorance instead (Todd, 2004). Within the early childhood discourse, there appears to be no intention to fulfil the second part of Kristeva's challenge, to live as others. Instead, there may even be a specific attempt at levelling, at smoothing any complicated differences into an easy, superficially homogenous co-existence. My analysis suggests that, to adopt a stance of ignorance, which means to become ignorant and unknowing even of oneself, provides some way of resisting superficial sameness and certainty, and of becoming other, even to ourselves.

Some suspicions arose from this undoing of *Te Whāriki*, indicating, for example, that perhaps the general and un-prescriptive articulation of expectations throughout the

curriculum guidelines actually does seek a more critical engagement with and amongst individuals than is immediately evident. Similarly, the expectations in *Te Whāriki* may actually recognise that immigrant otherness is complicated and difficult, but assume that teachers will deal with their otherness by themselves, and fulfil the curriculum expectations separate from and in spite of their personal struggles. My analysis exposed the requirement of a more critical commitment and responsibility to some encounters, for example, for responsible engagement in dialogic encounters with other adults, children and their families, or through committed engagements in community. Recognition of these requirements could, again, be assumed as deeply (albeit invisibly) embedded in *Te Whāriki*'s stated expectations to communicate with others. Perhaps these examples demonstrate by their very generality an underlying respect and commitment to otherness, and to humanity. However, my analysis has highlighted that confronting and acknowledging alterity is an essential ground-stone in encounters with otherness, which would benefit from immediate and explicit attention. The concerns about commitments to encounters with immigrant others are affirmed and reveal a, perhaps unintentional, acceptance of the ostracism that Kristeva seeks to eliminate, hidden behind surface level knowledge and superficial encounters.

PHILOSOPHICAL LENSES

This research is underpinned by a critical philosophical understanding of problematisation, as a framework for contesting and reconceptualising common ideologies and discourses, as well as by Foucault's (1982) study of power and of subject formation. I consider self formation as dependent on a certain sense of freedom, not from a state of repression, but from an ontological perspective where the individual is constantly free to become and to continue becoming. I surmise that immigrant teachers' formation thus occurs not only on the basis of their conceptualisations of themselves, but also through the diverse and complicated power relations and context within which they are situated, and by which they allow themselves to be governed. In my investigation, the formation of immigrant others is impacted by the early childhood education contexts, and by the ways that they produce themselves through their responses to these contexts.

Immigrant teachers' on-going formation impacts strongly on their constructions of home in their new situations. Whilst focused on a tension between conceptualising home as a physical space, or as a personal intrinsic sense of home, my analysis has highlighted the intricate complications involved in conceptualising and creating a home in a new context. Territorialisation, as the art of creating an intrinsic sense of home and comfort, has been revealed as vital to immigrant others' creation of a personal presence and to their way of inhabiting new homes. Conversely, a lack of a personal intrinsic sense of home that presents itself in an absence of territorialisation exposed a possible factor in creating a sense of the exact opposite: a personal, intrinsic sense of homelessness. Whilst immigrant early childhood teachers in Aotearoa/New Zealand are not assumed to be homeless in a

physical sense, my experiences with immigrant student teachers connects strongly with the revelation of this possibility of an intrinsic feeling of homelessness.

Deeply involved with and concerned about reconciling their past experiences of home with their new home, immigrant teachers' self-formation and attempts at territorialisation are strongly evident in the stories that originally inspired this research. However, this analysis has revealed that a strong sense of alienation and discomfort can equally arise from experiences in their new early childhood settings, governed by the liquid modern condition and early childhood discourse. I worry that an arrival at Kristeva's aim of engaging with others without ostracism, cannot yet be assumed.

CRITICAL FEMINIST LENSES

Kristeva (1991) suggests that the foreigner lives within each of us and that if we recognise this internal foreigner within ourselves, this will prevent us from detesting him in himself. This necessitates an important shift in consciousness towards meeting her utopian challenge. Her claim that "[t]he foreigner comes in when the consciousness of my difference arises, and he disappears when we all acknowledge ourselves as foreigners" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 1), demonstrates how recognising the foreigner within could be the catalyst for a humble, possibly frightening, re-imagination of being together, of communicating across and despite differences (Todd, 2004). Alternatively, not recognising individual inner otherness could lead to a turning away, of denying alterity, reframing engagements on the basis of shallowly informed and uncommitted togetherness, resulting in, rather than overcoming, both ostracism and levelling.

In relation to Kristeva's challenge, some demanding insights have arisen from my analysis of speech and of community. The use of speech and dialogue were revealed as strongly representative of a dominant focus on articulated speech, with a particular emphasis on the content of speech as the revelatory element in communicative encounters. My analysis exposed alternative conceptualisations that highlighted the importance of the listener in making meaning of what is said, as opposed to the speaker being in control of the meaning that will eventually be made of her story. I suggest that the resulting unpredictability and uncertainty of engaging in articulated speech creates such a vulnerable position, which potentially leads to the avoidance of any speech at all, and, instead, to a retreat into a safer state, of silence. Silence is thus highlighted as a subversive communicative tool of choice, by which the speaker avoids the naked exposure to which she would otherwise be subjected.

Conscious, responsible engagements with others are the focus of my analysis of community, which is conceptualised variously as an entity made up of a group of people, or as an engagement with others. *Te Whāriki's* (Ministry of Education, 1996) representation of community follows the dominant discourse, which states that community is made up of a group of people. It shows little recognition of the crucial value of responsible, committed

interactions across and despite difficult differences, representing the alternative conceptualisation of community as an act of engagement. *Te Ao Māori* concepts of *whanaungatanga* and *manaakitanga* explicate the integration of a commitment and concern for humanity implicated by such encounters. Community as an encounter thus requires a conscious straddling of differences and recognition of the temporary certainty of the encounter, and of the on-going formation of the other. The significance of such an encounter lies not only in a meeting with the other, but through the other with the whole of humanity. It exposes acts of community as ethical and also as spiritual engagements, and emphasises this notion as a valuable ideal with which to proceed towards Kristeva's dream.

NO VICTORY, NO CONCLUSION

Throughout this study, I have focused on how the early childhood discourse creates "just possibilities for living well together" (Todd, 2004, p. 338), and I have exposed the crucial importance of confronting oneself with the being or not being other. Kristeva (1991) stresses that it "is not simply – humanistically – a matter of our being able to accept the other, but of *being in his place*," and, to do this, she urges, "means to imagine and make oneself other for oneself" (p. 13, emphasis in the original). The early childhood discourse demonstrates a certain intention and, I assume, also a desire, at least, to live *with* others. Kristeva's proposition that individuals learn to live *as others*, and that there be no ostracism or levelling, remain, at this point, a wider utopian challenge. The inescapable complexity of immigrant otherness and of the power relationships with and amongst others as explicated in this study, reinforce Kristeva's own response to her utopian challenge. In affirming that there is, at the moment, no victory or conclusion, this task signals some important leads.

FURTHER TOWARDS UTOPIA ...

As an on-going challenge, following Kristeva's utopian dream requires a further extensive undoing, not only of *Te Whāriki*, but of the wider early childhood discourse. To imagine such a place as Kristeva suggests, where being with others becomes more than merely accepting them, but rather of walking with them *as others* ourselves, means further reconceptualising otherness, and the discourse by which it is governed. Further specific attention to immigrant teachers' otherness, perhaps even with another attempt at a shared engagement through a research project, will inform a more specific theorisation of their individual and collective experiences. An intrinsic commitment and responsibility towards others, and humanity, and towards recognising the foreigner within ourselves, may yet spare us from detesting others. If we are to avoid obliterating the foreigner through ostracism or levelling, endangering the foreigner within as well as in others, Kristeva's call for imagining possibilities for making ourselves other for ourselves remains the critical concern. The work remaining, therefore, implicates us as individuals, as well as collectively, in a more risky confrontation of ourselves, in being foreign not only to others but, most terrifyingly, to ourselves.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ahmed, S., Castañeda, C., Fortier, A. M., & Sheller, M. (2003). *Uprooting/Regroundings: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Ailwood, J. (2004). Genealogies of governmentality: Producing and managing young children and their education. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(3), 19-34.
- Anderson, B. R. O. G. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Anderson, B. R. O. G. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism (Revised)*. London, UK: Verso.
- Ansley, G. (2010, 5 January). Knifing threatens ties with India. *NZ Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10618423.
- Bammer, A. (1994). Introduction. In A. Bammer (Ed.), *Displacements: Cultural identities in question* (pp. xi-xx). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2009). Education in the liquid-modern setting. *Power and education*, 1(2), 157-166. doi:10.2304/power.2009.1.2.157
- Besley, T. A. C. (2007). Foucault, truth-telling and technologies of the self: Confessional practices of the self and schools. In M. A. Peters & T. A. C. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research* (pp. 55-69). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Besley, T. A. C., & Peters, M. A. (2011). Interculturalism, ethnocentrism and dialogue. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Braidotti, R. (2009). Introduction, Learning from the future. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 24(59). doi:10.1080/08164640802645117

- Cameron, M., Berger, J. G., Lovett, S., & Baker, R. (2007). *Ako: Being a teacher, being a learner, being part of a learning profession*. Retrieved from <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/15413.pdf>.
- Chan, A. (2009). Critical multiculturalism: The challenge of multiculturalism within a New Zealand bicultural context - A Chinese perspective. *International Journal of Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood*, 7(1), 29-40.
- Chan, A. (2011). Critical multiculturalism: Supporting early childhood teachers to work with diverse immigrant families. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, 2(1), 63-75.
- Chasteen, J. C. (2003). Introduction: Beyond imagined communities. In S. Castro-Klaren & J. C. Chasteen (Eds.), *Beyond imagined communities: Reading and writing the nation in nineteenth-century Latin America*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Codd, J. (2008). Neoliberalism, globalisation and the deprofessionalisation of teachers. In V. Carpenter, J. Jesson, P. Roberts & M. Stephenson (Eds.), *Ngā kaupapa here: Connections and contradictions in education* (pp. 14-24). South Melbourne, Australia: Cengage Learning.
- Deutscher, P. (2002). *A politics of impossible difference: The later work of Luce Irigaray*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Doherty, R. (2007). Critically framing education policy: Foucault, discourse and governmentality. In M. A. Peters & T. A. C. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research* (pp. 193-204). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Duhn, I. (2010). 'The centre is my business': Neo-liberal politics, privatisation and discourses of professionalism in New Zealand. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 11(1), 49-60. doi:10.2304/ciec.2010.11.1.49
- Duncan, J. (2006). Aspiring to quality - culturally constructed. *Early Childhood Folio*, 10, 32-36.
- Fenech, M., & Sumsion, J. (2007). Early Childhood Teachers and Regulation: complicating power relations using a Foucauldian lens. *Contemporary*

Issues in Early Childhood, 8(2), 109-122.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/10.2304/ciec.2007.8.2.109>

Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.

Gillis, S., Howie, G., & Munford, R. (2004). *Third wave feminism: A critical exploration*. Hants, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gunn, A. C., Child, C., Madden, B., Purdue, K., Surtees, N., Thurlow, B., & Todd, P. (2004). Building inclusive communities in early childhood education: diverse perspectives from Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 5(3), 293-308.

Ho, E., Holmes, P., & Cooper, J. (2004). *Review and evaluation of international literature on managing cultural diversity in the classroom*. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/EducationSectors/InternationalEducation/ProvidersOfIntEd/InternationalismClassRoomStrategies.pdf>

hooks, b. (2009). *Belonging: A culture of place*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Immigration New Zealand. (2010). *Long term skill shortage list*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigration.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/063ECB35-F5D5-44D8-8325-7041A727A9D5/0/1093.pdf>

Immigration New Zealand. (2011). *Essential skills in demand lists review*. Retrieved from <http://www.immigration.govt.nz/migrant/general/generalinformation/news/esidreview.htm>

- Johnson, T. (2002). Archaeologies and utopias: Reassessing Kristeva's relevance to feminist literary practice. *Feminist theory*, 3(2), 169-181.
doi:10.1177/1464700102003002343
- Juniper, J., & Jose, J. (2008). Foucault and Spinoza: Philosophies of immanence and the decentred political subject. *History of the Human Sciences*, 21(2), 1-20. doi:10.1177/0952695108091410
- Kilito, A. (1994). Dog words. In A. Bammer (Ed.), *Displacements: Cultural identities in question*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Kincheloe, J., & Tobin, K. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4(3), 513-528. doi:10.1007/s11422-009-9178-5
- Kolig, E. (2006). *Freedom, identity construction and cultural closure: The taniwha, the hijab and the wiener schnitzel as boundary markers*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lechte, J., & Zournazi, M. (2003). Introduction. In J. Lechte & M. Zournazi (Eds.), *The Kristeva Critical Reader*. Edinburgh, UK: Edingburgh University Press.
- Lewin, J., Meares, C., Cain, T., Spoonley, P., Peace, R., & Ho, E. (2011). *Namaste New Zealand: Indian employers and employees in Auckland*. Retrieved from <http://integrationofimmigrants.massey.ac.nz>
- Li, X. (2007). Multiculturalize teacher identity: A critical descriptive narrative. *Multicultural Education, Summer*, 37-45.
- MacEinri, P. (1994). How does it feel? Migrants and the postmodern condition. *Chimera*, 87-94.

- MacLure, M. (2010, December). *Qualitative inquiry: Where are the ruins?* Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Marotta, V. (2002). Zygmunt Bauman: Order, strangerhood and freedom. *Sage Journals Online*, 70(1), 36-54. doi:10.1177/0725513602070001005
- Marshall, J. D. (2007). Michel Foucault: Educational research as problematisation. In M. A. Peters & T. A. C. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research* (pp. 15-28). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McLachlan, C. (2011). An analysis of New Zealand's changing history, policies and approaches to early childhood education. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 36(3), 36-45.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage. (2008). *The Treaty in practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty/the-treaty-in-practice/early-crown-policy>.
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Te Whāriki - He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Pathways to the future: A 10 year strategic plan for early childhood education*. Retrieved from http://www.minedu.govt.nz/web/downloadable/dl7648_v1/english.plan.art.pdf.
- Ministry of Education. (2010). *Teachers in licensed teacher-led ECE services*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/ece/55104>.
- Ministry of Education. (2011). *Early childhood education initiatives and savings*. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/theMinistry/Budget/Budget2010/ECEInitiativesAndSavings.aspx>
- Mitchell, L., & Brooking, K. (2007). *First NZCER national survey of early childhood education services*. Retrieved from <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/15318.pdf>

- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Moss, P. (2006). Structures, understandings and discourses: Possibilities for re-envisioning the early childhood worker. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 7(1), 30-41. doi:10.2304/ciec.2006.7.1.30
- Nuttal, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Weaving Te Whāriki: Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Orange, C. (1989). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Osgood, J. (2006). Deconstructing professionalism in early childhood education: Resisting the regulatory gaze. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 7(1), 5-14. doi:10.2304
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, M. A. (2007). Educational research: 'Games of truth' and the ethics of subjectivity. In M. A. Peters & T. A. C. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research* (pp. 181-191). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Ponzanesi, S. (2002). Diasporic subjects and migration. In G. Griffin & R. Braidotti (Eds.), *Thinking differently: A reader in European women's studies*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Punch, K. F. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Reedy, T. (2003). Toku rangatiratanga na te mana-matauranga "Knowledge and power set me free ...". In J. Nuttal (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki* (pp. 51-75). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Rhedding-Jones, J. (2001). Shifting ethnicities: 'Native informants' and other theories from/for early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 2(1), 135-156.

- Rhedding-Jones, J. (2002). An undoing of documents and other texts: Towards a critical multiculturalism in early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 3(1), 90-116.
- Ritchie, J. (2003). Te Whāriki as potential lever for bicultural development. In J. Nuttal (Ed.), *Weaving Te Whāriki* (pp. 79-101). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Ritchie, J. (2008). Honouring Maori subjectivities within early childhood education in Aotearoa. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 9(3), 202-210.
- Ritchie, J. (2010). Being "sociocultural" in early childhood education practice in Aotearoa. *Early Childhood Folio*, 14(2), 2-7.
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2006). Enacting a whakawhanaungatanga approach in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Folio*, 10, 16-20.
- Rivalland, C. M. P., & Nuttal, J. (2010). Sameness-as-fairness: Early childhood professionals negotiating multiculturalism in childcare. *Early Childhood Folio*, 14(1), 28-32.
- Robinson, K. H., & Diaz, C. J. (2006). *Diversity and difference in early childhood education: Issues for theory and practice*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Robinson, M. (2010). More men needed in centres. *North Shore Times*. Retrieved from www.ecmenz.org/whatsnew.html.
- Rockler-Gladen, N. (2007). *Third wave feminism: Personal empowerment dominates this feminist philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://naomi-rockler-gladen.suite101.com/third-wave-feminism-a20276>.
- Schneider, K. (2012). The subject-object transformations and 'Bildung'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(3), 302-311. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00696.x
- Schultz, K. (1994). Book review: Strangers to ourselves. *Comparative Literature*, 46(3), 316.

- Silva, K. (2009). Oh, give me a home: diasporic longings of home and belonging. *Social Identities*, 15(5), 693-706.
- Smith, L. T. (2007). The native and the neoliberal down under: Neoliberalism and "endangered authenticities". In M. Cadena & O. Starn (Eds.), *Indigenous experience today*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- State Services Commission. (n.d.). *Publications and Resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.ssc.govt.nz/publications-and-resources?text=treaty+of+waitangi+>.
- Stone, L. (2004). Julie Kristeva's 'mystery' of the subject in process. In J. D. Marshall (Ed.), *Poststructuralism, philosophy, pedagogy* (pp. 119-139). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tan, L. (2011, 18 August). Schools, jobs lure migrants to Auckland. *New Zealand Herald*, p. A7.
- Tan, L. (2012, 3 February). Students from India lead charge. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10783070
- Todd, S. (2004). Teaching with ignorance: Questions of social justice, empathy, and responsible community. *Interchange*, 35(3), 337-352.
- Todd, S. (2007). Promoting a just education: Dilemmas of rights, freedom and justice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 39(6), 592. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00310.x.
- Todd, S. (2011). Educating beyond cultural diversity: Redrawing the boundaries of a democratic plurality. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(2), 101-111. doi:10.1007/s11217-010-9215-6
- Townsend-Cross, M. (2004). Indigenous Australian perspectives in early childhood education. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 29(4), 1-6.
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2010). *Intercultural dialogue*. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=35020&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

- Urban, M. (2008). Dealing with uncertainty: Challenges and possibilities for the early childhood profession. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 16(2), 135-152. doi:10.1080/13502930802141584
- Villenas, S. (2000). This ethnography called my back: Writings of the exotic gaze, "othering" Latina, and recuperating Xicanisma. In E. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the Ruins : Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education* (pp. 74-95). London, UK: Routledge.
- Viruru, R. (2006). Postcolonial technologies of power: Standardized testing and representing diverse young children. *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research and Practice*, 49(7), 49-70.
- Walsh, D. J. (2007). *Who are "we"? The many dimensions of culture*. Paper presented at the Early Childhood Convention, Rotorua, New Zealand.
- Wise, J. M. (2000). Home: Territory and identity. *Cultural Studies*, 14(2), 295-310.
- Wong, J. (2007). Paradox of capacity and power: Critical ontology and the developmental model of childhood. In M. A. Peters & T. A. C. Besley (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research* (pp. 71-89). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Wu, B. (2011). *Whose culture has capital?: Class, culture, migration, and mothering*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang Publishing.