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ABSTRACT

Chile’s history of (neo)colonisation and neoliberalism in education impacted early childhood education (ECE) and its curriculum. Its untroubled philosophical and pedagogical roots promote normalised ideas of ‘childhood’, and the (re)production of a specific subject: ‘the Child’. Consequently, regimes of truth about ‘the Child’ are (re)established in pedagogical and curricular practices.

Drawing on Butler’s concept of performativity and Foucault’s understandings of power and discourse, I explored how the Child is not born, but made. During 2013 I spent approximately five months in an EC classroom with 32 young children and four female practitioners. The approach was framed under a postmodern rationale. It was ethnographically informed, which involved participating and observing the everyday routines in the classroom. The ‘data’ that was generated throughout that period was analysed using Haraway’s metaphor of a ‘cat’s cradle’, which had Rapa Nuian influences. This resulted in three Kai-Kai figures, where I (dis)entangled several discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’.

Analysis suggest that ‘the Child’ is made in the ECE classroom, and cannot exist without ‘the Aunty’ (female practitioner), who is accountable for producing child subjects. Both subjects are bound in a binary logic, creating polarised relationships of need and dependency, and care and facilitation. Discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ are made through pedagogies informed by the ECE curriculum, produced and regulated by all the subjects, but also resisted and transformed.
IMPACT STATEMENT

This thesis provides knowledge about early childhood education (ECE), specifically in the Chilean context, to understand the field from a regional and cultural perspective. It discusses the early childhood curriculum’s impact on early childhood teachers and subjectivities, taking up a post-structural perspective on challenges and problems in the ECE field. Findings from this thesis are useful for initial teacher education and early childhood practitioners, as these acknowledge the challenges practitioners’ face in terms of their subjectivities and the requirements of wider policy imperatives. Visual images capture imbalances of power, which can be structural, relational, and embodied. Thus, it informs policy decisions on nurseries’ organisation, structure and curriculum. Analyses contribute to the current discussion and interrogation about the impact of a neoliberal rationale on ECE, education in general and society. Finally, this research also contributes to the conversation about childhood and how children are perceived and produced within society.
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INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the field of ECE has strived for children’s learning and wellbeing, and the reconceptualist movement, through its critical work, has raised awareness of everyday injustices and ECE’s political responsibility towards young children, their families and workers (see e.g. Blaise, 2005b; Bloch, Swadener and Cannella, 2014; Burman, 2012; Cannella et al., 2000; Cannella and Soto, 2010; Taylor, Pacini-Ketchabaw and Blaise, 2012). ECE contexts are disciplinary instances where ‘human kinds’ are fabricated (Popkewitz, 2012) and constituted as teachers and student subjects (MacNaughton, 2005), according to the broader social context.

The Study

This thesis tells the story of how I, as an early years practitioner, wanted to explore if discourses of ‘the Child’ were performative. Everything started with me stumbling upon Judith Butler’s theory of gender performativity and asking myself if this could also apply to other identity categories, i.e. that one was not born a child, but made into one. The study’s initial aim was to question how discourses of ‘the Child’ are (re)created in the Chilean ECE classroom. When I started to look into this issue, I realised that I had to be able to identify the array for available discourses of the Child and framed by a neoliberal and postcolonial rationale that underpins the Chilean ECE. This assumes that educational institutions are not neutral (Youdell, 2006b), and that classrooms are sites of power where ‘pedagogical practices, curriculum guidelines, educational theory and beliefs are put neatly into practice’ (Rogers, 2011a, p. 10). ECE contexts are disciplinary instances where teachers and students are constituted as subjects (MacNaughton, 2005; Rhedding-Jones, 1995) and their lives are regulated (Ailwood, 2011). Thus, throughout the study, I asked:

*How are discourses of ‘the Child’ performatively produced in an Early Childhood Education (ECE) context?*

This research question is composed by two specific research sub questions:

*How does the ECE context configure the available discourse(s) of ‘the Child’?, i.e. How are discourses of ‘the Child’ performed?*
These questions framed the study, and informed the organisation of the different research practices according to the following research purposes:

To problematise the founding discourses of EC studies, as a way of reconceptualising the subjectivities produced through these.

To reconceptualise different ways of developing inquiry into EC studies by thinking with~through~against¹ theory, to offer an alternative to dominant research narratives.

To trace how ‘the real’(ness) of ‘the Child’ is produced as ‘the real story’ (Britzman, 2003) within the everyday interactions of a Chilean EC context, I spent approximately five months (March – July, and November 2013) in the ‘Butterfly classroom’, which is part of a publicly subsidised nursery called ‘Pichintún’, in an urban area of Valparaíso, Chile. The research process was challenging and complex. During 2013 I spent approximately five months in an EC classroom with 32 young children and four female practitioners. The approach was framed under a postmodern rationale. It was ethnographically informed, which involved participating and observing the everyday routines in the classroom. The ‘data’ that was generated throughout that period, was analysed using a metaphor of a ‘cat’s cradle’ (Haraway, 1994), which had Rapa Nuian influences. This resulted in three Kai-Kai figures, where I (dis)entangled several discourses of ‘the Child.

(Un)doing the Chilean Child and Aunty

Postmodern thought (Butler, 1999; Foucault, 1982) and Latina-Feminism (Saavedra and Nymark, 2008) invited me to analyse and critically engage with the taken for granted elements of my everyday life as a person, as a female educator, and to understand that the field of ECE was based on a particular knowledge that created truths about the people inhabiting it. This implied looking critically at how identities of its main actors (children) have been shaped throughout the existence of ECE in Chilean history.

Our ECE curriculum is still imbued with European traditions that have a colonial origin, and therefore, the role of female practitioners and young children are also linked to it. Currently, Chile’s ECE is changing its governance, and it has been historically shaped by Catholicism and neoliberalism, the new coloniser (Quijano, 2014), draws on these structures to operate

¹ In this thesis, I use the mathematic symbol “~” of ‘similar’, to open up the possibility of fluidity between signifiers and subjects. Using this symbol avoids implying binaries, as with slashes (“/”); or fixed links as with dashes (“-”). It therefore opens a diverse possibility of readings without guaranteeing a fixed one.
locally through neo-colonial trajectories. Considering the complexity of this setting, it seemed necessary to explore how subjectivities of children and practitioners are being reproduced in ECE classrooms, in order to critically analyse the structural conditions that constitute them.

One of the most relevant findings was that the practitioner - in Chilean Spanish: Aunty – plays a fundamental role in the production of the Child subject, as the existence of each depends on the other. In the first version of this thesis (2016) I mostly concentrated in analysing these Kai-Kai’s perspectives from discourses of the Child which also entangled with my personal biography.

However, after the insightful feedback from the examiners, I revisited my analyses to acknowledge the invisibilisation of ‘the Aunty’, and how my readings of the production of ‘the Child’ positioned their subjectivities and practices in an unfair and unethical way. In this second version I have made a deliberate attempt to represent aunties’ subjectivities and practices in a more nuanced and measured manner. Similarly, this process has led me to reflect on my own role and privilege as a researcher, and how, despite my social justice and transformation intentions through research, I reproduced unjust conditions for practitioners and children. Perhaps I was naïve that I could keep in a critical distance such strong discourses like neoliberalism and Catholicism, which still shape our subjectivities and work in Chilean ECE.

The relevance of this thesis is that it identifies the origins of the dominant discourses of young children and female practitioners that shape current ECE. Most of these have their origins in Chile’s colonial roots and the conflicts emerging from it, and they are still present in today’s practices. It is important to have this discussion, not only in the Chilean context, but also in similar countries with a history of colonisation. There are many embedded ideas in current practices in ECEC centres and in the curricular framework that have not been analysed in depth, and that we are unaware of their impact and relationships with other globalised trends.

Structure of the Thesis

This study was written inspired by Anzaldúa’s (1999) work and writing style, and it was developed in a way that could work against ‘methodological simplicity’ (Koro-Ljungberg, 2012), opening up the complexity(ies) of the inquiry process and theory.
The first chapter present an overview of the Chilean ECE. It provides an overview of the policy agenda, exploring the current governance structure. It critically engages with educational policies as the curriculum, and social policies of ECEC. It concludes identifying challenges for the field. The second chapter adopts an approximation to a ‘history of the present’ about Chilean ECE. I discuss how the foundations of Chilean ECE curriculum are informed by westernised, Eurocentric, white, sexist and postcolonial notions, and how these established regimes of truth about ‘the Child’ and ‘the practitioner’, and configured the (normalised) discursive production of subjectivities in ECE contexts. In chapter Three, I suggest that Butler’s early work (1993, 1997a) enables the exploration of how we as practitioners, researchers and children create ‘children’ through our every behaviour, bodies and the embodiment of discourses impacting on them/us. Concepts from Foucault’s toolbox will also be explored, specifically focusing on power.

The methodology is in Chapter Four and includes information about the participants, setting, research design, methods, concluding with the study’s ethical considerations. In order to introduce and develop analyses, I draw on Haraway’s (1994) metaphor of ‘Cat’s Cradle’ to knit my own variation: ‘Kai-Kai’. Kai-Kais interweave theory and practice to create different figures of discourses of ‘the Chilean child’ and ‘Aunty’.

The Fifth Chapter explains the planned curriculum of the Butterfly classroom. It contextualises the reader with the applied curriculum, spaces and their arrangements, and pedagogic strategies in the nursery. It also describes ‘variable learning activities’ which are activities that are planned daily. Examples of how the space changes and how other pedagogical strategies are used are presented. Common patterns between rituals are identified and their relevance for other learning activities is emphasised.

Chapters Six and Seven unpack Kai-Kai figures of ‘the vulnerable child’ during hygiene and mealtime practices, respectively. These chapters explore how ‘the vulnerable child’ is relevant for establishing particular practices (e.g. behaviours, body training, amongst others) as foundations for other discourses. They also explore how the practitioner is constituted and works within these discourses.

Chapter Eight re-constructs a Kai-Kai figure of ‘the developing child’ through an episode of a planned variable learning activity. I interrupt the narrative periodically so I can disentangle how subjects’ practices are producing particular subjectivities. I present examples of (re)production, regulation (adults and children alike) and also resistance. Chapter Nine also presents a Kai-Kai figure of ‘the developing child’, but examines the principle of play informing variable learning activities. Three types of directed (adult-centred) planned play are
presented. Most of the examples show a romanticised notion of role play, in which individuals are expected to learn how to play properly. In addition, the themes and approaches reflect an aspiration for a particular type of gendered adulthood. Chapter Ten concludes the thesis, and braids the Kai-Kai figures, identifying their main characteristics. The final chapter is reflective and addresses my position of power within the research.
CHAPTER ONE:
CHILEAN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (ECE)

Chilean early childhood education (ECE) is currently a space where social, economic and health agendas co-exist and overlap, producing conflicts of interest at the policy level that are often left to be resolved at the local level by agents such as practitioners. This is arguably the consequence of educational interests being outweighed by these other areas of public policy.

In order to understand this entanglement of interests, this chapter introduces the reader to the current state of Chilean ECE. First, an overview of the education policy agenda for ECE is outlined, stressing the influence of neoliberal policies found in the Chilean education system. Second, some basic information about ECE governance structure is presented, in order to understand who are the key actors at state and local level, describing funding arrangements. Third, the expansion and size of ECE in Chile are explained, including information about enrolment, nurseries, and practitioners. Fourth, two key educational and social programmes that dominate currently in Chilean ECE are described.

I Overview of ECE policy agenda

The Chilean education system is composed of four levels: ECE/Educación Parvularia (from birth to approximately six years), primary education (eight years in duration, compulsory), secondary education (four years in duration) and higher education. Chilean ECE aims to favour comprehensive development and significant learning of children from birth until they enter primary education.

ECE is divided into three levels and six sublevels, organised in two cycles, according to age. The names of levels and sublevels reference development and growth phases, as described in the following table.
According to current legislation in Chile, ECE is recognised as a level in the educational system in the political constitution of the state since 1999. Since 2013, compulsory education starts from Transición II level onwards, although universal access from Medio Menor level has been guaranteed by the state. To ensure this, the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) is responsible for policy design and funding of ECE, securing access to Transición I and II levels for all children, and access to earlier levels (Sala Cuna, Medio Mayor and Medio Menor) to children whose families belong to the 60% more vulnerable of the country (MINEDUC, 2013, p. 7). This has resulted in a rapid expansion of ECE provision in the country in the past decade, and consequently, in its relevance for several public policy agendas.

Adlerstein (2012) argues that in the ECE level, policy has not always been in service of educational or children’s interests. She claims that ECE has been colonised by other public administration areas and interests, and has served alien purposes, leaving ECE installation fragmented and fragile, with contradictory meanings. Education policies do not have protagonist position in ECE, rather, it has been a locus for economic and social policy implementation, conceived as a ‘manageable structural variable of social development’ (Adlerstein, 2012, p. 12). As a result, ECE public policy has been developed under two paradigms: instrumentality and complexity (Adlerstein, 2012). Instrumentality considers ECE as a technical-rational process of production, promoting the use of standards to control the quality of the educational service. Conversely, complexity considers the ECE space as one where multiple subjectivities interact and where educators and communities are constantly negotiating with and adapting to national standards.

These two paradigms currently dominating the ECE policy agenda respond to a historical trajectory, which I briefly address here but expand on in chapter two. Since the 1940s, the policy agenda for ECE has been oriented towards social compensation and childhood
protection as a state responsibility; however, after the dictatorship, this was no longer considered a matter of state responsibility but rather a philanthropic interest from civil society (Adlerstein, 2012). This resulted in the loss of the pedagogical emphasis in the policy agenda on behalf of a remedial social assistentialism that greatly reduced public action and increased the participation of the private sector in ECE (Rojas Flores, 2010). In more recent years, the ECE policy agenda has incorporated discourses of children’s rights together with discourses of human and social capital, creating a consensus around the crucial role of ECE for national economic development (Adlerstein, 2012). As a result, the current public policy agenda for ECE reflects the influence of broader neoliberal principles, where marketisation and privatisation foreground the dominance of economic interests over educational ones.

Neoliberalism constitutes a political programme where the economic and educational agendas are interlinked (Apple, 2006), implying that ‘policy mechanisms should operate, as far as possible, by the principles of the free market’ (Gordon and Whitty, 1997, p.455). Some key aspects of a neoliberal rationale can be observed in the utilisation of ECE as a remedy for social mobility and economic growth, for instance, facilitating female participation in the labour market by releasing mothers from child-care duties. Additionally, the pedagogical aspects of ECE reflect a global education reform movement, focusing on the development of basic skills for school readiness. Finally, the introduction of market and choice mechanisms, such as state vouchers and standardised frameworks of quality assurance, result in the restriction of state’s role in education as a regulatory and subsidiary figure in favour of the privatisation of ECE provision, which is reflected in its governance structure.

II Early childhood education governance

The key actors in Chilean ECE are the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), the National Board of Kindergartens (JUNJI), and Fundación Integra. The following figure displays the different institutions involved in offering ECEC services in Chile.
The Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) is responsible for guaranteeing the fulfilment of the normative, ensuring access to this educational level and designing policies for ECE. MINEDUC also develops the curricular frameworks (under review and renewal in 2016-17), coordinates other government and non-government organisations, and determines the requirements to obtain state’s official recognition of institutions as ECE providers (MINEDUC, 2013). The following table details those institutions under the supervision of MINEDUC.

**MINEDUC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junji</th>
<th>Fundación Integra</th>
<th>Municipal and Private-subsidised providers</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 0-4 years.</td>
<td>- 0-4 years.</td>
<td>- 4-6 years.</td>
<td>- 0-6 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directly administered centres and subsidised centres.</td>
<td>- Directly administered centres and subsidised centres.</td>
<td>- Directly administered centres.</td>
<td>- Independent centres and part of private schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervises quality and assesses centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Part of primary schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own elaboration

Through its ECE Unit, MINEDUC administrates the delivery of resources to different entities, often municipal and private-subsidised education providers that offer this educational level in their primary schools, and receive state funding. These schools are
regularly visited by ministry supervisors, and are also inspected by the Quality Agency and Superintendence of Education, although there is not a specific inspection framework for ECE that is applied in these schools.

The National Board of Kindergartens (JUNJI) was created in 1973 and is a state-funded public institution. It has direct administration over public state nurseries and the delivery of educational services free of charge, and exclusive for vulnerable families. It has the faculty to inspect the organisation and functioning of all the nurseries of the country. JUNJI also finances public or private non-profit organisations, such as state institutions, municipalities or municipal corporations, foundations, and NGOs that provide ECE free of charge under its Transfer of Funds scheme (VTF). Funding is established through contracts that determine the necessary guarantees to ensure the fulfilment of the aims of the service, and the appropriate care of the state’s patrimony (Law 17.301). All of these subsidised institutions are part of the JUNJI network, and are inspected and technically supervised by it. The subsidy is established in unitary amounts per child, which varies according to region, age and average daily attendance.

JUNJI inspects but does not have sanctioning faculties. JUNJI’s inspection of registered and subsidised (VTF) nurseries operates through the application of a form that measures the achievement level in five areas: organisational management, management of educational process (which involves presenting curricular and planning documentation, but none of its contents are reviewed or analysed), good treatment and family, hygiene and food, infrastructure and security. JUNJI has been developing since 2012 an inspection that aims to reach all nurseries in the country, it involves visits and reports in which educational centres are classified in four categories according to the achievement level (high, medium, low, and insufficient) and is part of a public registry which can be accessed on the JUNJI website².

Fundación INTEGRA is a private institution that receives public funding through the presidency. Integra also has direct administration over nurseries and the delivery of educational services, which are free of charge and exclusive for vulnerable families. As JUNJI, it also provides subsidies to third parties (non-profit organisations) that involve economic resources to finance salaries, food, and supply expenses. Administration contracts are established between INTEGRA and organisations that offer services to children in socially vulnerable and challenging circumstances.

² www.junji.cl
In the following list, the different types of administration of ECE services are detailed.

a) Public: JUNJI (state organisation) and INTEGRA (private foundation) are two autonomous institutions that offer services from Sala Cuna Menor to Medio Mayor (three months to four years). Nurseries from both organisations focus enrolment on children whose families have been assessed as vulnerable and/or with economic deprivation. Likewise, primary municipal schools (state funded and administered by municipalities) offer services in the Transición levels. These educational centres provide care, education and food (breakfast, lunch and afternoon milk). The state subsidises according to each child's daily attendance.

b) Private: Private entities correspond to private companies, faith groups and individuals. Fully financed by families (fee values are not controlled), food is provided if included in the cost. These nurseries can opt to be registered with JUNJI, the same state institution that supervises their services. The standards do not require implementing the CFECE, but explicit alignment and/or links are suggested.

c) Publicly Subsidised: Private non-profit entities (e.g. departments of education of municipalities, NGO’s, faith groups) that receive state subsidies through JUNJI or INTEGRA. As with public institutions, enrolment is focused on children whose families have been assessed as vulnerable and/or with economic deprivation. Services are free of charge and subsidies vary according to each child's daily attendance. These nurseries are accountable to JUNJI or INTEGRA, which supervises and evaluates them a minimum of three times per school year. Similar to private nurseries, publicly subsidised entities are free to follow their own curricula, but explicit alignment and/or links with the CFECE are suggested.

II.1 Funding arrangements

The funding structure of the institutions that receive state resources is complex and uneven. The following table presents an overview of the funding arrangements in ECE.
Among the state-funded institutions, JUNJI and Integra receive annually a fixed amount of resources from the national budget, based on different criteria for both entities. JUNJI and Integra, in turn, assign resources according to different criteria for their own nurseries and for VTF ones. On the other hand, municipal and private-subsidised schools that provide ECE services receive a subsidy per child, which considers average attendance, children’s socio-economic level, geographic location and length of the school day.

These different criteria to assign resources result in children who are in the same social condition and in the same educational level, receiving different funding for their education depending of the institution they attend. This particularly affects children attending JUNJI and Integra VTF nurseries, as they receive between 45% and 30% less of the resources than other children (MINEDUC, 2013). Referring to JUNJI VTF nurseries, the amount per child corresponds to approximately 58% of the amount that a child receives if she attends schooling institutions, or the directly administrated by JUNJI and Integra. Integra VTF nurseries assign approximately 55% of the amount. Notwithstanding, it is important to mention that in 2013 the amounts per child in VTF nurseries (both JUNJI and Integra) increased in 50% and 30%, respectively. Moreover, resources assigned to JUNJI VTF nurseries are explicitly stated, while in the case of Integra, there is a yearly arrangement in which it is determined how funding will be transferred.

These funding arrangements reflect neoliberal elements coexisting with conservative ones. For instance, Staab (2013) argues that current welfare systems of many Latin-American countries, including Chile, have favoured marketisation, privatisation and deregulation. Areas such as education, health, and pensions insert themselves in a structure of a welfare model of a fundamentally liberal nature, where the market logic plays a key role and the state is
conceptualised in subsidiary terms. As a result, the state became smaller and reforms empowered private interests, encouraging consumer choice and entrepreneurship. Education became a commodity, traded by three types of providers: private, private-subsidised, and public.

III Expansion and size of ECE in Chile

According to the National Socio-Economic Characterization (CASEN) survey, coverage of ECEC services has almost tripled between 1990 and 2011. The growth has had different increments according to the age range: 4.1% for children between 0 and 1 year, and 94% for children between 5 and 6 years. The resources the state invests in ECEC has grown considerable through time, almost doubling from the 0.4% of the 2014 gross domestic product (GDP), to 0.75%. The budget for JUNJI and Integra has tripled between 2001 and 2013, and the spending in VTF nurseries has increased in a 185% during the same period (MINEDUC, 2013).

Within the last 20 years, the state has put special emphasis on ECE, expanding its services through measures, such as widening coverage, especially in the first educational levels (Umayahara, 2011). The following table shows the increase in enrolment at Medio and Transición levels and sub-levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Medio Menor</th>
<th>Medio Mayor</th>
<th>Transición I</th>
<th>Transición II</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>40,724</td>
<td>233,417</td>
<td>285,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,121</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>94,512</td>
<td>202,648</td>
<td>312,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>71,293</td>
<td>90,419</td>
<td>176,055</td>
<td>211,955</td>
<td>549,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author’s own elaboration based on MINEDUC (2002b; 2010; 2015)

Latest figures from MINEDUC (2015) indicate that 247,361 children (six months to four years) are enrolled in public and public-subsidised ECEC centres. There are 4151 ECEC centres, of which 1711 are publicly subsidised by JUNJI and 58 by INTEGRA, representing the 42.61% of the total.

Medio Mayor sub-level is highlighted in the table above because it has had the biggest increase in enrolment over the last 15 years. In the same period, Transición level was gradually moved from nurseries to primary schools and in 2013 Transición II was made part of compulsory education. However, the latter could be considered a political move, rather than a
change in the structure. Albeit for other reasons, most primary schools were already requiring children’s attendance to Transición I and II when applying for the first year of primary education. Both of these changes emphasised the relevance of Medio Mayor level as the preceding stage to (formal) schooling. Additionally, in 2005 the state created the VTF modality for nurseries that already existed in primary and secondary education.

III.I Practitioners

Chilean ECE has historically been a female dominated profession (Muñoz, 2014) and practitioners are expected to have a strong vocation, to always be joyful and love their children (Viviani, 2016). There are three distinctive types of practitioners. EC educators are university-trained professional who is in charge of one or several classrooms and can occupy the head teacher position. EC assistants are trained in post-secondary professional institutes and have a support role in classrooms, but often are left in charge of a group in the educator’s absence. Finally, technical EC assistants are trained in secondary vocational schools, and provide support to educators and work along with EC assistants.

The proportion or coefficient of adult practitioners and children in classrooms differs according to the institution they work for and the level they teach. The following table shows the official adult-children coefficient for each level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Coefficient practitioners-children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sala Cuna</td>
<td>1 educator per 42 children; in charge of two classrooms; 1 assistant per 7 children; 3 assistants per classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medio Menor</td>
<td>1 educator per 32 children; 1 assistant per 25 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medio Mayor</td>
<td>1 educator per 32 children; 1 assistant per 32 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transición I</td>
<td>1 educator up to 35 children; 1 assistant up to 35 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transición II</td>
<td>1 educator up to 45 children; 1 assistant up to 45 children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Superintendence of Education (May, 2017)

Those institutions that follow the official norms, i.e. MINEDUC and the ones belonging to the JUNJI network (including VTF nurseries) have to meet these regulations. The coefficient of adults per child is higher in levels with younger children (Sala Cuna) than in those older children (Transición I and II), but educators often have additional responsibilities they fulfil in
their nursery. For instance, in some cases, it is possible to observe EC educators in charge of two Sala Cuna classrooms, while simultaneously serving the role of nursery head teacher.

In terms of practitioners’ wages, university trained early childhood educators earn more than other educators (from professional institutes) or assistants. From 2016 onwards, the professional degree can only be offered by universities, although the degrees obtained in professional institutes up until that date, are acknowledged. EC practitioners’ wages are lower than those of primary and secondary education teachers. Also, in comparison to other countries, their wages are lower than the average of OECD countries. By 2013, the number of EC workers was over 39,000 people, most of them assistants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Practitioner</th>
<th>Years of Training</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Average Earning First Year</th>
<th>Average Earning 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Educator</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>University or up until 2016 Professional Institute</td>
<td>Approx. $523,343 - $617,193</td>
<td>Approx. $957,717 - $1,129,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Assistant</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>Professional Institute</td>
<td>No available data</td>
<td>Approx. $300,000 - $353,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Early Childhood Assistant</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>Vocational Secondary School (Final two years)</td>
<td>No available data</td>
<td>No available data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author’s own elaboration based on data from MINEDUC (2013)

IV   Educational and social policies in EC

According to the General Education Law (Ley Nº 20.370 D.O./2009, MINEDUC), the purpose and aims of ECE aspire to provide a framework for wellbeing and positive self-concept for children. Assuming a comprehensive perspective, ECE should enable children to develop physical (motor skills, self-care, body appreciation), cognitive (numeracy and literacy skills, artistic skills, creativity and curiosity), morally (caring of others, respect for diversity), and cultural (appreciating the natural and social environment, and indigenous cultural heritage) competences. From this definition of ECE aims, two broad policy areas are encompassed: education and social. The following sub-sections describe the ECE curricular framework (CFECE, education policy) and the ‘Chile Crece Contigo’ programme (social policy), and how they are linked to each other.
IV.I Educational policies in EC: Curricular framework

IV.I.1 The Structure of the ECE curricular Framework (CFECE)

Aesthetically attractive (rich in colours, children’s drawings and big letters), the CFECE⁴ openly encourages educators with a strong vocation to take on the challenge and work professionally to improve children’s learning. The aim of the CFECE is to promote ‘comprehensive human education’ for children (MINEDUC, 2001a, p. 27). Specifically, ‘the Child’ (female and male) is conceived as:

a developing person who develops his identity and who progresses in the discovery of his emotions and potentialities in a comprehensive [holistic] sense. He establishes meaningful emotional bonds and expresses his feelings, develops the capacity of exploration and communication of his experiences and ideas; and that explains to himself the world according to his understandings, while enjoying fully and playfully the phase he finds himself in. It also considers a projective vision towards his future schooling periods and citizenship formation. (p. 15)

According to this statement, ‘the Chilean child’ is in a state of becoming (Goddard et al., 2005; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998) – develops, discovery of his emotions, exploration, projective vision, future. Furthermore, she is consistently active in all the spheres of her world, and (inherently) engages with these in a joyful and playful manner. Finally, her development is aimed at her future in school and as a rational member of a democratic society. This discourse of ‘the Child’ resonates with Ailwood’s (2008) statement that for ECE ‘the shape of the adult-to-be impacts upon ways of producing the present child’ (p. 535).

The 1998 curricular reform sought throughout all educational levels learning to promote through sequenced teaching and learning processes, according to the expected outcomes of later educational levels (MINEDUC, 2002a). The CFECE transformed this purpose through the ‘triad of development, teaching, and learning’ (p. 10) representing the foundation of the document. The triad establishes that learning (linked to previous knowledge) triggers development, and progress depends on the ‘developmental maturation patterns’ (ibid.). Although CFECE states that developmental patterns are not universal, as each growth and learning process triggers different development trajectories; emphasis on ‘development’, ‘sequencing’ and ‘internalisation’ signpost a cognitivist rationale. Step-by-step notions in ECE are common in curricula (Bloch and Popkewitz, 2005), especially if their foundations are inspired in Piagetian (1972) learning theories. Heyning (2001) suggests that the ‘new’ form of

---

⁴ During 2016, the CFECE was under revision and a new proposal was presented in June 2017. However, the proposal was rejected twice unanimously by the National Educational Council (CNED). The expert panel assessed the theoretical framework weak, and emphasised the relevance of reformulating aims and structure.
constructivism, prevalent in the field of education today, rules as an unquestionable truth, as developmental theory becomes part of psychological science.

CFECE considers a broad age range that is divided into two cycles: birth to three years, and three to six years. Learning outcomes are divided into three areas of learning: Personal and Social Formation, Communication, and Relations with the Natural and Cultural Environment (See Figure 1). Each area is subdivided into nuclei, as detailed in the following figure. Referring to some nuclei in the second cycle, subcategories are included. Within nuclei, the CFECE enumerate ‘aprendizajes esperados’/‘expected learning(s)’, formerly known (before the reform) as ‘learning objectives’. These learning outcomes are broad and simple in scope in earlier stages and become more specific and complex later on. Additionally, the learning outcomes of the second cycle gradually focus more on skills and contents to promote ‘articulación’/linking (MINEDUC and UNICEF, 2002) between ECE and primary schooling.

In 2007, another curricular document (complementary to CFECE) was launched by MINEDUC: The Learning Progress Maps (Mapas de Progreso del Aprendizaje, LPM). Although not widely distributed and not compulsory for ECE institutions, LPM served to make explicit the influence of developmental and cognitive psychology in the ECE curriculum (specifically, Jerome Bruner, MINEDUC, 2008). For each learning area, and according to children’s age level, examples of children’s actions were used to illustrate the expected performance standards. These examples also included suggested ‘activities’ for practitioners to facilitate and assess children’s performance. The programmes for Transición levels, non-compulsory documents, were published in 2008 and linked the CF of primary education and Year One programmes. It specified for each nuclei 10 earning outcomes, and included suggested activities and
'performance examples' (examples that illustrate the ‘result’ of the implementation, i.e. how to ‘achieve’ the learning outcome through the suggested activities of the LPM).

Curiously, similarities can be established with Ailwood’s (2003) critique of the DAP text in the Australian context. She identified influential ‘tables of life’ about young children’s lives, arguing that these ‘create an imaginary order out of complexity, messiness and disorder’ (p. 295).

IV.I.II   Social policies in EC: Chile Crece Contigo

The law 20.379 institutionalised the subsystem of comprehensive protection of childhood ‘Chile Crece Contigo’ (Chile Grows with you), and established that the state will guarantee to families that are part of the 60% socioeconomically more vulnerable of the national population, access to nurseries (sala cuna and medio levels) in part time school days. Children whose families belong to the 60% more vulnerable and whose mothers, fathers or carers are working, studying, or looking for work will have access to nurseries (sala cuna and medio levels) in extended school days. This obligation is fulfilled by the state through the institutions that integrate JUNJI and Integra.

Chilean ECE has been acknowledged for its ‘continuous efforts to expand the coverage and improve quality’ (Umayahara, 2011, p. 11), and since the creation of ‘Chile Crece Contigo’ in 2006, it has also acquired recognition from OECD (2009; 2011) and UNESCO (2009). As a national comprehensive multiagency programme, it offers protection to young children ‘as of their first gestation medical check-up in the public health system’ (Peralta, 2011, p. 25). This programme integrates social, health and education policies and services for the ‘vulnerable’
segment of the population. This programme was made possible because of the educational reform (1996) that involved all educational sectors (for the first time including ECE).

Educational reforms do not happen by accident. Apple (2010) suggests that current trends show that they are generally driven by a will to change, highly influenced by the globalised economy and market needs. Specifically, in ECE, Ailwood’s (2008) analysis in the Australian context explores how educational reforms are entangled with different discourses and liberal economic purposes. She discusses how ECEC practices became public and ‘subject to accountability, quality and efficiency measures’ (p. 536), in order to target the most vulnerable population and ensure quality of services. In 1998, MINEDUC argued that the spirit of the Chilean reform aimed to ensure equity and quality (MINEDUC, 1998) in a system that had been partially generated by our economic shift (Avalos, 1996).

‘Equity’ and ‘quality’ were emphasised and considered a necessary response to ‘the changes and demands the country was making, and to the needs of the learners’ (MINEDUC, 2002a, p. 11). (Humanist) democratic values such as ‘convivencia’ (coexistence), and the promotion of ‘more and better learning opportunities for young boys and girls’ (MINEDUC, 2001a, p. 3) informed the national non-compulsory curricular framework (CFECE), which recollected the pedagogical and curricular trends that shaped the Chilean field in its century of existence (Peralta, 2012). Until then, only general curricular frameworks informed by school-readiness expectations were available (MINEDUC, 1998).

The trajectory of the curriculum intersected with the social trajectory of Chile Crece Contigo, sharing similar (scientific) foundations and purposes:

1) A country that grows at the pace of its children. Children are conceived as a possession and long-term investment. The future of the nation depends on the (normal) development of the (poor) child (Hopkins and Sriprakash, 2015).

2) Education is first subservient to the country’s demands, and second to its learners. This may suggest that political decisions drove the implementation of curriculum, independent of the context (Murphy and Moon, 1999). Take for instance that the pilot study of the CFECE (MINEDUC, 2002a) was published a year after the framework was launched (MINEDUC, 2001a).

3) Signifiers of equity and quality shift in relation to universality of access and accountability of the services. In this way, quality became the institution’s (nurseries, schools) and practitioners’ responsibility. Referring to accountability, private subsidised nurseries are audited and supervised comprehensively:
administratively (uses of subsidy), health reports (meal administration and tracking health and weight); and pedagogically. Nurseries and their professionals now are accountable for meeting the standards (Viviani, 2016), and ensuring that their curricula link with the CFECE.

4) ECE is institutionalised as a nodal point where health, social and education policies intersect. Chile Crece Contigo pushes a political agenda that made this intersection evident, and emphasised the production of a narrative of democratic society with particular understandings of ‘the Child’ and ECE.

Peralta (2012) and Silva (2002) acknowledge that the Chilean ECE tradition was taken into consideration as the basis for the ECE reform and creation of its curriculum. Consequently, this document represents a paradigm shift in which the amalgamation of traditions, worldviews and pedagogic–epistemological approaches are put together, overlap and contradict.

This study follows Cary’s approach to study curriculum as a ‘discursively produced historically, socially, politically and economically inscribed epistemological space’ (2006, p. 33) that produces realities and subjectivities. Through pedagogic implementation, discourses operate with and through learners and teachers (Popkewitz, 1998). In the following section this curricular document will be reviewed in detail.

IV. III Linking education and social policies in EC

The concept of ‘comprehensive’ (holistic) informs both strands and legitimates practices that affected subjects’ lives. This argument was used to instigate discussions on the need for state ECE provision (JUNJI, 2006), and it was later promoted as a curricular modality (‘Curriculo Integral’, Alarcón, Bonard and Simonstein, 1985; Peralta, 1987). The creators explained that it aspired to capture all the humanist elements of ECE precursors, progressive education and developmental trends. Later in 2001, the national curricular framework (CFECE, MINEDUC 2001a) used the notion of ‘integral/comprehensive education to promote wellbeing and development (UNESCO and MINEDUC, 2004) and was further reinforced with complementary curricular documentation (LPM, MINEDUC, 2008) and multiagency policies that involved ECE (e.g. Chile Crece Contigo, Frenz, 2007).

In 2014, the state drew again on the ‘comprehensive’ signifier when installing a legal framework for ECE that ‘generated new conditions enabling the creation of a comprehensive quality policy’ (MINEDUC, 2014, p. 8, personal translation). This legal framework guaranteed the right to quality ECE for all children, stimulated families’ commitment to children’s early
learning process; and the improvement of the ‘coordination and efficiency of state’s efforts and resources’, Ibid.). This investment implied universalising access to ECE provision in publicly subsidised nurseries.

Both curricular and social trends of ‘comprehensive’ education/services/development are responses to broader international (economic) trends (Salazar Perez and Cannella, 2010) and their implementation responds to the particularities of the Chilean educational context, establishing ‘a truth’ (Foucault, 1982) that shapes educational realities and lives of subjects.

V Concluding thoughts: challenges and critical issues

The current state of ECE in Chile represents the entanglement of different policy agendas. This can be observed in the linking of education and social policies through the CFECE and the Chile Crece Contigo programme. This multiagency approach is framed by the concept of ‘comprehensive’, and operates through a governance structure that binds together ministries of education, social development and health.

I argue that these policy agendas can create tensions and contradictions that are left to be resolved at the local level by practitioners, in a context of constant expansion and precarious working conditions. In fact, ECE practitioners (educators, assistants and technical assistants) are underpaid when compared with other education professionals and in consideration of their workload after the explosive expansion of the sector in the past decade (adult-child ratio, external supervision, administrative responsibilities).

This entanglement of different policy agendas (education, social, health) and the expansion of ECE could be linked to a neoliberal-inspired rationale that considers early education as a remedy for economic and social issues. This rationale has led to develop public-private partnerships to expand the provision of ECE and to create an educational quasi-market with the introduction of per-pupil vouchers provided by the state, as it has been documented in other education systems around the world. Chile’s engagement with these global neoliberal influences, operating through local ways of providing and organising ECE, suggests a neocolonial trajectory that needs to be addressed from a historical perspective. This is the aim of Chapter Two, where a history of the present of ECE is introduced.
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORY OF THE PRESENT

I Introduction

Chile’s colonial past, its postcolonial trajectory(ies) and its more recent neo-colonial explorations, underpinned by neoliberal trends, have permeated ECE and its curriculum. These created a superficially unified, cohesive and coherent narrative about ECE and children, represented in how classrooms are configured according to particular socio-political agendas available in the curriculum. This narrative constitutes the ECE classroom on a ‘structural’ micro level, and disposes ideas and understandings, sometimes overlapping and/or contradicting.

In this chapter, I will review literature that challenges this unified narrative, questioning its taken for granted nature and embedded discourses. This review provides a contextual framework, identifying other narratives that would help us make sense of the current conditions of Chilean ECE and its curriculum. Influenced by Foucault (1977), a ‘history of the present’ of Chile’s ECE will be reconstructed, in order to examine how current conditions were made possible. To describe and unpack the different power struggles that produced the official narrative, and how the incidents of these socio-historical processes still shape the present, is a strategic move to ‘locate individuals in discursive spaces’ and to problematise the categories used for the discipline of subjects and their self-regulation (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p. 13).

Having this approach in mind, embedded curricula discourses and their impact in contemporary understandings of ECE are critically analysed. Popkewitz (1997) conceives curriculum as a ‘disciplining technology that directs how the individual is to act, feel, talk, and “see” the world and “self”. As such, curriculum is a form of social regulation’ (p. 132). In his analyses, he explores what discourses of ‘the Child’ are present in curricula and how they shape children and practitioners (and families). Similarly, Cannella (1998) asks how traditional ECE images frame our readings, ourselves and limit children and their families. Consequently, this history of the present of Chilean ECE is also influenced by reconceptualist approaches (Bloch, Swadener and Cannella, 2014; Kessler and Swadener, 1992; Pinar, 1998; Taguchi, 2006; Taylor, 2011), which consider ECE as a site from where to transform unjust conditions and practices (MacNaughton, 2005) that promote the fabrication of hegemonic subjectivities.
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Cannella’s (1997) analysis of constructions of childhood emphasises how modernist curriculum approaches (e.g. progressivist and child-centred approaches) linked with child development (e.g. Highscope, based on Piagetian thought) have shaped the field. According to this author, ECE is closely related to other forms of western education because it ‘follow[s] the curriculum development tradition’ and ‘has institutionalized technical, deterministic perspectives of learning’ (Cannella, 1997, p. 94).

Consequently, the ECE curriculum is conceived as a political text (Apple and Buras, 2006; Pinar, 1995), which serves as an instrument to (re)produce and perpetuate (un)just living conditions (Kessler and Swadener, 1992). Curricula represent society’s priorities and interests, acting as curriculum authority, determining the valued knowledge (Bernstein, 2000; Ross, 2000). For instance, ‘knowledge-based economies’ in neoliberal societies recognise the relevance of technology and knowledge for economic growth (Ailwood, 2004). Children are produced as (future) worker/citizens who are ‘life-long learners, self-maximisers – (…) autonomous and rational’ (p. 29). Consequently, privileged knowledges reflect a way of understanding subjects and their ways of learning/teaching (Popkewitz, 1997; Popkewitz, Pereyra and Franklin, 2001).

Popkewitz (2009) examines how curricula fabricate particular knowledge(s) and, consequently, subjects. He explains that historically produced overlapping practices configure the curriculum, establishing ‘cultural theses’ about child and adult subjects that are part of ‘schooling’ institutions. Similarly, Fendler (2001) explores how the ‘educated subject’, i.e. the (schooled) child, was made through different curricular trends that articulate curricular and pedagogical technologies that, ‘as a technology of the self (…) constructs the self to be educated’ (p. 132). The classroom embodies the curriculum, because it re-assembles and links principles about who ‘the Child’ is and should become. Curriculum constitutes the classroom by conferring meaning and relevance to particular ideas and how it is ‘done’ by practitioners, which, as an effect, create practices that not only regulate subjects within the classroom, but fabricate them into these ideas (MacNaughton, 2005).

Poststructural critiques of the curriculum enable us to challenge ideas that fail to link the ‘politics of knowledge’ with the production of subjects in order to move beyond the available narratives (Fendler, 2003). Lessons can be learned from Kessler and Swadener’s (1992) problematisation of curricular guidelines for developmentally appropriate practice. They made
it an object of study by examining it ‘in context (…) from a personal and political perspective’ (p. 289, italics in original), denouncing its individualistic ethnocentricity.

These critiques are relevant for the Chilean context, as a constant long-term investment in ECE as a remedy for social inequality and exclusion has been made (OECD, 2009; UNESCO, 2009). Drawing on Pinar (1995) and Popkewitz (2012), the following section explores Chile’s socio-cultural and historical context, and how it shapes the current conditions of ECE and its curriculum, which have a direct influence on classrooms and subjects. In this sense, I will draw of Foucault (1977) to develop a history of the present, and will also draw on Baker (1998) who, using Foucault’s notion of ‘populational reasoning’, suggests how the production of children who need rescuing, has developed to justify intervention and the shaping of their subjectivity.

III A History of the Present of Chilean ECE and its Curriculum

What happened to make young children and (their need for) education an issue for state consideration and intervention through curriculum and institutionalised schooling? To think about this question, I will develop an approach to Foucault’s notion of history of the present, as he claims that it is critical ‘to know the historical conditions which motivate our conceptualization. We need a historical awareness of our present circumstance’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 778).

Several authors on Chilean ECE have taken pride in how our country was the first in Latin-America to implement this educational level (Adlerstein, 2012; MINEDUC, 1998; Peralta, 2003; 2011; Umayahara, 2006b), both for privileged—the German colonies (JUNJI, 2006) - and vulnerable families, since the end of the 19th century (Peralta, 2012). For both populations, ECE was framed within romanticist thought (Froebelian and Pestalozzian, heavily influenced by Rousseau (Peralta, 2008a)) and functioned under Christian salvation themes, as highlighted in other contexts (Popkewitz and Bloch, 2001). The first Chilean state-funded EC institutions were based on catholic morals, while Froebelian (protestant) philosophy was the foundation of the German settlers (colony) kindergarten. These two experiences constitute the pedagogical and curricular base of modern Chilean ECE (Peralta, 2012).

III.1 The state as a carer

‘In countries like England, France and Germany, the state is a careful gardener who sees in each child a delicate plant which will become later a robust tree in the jungle; and which needs to be held, fed and strengthened’ (Extract from "Ultimas Noticias" Newspaper, 21st April 1908, in Illanes, 1991, p. 55)
European liberalism impacted in the conception of the moralising role of the state, in order to avoid decadence of the less advantaged population (Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate, 2016). Rojas Flores (2010) explains that by the end of the 19th century, Chilean modernisation and development had a direct impact on the creation of the first social policies. Actions of the state and the private sector were combined to offer services to children. Although - or exactly because - it was argued that a population’s morality depended on economic and social elements, education became the chosen vehicle (Illanes, 1991).

Towards the turn of the 19th century, and based on assessments of the little worth and immorality of the Chilean population (Vicuña Mackenna, 1865), European colonies (particularly German and English) were invited by the Chilean government to live in Chile and improve its cultural heritage. The import of progressive agendas was promoted, like the construction of the first steam train (Bizzarro, 2005), and the control of the Mapuche people in the south. The Araucanía territory was violently ‘pacified’ (Sosa, 2015, Millán, 2011) by homogenising the population into a ‘Chilean’ one. Similarly, a few decades later, parliament discussed the necessity of pacifying the (deprived) youth population (Illanes, 1991). Mestizaje (racial and cultural mixture) in Latin-America became in some cases a strategy for whitening the population, and it was considered necessary for nation-building (Quijano, 2000). Montecino (2010) explains that these efforts to modernise Chile, ‘tended to “pull thick veils” over our cultural mestiza reality’ (p. 93), while Millán (2011) suggests that historians’ silence has made them accomplices of Eurocentric trends, not acknowledging other narratives in our current (whitewashed) cultures.

By 1891, although Chile was a secular state, the Catholic church had an active role in it. Within this context, a new moral rationale emerged: a good Catholic had to take responsibility ‘for the suffering Christ, defend the private property, and avoid social conflict’ (Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate, 2016, p. 82, personal translation). Charity organisations multiplied, and the moral lesson was incorporated into the everyday secular culture. The Chilean state had to reaffirm its independence as a republic by presiding, directing and surveying its education. The creation of the state-funded Chilean public schooling (Rojas, 2001) and the first public popular EC services (Peralta, 2012) were tightly linked to modernist notions of the rational individual (Redon and Angulo Rasco, 2015) and progressivist curriculum. These parallel trajectories entwined to produce a new way of thinking about the identity category of ‘the Child’ and ‘the practitioner’, who they are, and have to become. According to Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate (2016):
the creation of a proposal that sought to define human nature as a perfectible being through education [...] the intrinsic goodness (Pestalozzi); the discipline and reason to transition from the animal state to the human one (Kant) and freedom, work and progressive development (Froebel), were the pillars upon which the Chilean educational theorists based an important part of their proposal to infancy

(Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate, 2016, p. 58, personal translation)

The discourse of the ‘Chilean child’, informed by the previously mentioned ideas, was put into force through the institution of schooling, promoting morality, sociability, and preparation for adulthood. In this sense, women were relevant because it was assumed that they, as potential mothers changed ideas and habits of people (Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate, 2016). In order to prepare these women, Leopoldina Maluschka was hired by the Chilean state, and she introduced the Froebelian approach, and whose methods and contents were gradually adapted to the Chilean context (Abett de la Torre Díaz, 2011), providing the foundations for EC initial female teacher education (Muñoz, 2014). It is interesting to notice Maluschka’s appropriation of Froebel’s gifts (a series of didactic materials): she Chileanised these by painting them in the colours of the national flag (white, blue, and red). Patriotic symbols for nation-building were painted upon European and white discourses of ‘the Child’, ‘the educator’ and education. Under Maluschka’s guidance, the first generations of ‘Kindergarterinas’ were prepared to serve the nation and state (Abett de la Torre Díaz, 2011).

According to Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate (2016), the initial Kindergarten had a project of childhood that was disciplined and tidy, which was defined by predominant (adult) moral codes of the elite, ‘in order to stimulate the “normal” and correct or eliminate the “abnormal” of the individual and social behaviours’ (p. 177, personal translation). The discourse of the female practitioner also has been marked since its conception. The figure of the female practitioner (‘Kindergarterina’) had a vocational calling for the nation, state, and (Abett de la Torre Díaz, 2011). Their service, inherent from their nature, but trained according to Froebelian philosophy required that they continued educating morals and Christian culture.

Chilean ECE was also influenced by developments in other educational levels, which initially emerged in Chile through the Catholic church. This origin permeated the schooling identity under a missionary or apostolic view, although public state funded schools were secular. For Núñez (2004) the state promoted the creation of practitioner identities that intertwined missionary and republican redefinition: ‘republican priesthood’. The author argues that traces of ‘republican priesthood’ can be found in contemporary arguments about vocation, which are more frequently found in the female practitioner population. This final idea can be related to what Montecino (1990) calls ‘public mothers’.
In this respect, Popkewitz and Bloch (2001) analyse how in the North-American context, particular discourses of ‘the Child’ were inscribed by linking social administration with notions of freedom and the implementation of the curriculum in pedagogy and schooling. Additionally, the universalisation of the Child also links to her production as a social being. Similarly, Hultqvist and Dahlberg (2001) state that the curricular discourses which made the Child knowable and disciplined were hybrids circulating in Europe and their colonies (from the 17th century onwards).

Note the similarities with Chile’s colonial history (from the 16th to the 19th century) in Chilean ECE, as well as the current political and economic movements towards neoliberalism (Galdames, 2011). Assumptions of domestication of inferior primitive people, Chileans, specifically children, through education~salvation (Cannella, 1997) legitimised and perpetuated similar knowledges through post-colonial trajectories in an independent, modern and liberal republic of the south (Quijano, 2014).

IV Populational Reasoning

The socio-historical foundations of Chilean ECE illustrate how children and practitioners were and still are considered as manageable populations in political terms. Populational reasoning (Popkewitz and Bloch, 2001) is a useful concept to unpack this framing, because it is a way of thinking about certain populations (e.g. ‘the Child’, ‘the practitioner’) in instrumental ways according to how the state operates. Populational reasoning ‘normalizes by creating the normal/abnormal’ about how children are (e.g. grow, learn), and ‘makes possible a particular type of governance. The reasoning secures individual’s identities’ (Popkewitz and Boch, 2001, p. 14).

A way to make populational reasoning possible is through curriculum. The CFECE was published in 2001 after educational reform in 1996 that attempted to compensate the effects of dictatorship. Similar to other educational levels, the inputs for CFECE were the promotion of democratic values, findings of neurosciences, and psychology of learning (Silva, 2002). It also attempted to maintain the foundations of the EC field (UNESCO and MINEDUC, 2004). In a previous analysis of the CFECE (Galdames, 2010), I established parallels with romanticist and humanist thought and the comprehensive curriculum (Alarcón, Bonard and Simonstein, 1985). The authors argued that this modality was created for the particularities of the Chilean context. However, in my analysis I identified that influences of developmental psychology and
western humanist and romantic philosophy were not contextualised, but rather appropriated (Galdames, 2010).

Linked to the above argument, a discussion about the ‘natural’ abilities of the female sex for (maternalist) education is present throughout the history of Chilean ECE and the role training has in female practitioners’ education. Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate (2016) argue that ECE was proposed as a substitute of maternal education and support for children’s and the state’s development, echoing Froebel’s understandings of the female practitioner as a ‘natural’ educator. For instance, shortly before the launch of the CFECE, MINEDUC published a document about the EC field (MINEDUC, 2001b), which stresses that ECE existed throughout Chile’s history, as indigenous traditions of female childcare and childrearing were observed throughout the territory. Additionally, both MINEDUC (2001b) and Peralta (2003) emphasise how indigenous people developed EC ‘ethno-education’ centred on offering ‘atención integral’/comprehensive care to their children. This rhetorical move suggests the assumption that culturally, education and care in early years has always been present, and that it is linked to maternal care. It also implies that ECE has an inherent nature, and therefore is compatible with later educational approaches introduced by (neo)colonisation.

One relevant approach is the Christian morality, previously mentioned to describe a missionary view of schooling. Montecino (1990) explains that the Mother Mary symbol constitutes in Latin-America an identity of origin. She argues that maternisation is not only present on a biological level, but also in women’s labour, relationships and worldview, i.e. the Marian symbol is part of the
Chilean female subjectivity which involves in different degrees being motherly. She suggests that currently, ‘religiousness continues marking the symbolic horizon and women who are closer to it’ (p. 288, personal translation) incorporate it in different social spheres.

Considering this Christian moral influence, maternal care is a central signifier in Chilean culture (Gajardo and Oteíza, 2017), which explains cultural artefacts, such as the magazine extract above. The article emphasises that the female EC educator teaches and disciplines children in a way that ‘children’s defects disappear and gradually end up being normal little kids’. She is considered ‘a mother for others’ children (…) who carries a spirit of understanding, dedication and abandonment of herself, which is only present in women’ (personal translation). These assumptions still echo through academic statements like the following: ‘Definitely, keeping all the proportions of the case, the [female] early years practitioner is an extension of the mother’ (Muñoz, 2014, p. 23, personal translation). Furthermore, Viviani (2016) explains that female practitioners are expected to have a strong vocation, to always be joyful and love their children. Love and joy can be linked to Froebel’s philosophy (Peralta, 2012), in which female practitioners’ essence is assumed to be closer to nature and therefore also to children. Consequently, an unproblematised, apolitical motherly stance informs the role of the EC practitioner.

Additionally, another source of populational reasoning is the appropriation of universalised developmental theories, a trend strongly promoted during dictatorship (JUNJI, 2006). In this
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period, the socio-economic system and social services like education were reconfigured (Pinkney Pastrana, 2009, Leiva, 2017) and new strategies to control the young population were promoted. For instance, public ECE provision expanded its coverage to combat child malnutrition (MINEDUC, 1998) and adopted Highscope Curriculum (JUNJI, 2006), which is based on Piagetian cognitive developmental theory and Dewey’s principle of learning through activity. The focus on observing, shaping and managing child bodies became more evident, especially after ‘Chile Crece Contigo’ was introduced in Chile. Children, their families and communities were now ‘at risk’ (Swadener, 2005) and required the state intervention in all levels of their lives. Developmental psychologies acquired scientific authority and legitimated control and surveillance of (deprived) population, leading to its unquestioned application and impact on contemporary curriculum.

Populational reasoning was based on two strands: multiagency intervention (education, health and social protection) through female practitioners, and complementary developmental theories which focused on (normal) child growth and behaviour to guarantee learning in later stages of schooling. Umayahara (2006) makes this link in CFECE clear, she identifies that its aim is to offer ‘scientifically guided education’ (Comisión 17, 1974, in Umayahara 2006, p. 24). These two strands became crossed and entangled through the operation of a simultaneous dominant (neo)liberal rationale which demanded expansion of the ECE field to the whole population (Staab, 2013). This expansion was linked to market liberalization policies that were applied to all social areas during the 80s.

In this respect, CFECE and consequently discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the practitioner’ were influenced in the following ways:


2) Development homologies (Popkewitz, 2001), in progression of a country and its seeds, children (Hopkins and Sriprakash, 2015). This latter idea is not new (Kindergarten – garden of children), but now was articulated with scientific knowledge of psychological development.
Peralta (2012) emphasises children’s promising potential because of their intrinsic capacity to create (which is inherently good) with whatever is at hand. For her, children not only show creativity, but also problem-solving capacities, a capacity that is highly valued nowadays in a cosmopolitan subject (Popkewitz, 2012) in a capitalist (Dahlberg and Moss, 2005) and technicist (Cannella, 1997) society.

These two strands are the main ideas that inform CFECE, legitimising the intervention of young children’s and practitioner’s lives in all the possible imaginable spheres. This control and constitution aims towards development and progress of the country, which following neoliberal trends, enables globalised discourses to colonise local ones in a new manner (Quijano, 2014).

V On neo-colonialism and neoliberalism

For Quijano (2014) colonialism refers to a structure of domination and exploitation. Production of resources, labour and politics of one population are claimed controlled by a social group of a different identity and which belongs to a different territorial dominion. Colonialism dates back centuries, while neocolonialism is a recent phenomenon: ‘[n]eocolonialism pretends to offer a kinder version of present global economics than past colonialism; hence its presence may at times be quite subtle’ (Buescher and Ono, 1996, p. 130)

Cannella and Viruru (2004) argue that ECE spaces have been the object of (re)colonisation, through different spaces and approaches. Take for instance academic disciplines and research framing the field of ECE (Salazar Perez and Saavedra, 2014), which establish definitions of education, ‘the Child’, ‘the practitioner’, curricula and pedagogies and impact directly on lives and subjectivities of every person who inhabit these spaces.

Associated with this phenomenon, is the emergence of the knowledge-based economy, which led to the reconceptualisation of education as transmission of knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to participate in the context of globalisation (Carnoy, 1999; Sahlberg, 2006). Globalisation has reshaped the cultural and social role of education institutions to make them responsive to global rather than national issues, and prompting privatisation in order to decouple from state control (Ball, 1998). Neoliberalism provides the ideological foundation for this change in the balance of power between states and the global market (Apple and Buras, 2006). Neoliberalism promotes policies ‘for evaluation, financing, assessment, standards, teacher training, curriculum, instruction, and testing’ (Burbules and Torres, 2000a, p. 15), producing competition for parental choice in education quasi-markets (Gordon and Whitty,
1997). Consequently, these neoliberal policies produce efforts to restructure and privatise public education, placing the state on the regulatory role, overseeing and controlling schools, teachers and students for meeting (curricular, professional, performance) standards, which represent the values of the global knowledge-based economy (Apple, 2006).

As a result, it is possible to argue that (global) neoliberal discourses operate through colonial trajectories (Quijano, 2014), validating and perpetuating oppression by operating though local institutions like Chilean ECEC. Though multiagency initiatives that converge within the Chilean ECE institution. EC policies contribute to shape a notion of ‘the Child’, constituting children as restricted subjects: in lack, savage, developing and/or immature, and with little capacity of agency (Galdames Castillo and Poblete, 2014). ECEC has become one of neoliberalism’s technologies for control and domination of children as a future workforce (Dahlberg et al., 2007). In fact, Dahlberg et al (2007) state that in the US and UK contexts: ‘government, advocacy groups and others speak openly about the business case for employers to invest in child care, “as a cost-effective approach to maintaining a stable, well-prepared workforce today”’ (p. 47).

In the Latin-American context, in addition to neoliberalism, Catholicism is another important influence operating through neocolonial trajectories. The Catholic church was the founding educational institution in all the colonised countries. However, its interplay with globalised and neoliberal forces may be different; as Chile in particular has engaged with neoliberal policies since very early on (privatisation and marketisation of social services began in the late 70s). For instance, countries like Mexico, Bolivia and Ecuador have explicitly included the ethnic and racial dimensions in their ECE curriculum (Peralta, 2003). In other words, Chile’s conceptions of education and childhood, favour the ‘appropriation of globalized discourses and the neoliberal rationale and, in consequence, the creation of neo-colonial trajectories of knowledge’ (Galdames, 2011, p. 110)

Tobin (1995) denounced how neoliberal discourses permeated into different layers of ECE, illustrating how its curricula create practices and classroom realities that reproduce its notions of freedom of choice, demand and scarcity and individualism. ECEC has become one of neoliberalism’s technologies for control and domination of children as a future workforce (Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2007). Similarly, Salazar Perez and Cannella (2010) illustrate through the case of New Orleans, how neoliberal policies of ECEC are used to control and privatise services, creating vast inequities. Lee (2010) shows how ‘neoliberal political economic reasoning’ (p. 131) materialises in the Taiwanese context as preschool vouchers, and how these ideas impact on ideas about equality and social justice for young children. Her warning is
relevant and relatable to the Chilean context, because both nation-states promote ECEC as a remedy for overcoming social injustices like poverty or inequality (MINEDUC, 1998; Peralta, 2011; Umayahara, 2006b).

Returning to the link between neoliberalism and Catholicism, Montecino’s (1997) conception of syncretism⁶ may be useful. She defines it as a fusion of ‘symbols and cultures’ (p. 105), which illustrates how particular colonised cultures have forcefully appropriated rituals, symbols and systems of belief, by articulating them with their own, like Latin-American people who were conquered by Spanish Catholics. These mixtures are not an exact replica of the original, sometimes are used for other purposes, and become naturalised through time by their continual hegemonic (re)production in everyday practices (Quijano, 2014). However, their normative character is subverted by the same meanings which are supposed to be suppressed: ethnic minorities resisted catholic discourses of salvation by performing the rituals but discursively ascribing their own beliefs. Montecino suggests that within syncretism and constant merging of symbols, ‘mestizas have re-enacted the social’ (1997, p. 49). She identifies within the mestizo ethos a ‘Marian allegory’, as aforementioned, which goes beyond the religious congregation, but also impacts on women’s identity constitution.

VI Concluding Thoughts

In this chapter, an approximation of a ‘history of the present’ of Chilean ECE was developed to map the current landscape. Chilean ECE field was shaped by a variety of socio-political agendas, rooted in Chile’s history and marked by globalised trends. Particular trends that were identified in the history of the present, can open up possible explanations about the current state of Chilean ECE, ‘the Child’ and ‘the practitioner’ subjectivities.

The modernist project, and the liberal values that promoted and constituted the conception of the Chilean (white) republic were fundamental, as education was introduced as the key to improve the economy. Education for ‘problematic’ subjects (e.g. vulnerable, indigenous) in particular, would train them for the labour market. Since its inception, ECEC services have been class segregated, and differences between social groups have been accentuated. The creation of ECE for the least advantaged population became a strategy to construct an understanding of specific social groups. It created the illusion of ‘integrating’ these populations

⁶ Stewart’s (1999) discussion on syncretism seems useful for analysis purposes, as it takes into account the church and state which put systems and strategies in place to eliminate difference towards achieving (white) cultural and racial homogeneity.
and provided the appearance of participation in society, which at that point was only possible for privileged social groups, to strengthen the idea of the nation-state.

Further, the female practitioner is considered the maternal responsible for guaranteeing the moral, social and economic progress of the Chilean nation-state. Her subjectivity draws on a ‘Marian allegory’, which has a colonial origin, but through the mixture of different social, cultural and catholic discourses, had reified the current notion of ‘vocation’, demanding a complete maternal dedication. The incorporation of women into the labour market became an illusion of freedom for Chilean women, and liberation of mothers so they could access the workforce.

This chapter illustrated how the Chilean ECE and its curriculum produce dominant discourses of the Child and female practitioners, which frame classrooms and everyday practices and interactions. Looking at the Chilean case of how discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the practitioner’ are shaped or emphasised through global neo-colonial and/or neoliberal forces is relevant for other countries. Particularly, developing countries are expected to follow global tendencies of universalising ECEC provision to compensate for social inequities and promote social justice (Dahlberg and Moss, 2005).

The shapes that ECEC has taken, has an impact on children’s and practitioner’s lives and subjectivities, by attempting to ‘make’ them subjects for this rationale. However, the extent of this impact has rarely been explored. In the following chapter I will work with a Foucauldian toolbox of concepts and Butler’s theory of performativity, to look into how subjects are produced in spaces that convey and reinforce particular discourses.
CHAPTER THREE: POWER AND PERFORMATIVITY

The classroom is a microsite where broader social issues are lived and challenged (Taylor, 2008). The frameworks practitioners enact, in collaboration with children in classrooms through different discursive practices, are deeply informed by the curriculum that configures the classroom and its actors within it. The curriculum transmits ‘relevant’ knowledge to be acquired, and shapes subjects who transmit and acquire this knowledge. The curriculum therefore fabricates subjects and also subjectivities (Popkewitz, 2009).

In this chapter, a theoretical framework to think about the process of (re)creation of subjectivities in the classroom is developed. First, I use some of Foucault’s tools for thinking about power and sites of power, and draw on different studies developed in ECE that adopted a Foucauldian perspective on (classroom) subjectivation processes. These works show how regimes of truth provide a rationale for the researched classrooms, and how children and practitioners respond to them in multiple ways. Under a Foucauldian understanding of power, subjects (in this case both children and practitioners) are capable of resisting while re-enacting the discourses that constitute them.

The second part of this chapter works with Butler’s theory of gender as performatve (1993, 1999) to think about how discourses are produced through practices. For Butler, sex and gender do not pre-exist, but rather are established as truths that powerfully norm and (re)produce subjects. I do not aspire to make a literal transposition of gender as performative into ‘the Child’ or ‘children’. I am aware that feminist problematics differ from the ones I am unsettling here. Nonetheless, I concur with Kallio (2007) that some ideas can benefit childhood studies, particularly because ‘children’s politics are strongly connected to their own bodies’ and therefore ‘should direct our attention to the study of embodiment’ (p. 125).

Underpinning Butler’s theory are poststructural ideas of decentring the subject, who is not a fixed and given entity (St. Pierre, 2000). In this sense, the processes through which subjects take up certain discursive positions are ‘ongoing process[es] of becoming—rather than merely being—in the world’ (Jackson, 2004, p. 674) which are produced within everyday practices in relationships with others. Butler’s work provides an alternative for thinking about subjects transgressing discursive positions that they are assumed to adopt.
In the final part of this chapter, I review different empirical studies which draw on these ideas (Blaise, 2005b; 2010; Taylor and Richardson, 2005). The relevance of these studies relies on how practices are analysed. The understanding that children (I would also add practitioners) are social actors and (re)construct meanings from the discourses ‘available to them in their everyday worlds’ (Blaise, 2005b, p. 85) is emphasised. With Butler and Foucault, I seek to illustrate how children and practitioners construct themselves relationally as gendered beings in the normative frame of the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1999).

I Using some Concepts from Foucault’s Toolbox

Foucault attempted, throughout his research and writing, to ‘create a history of the different modes by which, in [Western European] culture, human beings are made subjects’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 777). He traced how particular subjectivities (e.g. the mad) became relevant, were made into unquestionable ‘truths’, and were produced in through institutions (e.g. psychiatric hospitals). He was concerned with how we tell ‘the truth’ about different phenomena, and what rules configure and represent our realities, knowledge(s) and their impact upon how we understand our-selves and each other.

By looking closer into the universally accepted, critiquing and rejecting certainties, Foucault identified ‘regimes of truth’; truths tightly intertwined that govern what is normal and desirable. A regime of truth is a mechanism that establishes how we have to think, act and feel. Several RECE authors argue that developmental theories established ‘regimes of truth’ about children, practitioners and teaching and learning. Consequently, these regimes not only shaped everyday practices, but also children’s and practitioner’s lives and subjectivities (for example: Burman, 2010; Edwards, Blaise and Hammer, 2009; MacNaughton, 2005).

Foucault’s analyses offer different approaches and concepts. He thought of theory as an instrument for analysing power relations and the struggles emerging from these (Foucault, 1980). For him, others’ use of his concepts should transform these while expanding inquiries (Garland, 2014). Foucault’s work enabled me to think critically about taken for granted ‘truths’ in an ECE classroom, how these frame our everyday practices and understandings, and consequently how we make each other into subjects by taking into consideration the effects these have on practices and bodies.

For Foucault, critical work has a political function: it has to create a critical environment in which transformation can occur. This means that when thoughts and beliefs about an issue differ from the dominant discourse, transformation can occur. Likewise, bell hooks, quoted in
(Deveaux, 1996) suggests that transformation arises in our daily lives, as it is a process that involves opposing the effects of hegemony.

Given the poststructural approach that I followed in the study, transformation is understood as a process of change that could apply to subjectivities, discourses and practices. Within this worldview, although there are structures that make subjectivities and discourses possible, this does not imply determination. Each time somebody draws upon these structures, there is a possibility for transformation by resisting and subverting their power/knowledge. Unfortunately, transformation is not something that can be guaranteed, as there is not one exclusive process through which this can be made possible. In this sense, the approach of the study and specific methods, attempted to observe and analyse possible transformative effects of critically researching the discourses that produce subjectivities in the EC classroom.

I.1 Discourse(s)

We come to know our world, our-selves and others through formal frameworks, which Foucault called discourse(s). Each discourse brings together different elements that are associated, and create a ‘body of thinking and writing that use[s] shared language for talking about a topic, shared concepts for understanding it and shared methods for examining it’ (MacNaughton, 2005, p. 20). These elements frame everyday practices, spaces, and others.

Discourse is productive, given that it ‘represent[s] or report[s] on pregiven practices and relations’ and ‘it enters into their articulation’ (Butler, 1995, p. 138). Discourse is not only about what is said and the embedded meanings, but also about the position from where these are enunciated, as well as their effects (making of) over subjects, subjectivity is constructed through discourse. Discursive practices enact and show what ideas are legitimate, what set of rules are framing them, and lead to the (re)establishment of the illusion of unquestionable universal truth(s). In Foucault’s words, this is problematic because implicit systems confine us, and create a ‘system of limits and exclusion which we practice without knowing it; I would like to make the cultural unconscious apparent’ (Foucault in interview with Simon, 1971, p. 198).

Drawing on this idea, poststructural theory insists that subjects are not ontologically pre-existent (Jagger, 2008). Subjects are produced by the power operating through discourse and as an effect of dominant discourses (Britzman, 2003) which are historically located. In this sense, Hultqvist and Dahlberg (2001) explain: ‘There is no natural or evolutionary child, only the historically produced discourses and power relations that constitute the Child as an object and subject of knowledge, practice, and political intervention’ (p. 122).
Discourse is then understood as a practice that involves knowledge and power, and it is represented as a dyad: power/knowledge. The dominant knowledge is embedded in the way power operates, which in turn legitimises why and how subjects relate to each other. Foucault (1979) interrupted regular ways of thinking about power by proposing that it is not a pregiven object that is handed or kept by individual subjects/groups/institutions. They do not possess power in a stable manner through time nor space. Rather, power enables them to do things upon themselves, others and their environment. Power is productive.

I.II ‘power is not evil!’ (Foucault, 1997, p. 298)

Foucault’s conceptualisation of power takes into account how it is inherently linked to knowledge and how it is productive of subjects and truth(s). For Foucault, ‘power means relations, a more-or-less organised, hierarchical, co-ordinated cluster of relations’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 198). Power operates in multiple sites and levels; it is open, fluid, local and is exercised in a multiplicity of ways. It ‘is exercised in microrelations and micropractices, in every interaction in every sphere of society (Fenech and Sumsion, 2007, p. 111).

Power operates through~‘in relationships, and these are based on particular knowledge(s) that are considered true within that context. Through power relationships, we are made into subjects. The meaning of ‘subject’ is twofold: ‘subject to someone else by control and dependence’ and ‘tied to his own identity by a conscience of self-knowledge’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 781). These relationships show us who is who, the different discursive positions available for the involved. It bestows an identity category – ‘a law of truth’ (ibid.) – on us, which helps us make ourselves recognisable to our-selves and others. Conflicts emerge when something in that relationship is not met according to the norm, when the knowledge embedded in this relationship is challenged. For the purposes of this study, I will explore specifically disciplinary and pastoral power.

Disciplinary Power

The concept of disciplinary power emerged in Foucault’s ‘Discipline and Punish’ (1977), where he traced genealogically the socio-historical shifts towards modern prison systems. The power operating in prisons can also be observed in other institutions, as for example schools. Discipline is considered a technique of power and its function is to train ‘moving, confused, useless multitudes of bodies and forces’ (p. 170). It places attention on bodies and their behaviours, to shape and produce particular subjects. For instance, an effect of training is the
production of docile bodies that regulate themselves autonomously, according to the prescribed norm. Foucault detailed three procedures that operate as techniques of disciplinary power: hierarchical observation, normalising judgement and examination. These mechanisms do not operate separately, rather combine and overlap. I will briefly explain these.

Hierarchical observation gives a central role to the gaze, which operates in multiple ways, automatically and anonymously. This mechanism establishes a distance between supervisor (guarantor of surveillance) and observed who is under total scrutiny. It creates the illusion of constant vigilance and control, and forces a state of alertness, both for the observer and the observed. Surveillance is also embedded in the physical space, rendering ‘visible those who are inside it’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 172). Foucault established parallels between the prison and the school, illustrating how within modern western disciplinary society, power was normalised. For him, with the introduction of mass education and large-size classes, the practice of teaching appropriated this mechanism for effectiveness purposes. Surveillance defined and regulated relationships between teacher and student(s).

The second mechanism, ‘normalising judgements’ leads to the examination of micropractices, which establish what behaviours are acceptable or not. This classification denoted differences between a good or bad subject. Underlying these judgements are ‘truths’ about normalcy, qualities and skills. As a consequence, ‘normalisation’ is a process through which actions and ideas become normal or natural and is considered by Foucault as one of three strategies to exercise disciplinary power. Behaviours outside these categories are punished to promote their disappearance. As an effect of surveillance and close examination, subjects are objectified and become legible and docile.

This last idea relates to the third mechanism, examination. The practice of examination homogenises subjects and behaviours and leads to the production of ‘truths’ about the subject but also the group it belongs to, i.e. it becomes an object of knowledge. To illustrate how these three mechanisms operate, Foucault built on Bentham’s Panopticon, a prison designed for effective surveillance. He used this figure as a metaphor to illustrate how modern disciplinary societies function through observation and normalisation (Foucault, 1977).

Pastoral Power

As with disciplinary power, the gaze is also central in the exercise of pastoral power. Originated in Christian institutions, pastoral power is oriented towards salvation (Foucault, 1982). The pastoral gaze –both from the divine and her representative on earth – oversees the individual
subject and multitude simultaneously and in a totalising way. Relationships based on pastoral power also are dual (flock-shepherd) but operate in the community and throughout the individual’s life. The shepherd commands and sacrifices herself for her salvation and of the flock. But the flock, as a group, and each individual within this flock, also offer them-selves voluntarily as a sacrifice. Opening and knowing what is in people’s minds and their secrets, produces individualised knowledge about their consciences and how to direct these (Foucault, 2009). The surveying gaze totalises and individualises, but operates towards a transparency, which redeems the subject if she regulates herself within the norm. Individual members have to examine them-selves and demand the shepherd’s guidance of conscience.

Although Christianity is not as present as in previous centuries, Chile’s culture is still impregnated by Christian values (Montecino Aguirre, 2010). I concur with Foucault that pastoral power is spread and operates outside the church, into the modern state, which created new forms of it. Salvation now does not happen in an afterlife but in this world. The signifier of salvation is reinterpreted into welfare, health and (social) security, among others. Pastoral power is exercised by a great diversity of institutions, both from the public (state and private organisations) and private (the family) spheres. Structures of different disciplines of knowledge, like medicine or education also exercise it, and it operates within their institutions (hospitals, schools). Within these different spheres, the production of knowledge about individual human beings and as populations is produced.

Technologies of the Self

Both disciplinary and pastoral power have internalised the external gaze. Even the own overseer (supervisor, teacher, shepherd) exercises this ‘surveillance over, and against’ herself (Foucault, 1980, p. 155). We are all caught in this machinery in which, through our practices (based in disciplinary knowledges), we turn our-selves into subjects according to universalised (modern and humanist) ideas. Foucault called technologies of the Self the ways in which we produce and regulate our-selves (bodies, thoughts and practices - souls) through the available discourses and systems of power. It is assumed that our transformation towards and based on the humanist ideal leads to states of purity, happiness, perfection and/or wisdom (Foucault, 1988b). Influenced by Christian morality traditions, we turn to examine ourselves and act to regulate ourselves according to the norm. Foucault called the connection between technologies of power and of the self governmentality (Foucault, 1988a). Governmentality considers the mundane ways in which groups and subjects govern each other and them-selves, and how these relate to how the state governs and shape these micro-relationships. Ailwood
(2004) uses governmentality to analyse how Australian ECE, following a globalised trend, is
used to govern subjectivities of children and practitioners.

**Resistance**

Studies drawing on Foucault in ECE classrooms are extremely useful for making ECE unfamiliar
and provide other theoretical readings and approaches (see e.g. Cannella, 1999; Gawlicz, 2010;
Millei, 2005) for the field. However, it is easy to focus exclusively on disciplinary power and its
techniques, and forget that resistance operates within discourse. Concurring with Fenech and
Sumsion (2007), this overemphasis can have two effects: first, it depicts practitioners and
children as oppressed by an almighty structure which operates and uses their production as
subjects. Second, it omits an important aspect of Foucault’s understanding of power: ‘Where
there’s power, there’s resistance’ (Foucault, 1979, p. 95).

Power operates on different levels and through different micro-relations, and how we are
positioned in each, is not stable nor always the same. Omnipotence is an effect of certain
hierarchical discursive positions which produce the illusion of powerlessness (Foucault, 1980).
We are much freer to act than we think (Foucault and Martin, 1988), and Foucault put a great
effort in exploring how to develop strategies and show others how it can look.

Based on the same power relations, resistance can acquire multiple forms and disrupts
normalised regimes of truth. For instance, the body can be reinvented if we use it in non-
habitual manners, and make it “our-selves different to what is assumed as normal and true for
the discourses that constitute us. In this sense, reflection can be used for subverting and
engaging critically with ethics and ‘forms of self-constitution’ (Foucault and Martin, 1988).

**I.III Foucault in ECE Studies**

Millei and Cliff’s (2013) semi-ethnographic study illustrate how power operated over children’s
bodies and lives within an Australian ECE bathroom context. Their findings show that the
bathroom reinforced dominating discourses about children’s bodies, constituting certain
subjectivities (not always successfully), like ‘problem bodies’ which needed and justified
intervention. Analysis consisted in identifying what discourses and practices operated within
the setting and how children’s subjectivities were produced.

Similarly, Gallacher’s (2005) social micro-ethnography explores the toddler-room in a Scottish
nursery. She suggests that although the nursery is an adult space designed for control and
organisation, children attempted to appropriate and reconfigure it for themselves. According to developmental and pedagogical discourses, toddlerhood is centred in children learning self-control according to adult expectations. The role of the nursery is central in ordering children through the use of disciplinary technologies. Gallacher’s findings concur with Millei and Cliff’s (2013), that panopticism and surveillance practices were implicit in staff’s actions, and that each space in the room had a designated objective.

Millei and Cliff’s (2013) study acknowledges the architectural configuration of the bathroom and its impact in children’s embodied experiences of subjecthood. In the Australian context, this space was designed in a way that anybody could see when children used it. The bathroom was a public (and explicit) space and therefore a key site for disciplinary and bio-political action (Lee and Motzkau, 2011) for subjecting children. The authors suggest that dominant discourses of child innocence and/or incompetence were directly involved in the control and surveillance of the bathroom.

Millei and Cliff (2013), and Gallacher (2005) claim that disciplinary discursive practices reflected an idea of how~who children had to be, bodies and selves were modified according to the established ideal. Making certain knowledges universal, has been at the expense of exclusions, bans, denials, rejections, at the price of a kind of cruelty with regard to reality’ (Foucault in Interview with Elders, 2012 (1971)).

The title of Gallacher’s (2005) study (‘The terrible twos’) reflects assumptions that young children (negatively) transgress rules because of their age/phase. She illustrates how the classroom was controlled through practices of discipline and surveillance which varied from verbal warnings, stopping activities or moving children from one place to the other, to oral praise and cuddling in order to reward or possibly to restrain the Child. However, none of these strategies were analysed from a gender perspective and motherhood discourses (Dalli, 2001).

Foucault has been criticised for interpreting his theory of power as deterministic, static and repressive (Sawicki, 1996). However, he distinguishes between domination (oppressive and with no alternative) and power, which ‘refers to relations that are flexible, mutable, fluid, and even reversible’ (ibid., p. 170). ‘Power is a game of strategy’ (Foucault, 1997, p. 298), thus in classrooms the problem is not creating relationships of teaching-learning, in which a more knowledgeable subject ‘in a specific game of truth’ (ibid.) enables others to construct knowledge and acquire techniques. Rather, it is problematic when unnecessary arbitrary authority is used to produce subjects in unequal ‘stable’ positions.
The classroom as a site of Power

Within classrooms, norms constitute discursive practices, which establish what spaces and things are recognisable and clear (Barron and Jones, 2014). Millei and Cliff (2013) and Gallacher’s (2005) studies signal that practitioners’ discursive practices did not consider children’s actions beyond ideas of transgression or resistance (as opposite to repression). On the one hand, Gallacher (2005) illustrates how children’s ‘newly discovered’ bodily functions (my emphasis, e.g. climbing, running, squashing others) challenged the disciplinary classroom. However, instead of reading this resistance as part of disciplinary power, she drew on psychological and pedagogical discourses to explain young children’s behaviour:

‘The ‘terrible twos’ are about control (…) they are discovering that they can, to some extent, manipulate others and negotiate the use of space to their own ends’ (p. 256)

These assumptions (developmental discourses about behaviour and performance of bodies) provide only one reading of how children were using their bodies within the nursery. Additionally, her use of concepts like ‘under-life’ and ‘working the system’ (drawn from Corsaro’s 1990 adaptation of Goffman’s (1968) concepts) denoted deliberately (negative) confrontational intentions (the only possibility for domination is confrontation: Foucault, 1982). Gallacher claimed that young children created a separate but parallel world to the classroom, in which they were able to bend rules without breaking the norm (e.g. using equipment for different purposes). By assuming classroom ‘underlife’, the author established a new duality, where certain things happen in one reality and the opposite in the other. Nevertheless, classrooms are multi-layered hybrid spaces, where multiple discourses arise and converge, are re-produced and dismissed (MacNaughton, 2005; Rogers, 2011)

Millei and Cliff’s (2013) findings show that the bathroom was a panoptic space exclusively for children, controlled by adults who could see them from everywhere and could stand in its entrance. Children could not articulate (verbally) why adult bodies were separated from theirs. Possibly, the surveillance role of the adult was taken for granted, or practitioner’s own bodily experiences had been invisibilised (or even disembodied?). Children were conscious of the visibility conditions and attempted to use spaces where they could avoid visibility (for themselves and their peers). Bathroom use and habit practices also generated shared knowledge between the subjects using the space. Interestingly, adults did not empathise with children’s embodied experiences.
Additionally, Millei and Cliff’s bathroom was also a space where ‘uncivilised’ bodies stood out (e.g. wetting or holding in). They draw on Butler (1997b) to argue that children’s bodies were constituted as projects according to specific civilising norms. Millei and Cliff interpreted that problem bodies were called out as such when not responding to developmental and biological discourses. However, by following certain norms, children also made their own bodies through their own situated knowledge. For example, one child avoided disciplinary control by wetting herself and gained a certain degree of (bodily) freedom of surveillance.

‘Pedagogised’ routines justified children’s use and their regulation in the bathroom. Educators instituted many of these routines in order to ‘manage, organise and teach children en masse according to institutional and social conventions’ (p. 12, italics in original). This means that disciplining regimes have become part of the pedagogical design and implementation within the ECE context, such as ‘hygiene discourses’ (p. 13), which are part of expected learning outcomes (Burman, 2010; 2012). The curriculum is central in configuring this ritual. In Millei and Cliff’s study (2013) some children developed different alternatives to avoid or make it look as if they were developing the habits, thus subverting the system. This finding could also be used to revisit Gallacher’s (2005) work, which interpreted how practitioners repeated certain actions to control children’s behaviour and learning.

Both articles have the potential to reinforce the idea of the classroom-toilet as a panoptic space, because ‘data’ collection was based exclusively on observations leading researchers to perpetuate the illusion of the regulating gaze. Millei and Cliff’s (2013) presence in children’s actions within the toilet, their relationship and impact upon the constitution of subjectivities in the bathroom, was not considered. Although they were not practitioners, they were adults and did not use the (same) toilets as they did. Therefore, children’s use of the toilet as a regularised (and pedagogical) habit was taken for granted, and the common relational aspects between researchers and participant children (we do all use the bathroom) were not highlighted. This reinforced discourses of children’s body control and dualities between adult-child.

Gallacher (2005) suggests that the ‘toddler room’ could be considered a ‘polymorphic space’ (p.261) because rules and spaces were constantly (re)negotiated between children and adults. She adds that these kind of spaces are especially relevant for children in the gradual absence of ‘wild spaces’ outside of adult control than they had in the past’ (ibid.). This last argument reaffirms my critique that dualistic discourses are embedded in the development and analysis of her study, and can also be linked with Taylor’s (2011) critique of notions of children’s ‘inherent’ wilderness and connection to nature.
Taylor and Richardson (2005) use Foucault’s heterotopia in order to critically analyse a space where dualities of gender, sex and childhood were based on binaries, and explore how other ‘untrue’ (or unseen?) reflections were made within the ECE classroom. They suggest that the ‘home corner’ was a utopian space where discourses of childhood innocence and heteronormativity converged in play. The effect was twofold: an idealistic assumption of innocent ‘playful’ childhood, and an idealistic assumption of how idyllic adulthood looked. Their findings reaffirm the discourses the home-corner aspired to serve, because its idealised and normative effect generated a hyper-reality. The ‘real’ aspects were exaggerated and reflected how heteronormative discourses demanded specific coherent performances in order to make the utopia (‘home’) ‘real’.

The ECE classroom can be performing this twofold function by simultaneously creating a ‘real’ space for ‘the Child’ and providing the illusion that ‘the Child’ is fabricated through discursive practices. On the one hand, this space is configured to produce particular subjectivities, and is framed by the curriculum. On the other, the reiterative enactment of discursive practices which aim to constitute subjectivities, create the (im)possibility of ‘the Child’ - and therefore the chance of resistance and transformation. Similarly, Butler’s early work on gender performativity is a useful theoretical tool to think about the process of (re)creation, resistance and transformation of subjectivities in the classroom.

II Butler’s Performative Politics

Butler’s early work on gender performativity (1993, 1997a, 1999) enabled me to think differently about naturalised discourses of children and ‘the Child’. For Butler, sex and gender become effects of a discourse that establishes how bodies have to be, producing the identity ‘they are deemed to be simply representing’ (Jagger, 2008, p. 17). This idea is powerful for reconceiving the constitution and reproduction of child subjects, according to hegemonic discourses.

According to Butler, sex is not the origin of gender (biological woman corresponds to cultural female), but rather both are effects of a heteronormative matrix, which is a framework that establishes the law about who is considered intelligible, and who is not. Butler draws on Foucault’s idea of productive power in creating subjects through and in discourse. Discourses operate through and as our practices, and limit and show what gender is natural and normal. Through its repetition, the illusion that gendered subjects pre-exist is created. This leads Butler to argue that gender is performative. Performativity ‘is the discursive mode by which
ontological effects are installed’ (Butler, 1994, p. 33). This means that it creates the illusion that gender pre-exists us, and that it is an unquestionable truth that has always existed and is independent of our acts.

II. I  Iterability

Conventions based on ‘truths’ have been historically reproduced, and through repetition come to life in present acts. There is no individual subject will behind its repetition, rather its power relies on conventions that through historical repetition have a ‘sedimented iterability’ (Butler, 1995, emphasis in original). In other words, we become women/men/… through repeating actions that refer to the identity we have been ascribed (Jackson, 2004).

Repetition allows the effects of discourses to materialise in practices, artefacts, speech and behaviour, e.g. feminisation. We can play with this idea and think how it also can apply to think how behaviours considered childish, are linked to a child subject. Discourses need to be repeated to maintain its force of producing the effects it names. For example, repetition creates the illusion of a ‘natural’ origin of gender and (re)establishes a regulatory regime through which limits of normalcy are set.

Ontological effects like sex, gender - and I suggest ‘childhood’ as a structural phase of the life cycle- are installed as natural through discourse, produced through our embodiment and speech. If we think that childhood is performative, then children are produced through~with discourses of ‘the Child’. The assumption is that childhood is a natural human phase, everybody has been a child, and there are better/healthier ways to be(come) one. The relevance of this concept relies on the illusion of constituting a subject and providing her an identity according to the norms (Jackson, 2004) (woman, female, male, masculine, adult, child). Taking this idea further, we are not children from the start, but are made as such through repetition: the Child becomes someone that is repeatedly done collectively and individually.

II. II  Being Called and Constituted

Butler explained that gender is produced through and because of a ‘reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names’ (Butler, 1993, p. 2). This means that identity categories are produced because they are repeated and because they call out, name a subject and therefore by implication tell her who she is.
We do not choose our gendered identity. It is produced when we are interpellated, a concept that Butler (1997a) drew from Althusser (1984): we are called a name, and it re-produces itself as we repeat ourselves. We act according to the limits established by discourse. Interpellations (designations) give us the illusion of being what is named, a pre-existing subject (Atkinson and DePalma, 2008). Consequently, naming an identity constitutes a subject and creates the illusion that they have always been that identity.

Butler illustrates the idea of interpellation through the exclamation ‘It’s a Boy! It’s a girl!’ (Butler, 1997a, p. 49). Childhood could also be considered an identity category that is performatively adjudged to and with subjects. Given current technological progress, we are named before we are born as gendered, and we are positioned within an identity category of youth: the Child (baby-infant-toddler).

Regulatory regimes created through nomination, limit and situate subjects within the normative discourse. These also create and frame who is/is not an intelligible subject (Britzman, 2003), i.e. who is/is not ‘a (normal) child’. Relevant to highlight is the notion of constitution. The identity category that is called out and nominates us, pre-exists us (Butler, 2004). And although we are ‘done’ by it, we are not determined to be(come) that identity category throughout our existence. The repeated discourse positions us within a regulatory frame, but we are not fixed by or in it. Rather, discourses require repetition to produce the illusion that they are truths, allowing for agency, resistance and transformation. This is the possibility for change and resignification that is materialised through ‘discursive performativity’ (Butler, 1993; 1997a).

Foucault’s notion of productive power is embedded in Butler’s theorisation of ‘discursive performativity’ (Butler, 1993; 1997a), given that discursive practices are not only descriptive (nominative) but also productive. While repeating a prior practice, there is the possibility of producing a different subject (Atkinson and DePalma, 2008). The interpellation of ‘the Child’ deposits a specific idea about a group and identity. While reproducing it, we can also subvert the powers that act on them and which they enact’ to create a ‘new performative meaning, which in turn generate[s] new chains of citations’ (Davies, 2006b, p. 426)

This idea is profoundly powerful. What we think means~is a ‘child’, can be done but also opened up radically. ‘The child’ is not determined to be innocent/vulnerable/ignorant/..., and these exclusionary frames can be challenged and reclaimed while embodying them.

In ‘Excitable Speech’ (1997a), Butler explains how calling a name does harm, and how citational practices can produce subjects beyond the norm (heteronormative matrix). To
position someone outside the norm produces ‘the abject’, it un-does the individual subject and dismisses her existence from what counts within the human sphere. Within the current unjust conditions of Chilean ECE, being made into a ‘child’ can have similar violent effects as hate or injurious speech. It can situate child subjects for example either as normal/abnormal, vulnerable/protected, innocent/immoral; and consequently imposes a condition of exclusion. Being called out also tells subjects who~what they~we are and represent to themselves and others, i.e. a discursive frame of reference upon which to draw. But hate speech has the discursive potential of injury and resistance. Discursive agency then, is a possibility for everybody, according to how she responds to it.

II.III Studies drawing on Butler

Blaise’s (2005a) ethnographic study explores how children created and sustained gender in a North American urban EC setting. She articulated different observations (video and in person) of play, with interviews with the practitioner and students, and student artefacts. She identified critical incidents and then developed critical discourse analysis on these to identify five gender discourses located in everyday classroom interactions and activities. The heterosexual matrix framing the classroom context was identified and the study offers examples of how children ‘do’ gender to maintain and/or resisted this matrix. Her findings also show that children actively maintained the matrix to frame others and resisted it through their speech and actions in their EC classroom.

Among the five case studies, Madison was a girl whose practices and statements displayed a flexible and contradicting understanding of gender. Her interests in gender-equity (in toys and access to ‘male’ play spaces like Lego construction) were complemented with what Blaise identifies as ‘gender-bending’. Blaise analyses Madison’s pretend play, where she performed male roles (human and animal), and argues that she does this to access other power positions in which femininity does not limit her range of action.

Five years later (2010), she revisits her evidence and developed a new analysis by articulating a queer (re)reading of play. She links Butler with Deleuze’s and Guattari’s concept of ‘assemblages of desire’ ([1984] 2004, [1987] 2004, in Blaise, 2010, p. 81) to explain how this construction developed and/or was resisted. She contends that, albeit Butler’s theoretical framework is useful for identifying situations where gender is ‘done’, this framework is not useful for understanding children’s resistances beyond a binary rationale. Drawing on
‘assemblages of desire’ (ibid.), she re-reads her evidence to illustrate how gender and sexuality were fluid, developing and ever changing.

An ‘assemblage of desire’ is a different approach to comprehend social reality. An assemblage is a number of non-organised elements (which can be diverse and disparate) that are gathered into one context. By creating different relationships between the environment, subjects that compose it, and animate and inanimate elements, an assemblage produces a (different) reality, or fragments into other realities. Thus, it is not singular or holistic, rather it is ‘assembled, connected to language and bodies’ (p. 87), it is open-ended and unpredictable. Assemblages are multiple, can contain other assemblages, and create different constellations that can be ‘mapped’ as ‘assemblages of desire’.

Blaise (2010) extended this idea to children’s play, which, as a constellation, has the same ontological position as discourses, animate and inanimate elements. Children create assemblages of their desire in their play. For instance, Madison’s (earlier (2005) identified as a ‘gender-bender’) resistances to femininity, to ‘being’ a girl, were unpacked as desires, i.e. possibilities for doing gender differently. The effects of her desires are unpredictable. But according to the author, they seem to be deliberately experimental. The idea of ‘assemblages of desire’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1984, in ibid. 2010) enabled Blaise to (re)read children’s play as well as her position as a researcher. She acknowledged how her own desires, ‘data’ collection approaches, relationships with children, and presence in the classroom, articulated with(in) and encouraged the creation of new assemblages.

Likewise, Taylor and Richardson (2005) developed an ethnographic study in an Australian EC context to research children’s socio-cultural interactions during free-play in the ‘home corner’. The authors argue that compulsory heterosexuality ‘geared’ with childhood innocence produced a disciplinary mechanism that regulated the range of subjective positions children could/not adopt, and therefore also impacted on the ways in which we adults made sense of childhood.

According to Taylor and Richardson, the childhood innocence discourse in ECE is intimately linked to hegemonic ideas of heterosexuality. Romantic discourses of the innocent and natural child are subsumed to developmental practices and reconfigured towards enabling order. The authors concurred with other scholars that these have universalising effects on the social category of childhood in ECE (Blaise, 2010; Burman, 2008a; Cannella, 1999; Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2007; Fendler, 2001; Walkerdine, 1993).
Narrative vignettes collected from their observations of children’s play in the ‘home corner’ enabled the authors to explore how children adopted (or not) different (gendered) subjective positions, how they regulated and transgressed heteronormative discourses of childhood. The ‘home corner’ reflected a romanticised view on westernised adult middle-class life and children’s play, very particular to ECE classrooms informed by play pedagogy. It had normalising effects, because it associated which actions/roles/play were valued and which ones were not. The authors explain that it was expected to see children emulating and engaging in ‘straight’ forward ‘(heterosexual) family play that conformed to the styles and manners deemed appropriate to ‘normal’ development’ (p. 166). I would add that by showing what and how children should play, it also expressed who they had to become.

This space revealed a struggle between a normative gender regime and a child’s attempt to resist and modify its ordering to define a single identity category. Taylor and Richardson argue that in play, ‘hybrid identities’ (2005, p. 169) emerged. Some children took on contradicting and multiple identities that refused to be reduced to simple essentialised categories, disrupting the ‘normal’ order of the home corner and their ‘assumed’ gender. Take for instance Reg, who played ‘policeman mother Thelma’ who chased baddies, used frocks and took tender care of her baby.

Blaise (2005b) also found different kind of resistances, though she interpreted these as ‘gender-benders’, i.e. children challenging heteronormativity by exploring other discourses. Taylor and Richardson’s (2005) use of the heterotopia of the home corner enabled them to read it as a flexible site, where rules and power evolved and were enacted differently. It was a space for production, exploration and contestation. Children’s play was fluid and adaptable, as the performance of gender categories and childhood discourses were strategic, flexible and shifting. The authors conclude that children could be understood as ‘potentially queer’, given that in their play they ‘convey[ed] the complex, hybrid and rapidly transforming world that (…) [they] inhabit, embody and act upon’ (ibid, p. 171).

Parallels can be drawn with Blaise’s (2010) arguments about how children’s play constituted different assemblages of desire, as both studies acknowledge fluidity and queerness in children’s practices and play. She explains that children’s desires shifted and were materialised in fluid movements, where queering was a point of departure and ‘through which a non-normative outside sense of belonging might be attained’ (p. 170). Blaise (2010) asked if Madison’s gender-bending was the only assemblage possible. Because there are endless possibilities of constellations, Madison’s performativity and experimentations could have been
understood as not being one specific kind of girl or boy, but the (re)invention of (still unrecognised) gender(s) with others.

This idea is relevant to the findings that Taylor and Richardson (2005) raise: although the home corner/play was a space that was constituted to be ‘done’ in a particular way, children played it differently. How play is done and what is played about, are issues that I explore in my study.

One extract of Blaise’s (2010) (re)read evidence, shows Madison announcing her desire not to be a girl, and that her ‘doing boy’ produced ‘another way of doing gender’ (p. 89). I would also add to the analysis that Madison’s use of words may also present a contestation to a static and determined notion of ‘being’:

Madison: Well, I like to play house ... and I pretend that I’m the brother ... the older brother.
Mindy: But you’re a girl?
Madison: But I hate being a girl.
Mindy: Why?
Madison: Because I just hate being ...
Penny: (Interrupting) But girl is much more prettier.
Madison: I just hate being prettier.

(Blaise, 2010, p. 89, my emphasis in italics)

Madison may have had some degree of awareness of the exploratory and unfinished dimension of her gender doing, because she explained that she pretended, not that she ‘played’ or ‘was’. If we understand her use of words under a westernised traditional conception, the idea of ‘being’ signals a static position and does not allow Madison to explore fluidly other discursive positions. It would be interesting to explore if Madison was also explaining her desire in other aspects that overlap with gender, as for instance family roles and positions.

For example, Madison also played being ‘boy puppy’ who was a pet and rescued her co-players. She drew on this discursive position although it was frequently considered less empowered than human roles. Notwithstanding, it enabled Madison to establish new power relationships with others while performing a different form of human masculinity. She subverted the traditional submissive role of ‘the pet dog’ by becoming a rescuer without drawing on familiar ‘macho’ male heroes’. The interspecies aspect, i.e. thinking of possibilities of being that go beyond traditional ‘human(ist)’ roles, echoes with what Taylor, Pacini-Ketchabaw and Blaise (2012) sign-post as an important issue to consider for reconceptualising research in ECE.
To summarise, in this chapter I outlined and introduced the key concepts of the theoretical framework that informs my thesis. By using Foucault’s and Butler’s concepts, I aim to think and study how discourses of the Child are (re)produced in the ECE classroom. In the following sections, I will engage methodologically with the aim of my thesis.
CHAPTER FOUR:
METHODOLOGY

The methodology of a study reflects how the researcher transforms her theoretical framework into practice, in order to explore and question a particular context. This process displays the researcher’s understanding of what knowledge and reality are, and is embedded throughout the design, implementation, ethics, and analysis process.

This chapter aspires to, first, present the research design providing information about the context, participants and research process. Second, to develop a brief explanation of a postmodern rationale for the study, and present the research methods which underpin it. Moreover, in this chapter I explain how Borderland Mestizaje Feminism (BMF, Saavedra and Nymark, 2008) enabled me to reassemble methods from different knowledge paradigms (e.g. ethnographic approach and reflective diary informed by autoethnography) to create new understandings that take into account the hybridity of knowledge and the liminal spaces created within the study with others.

I Research Design

This study called for an inductive and gradual approach, so it could be shaped through experiences and suggestions from staff, children and my supervisor7, especially in relation to the ongoing adaptation of design, methods and ethics. For that reason, in this section is very important to describe in detail the context in which the study took place, and the participants involved. Further, the design of the study, which involved several phases of piloting and ‘data’ construction, and the analytical strategy that articulates theory and inquiry are considered before presenting the research rationale and methods.

---

7 See in Appendix Gantt Chart 1 and Table 1.
I.1 Setting

The study was developed in a Chilean publicly subsidised nursery ‘Pichintún’, in Cerro El Litre, a deprived urban area of Valparaíso. As a port city, Valparaíso has always been an important touristic attraction, especially since becoming a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The city is built on a series of forty-two steep hills, each separated by narrow streets, which lead to its bay. Houses of different shapes, sizes and colours provide an astonishing view from the city centre.

At the end of summer 2014 (February), soaring temperatures, pacific winds and poor electric installations and a raging fire, made Cerro El Litre the centre of attention of the world. Located on the northern part of Valparaíso, the catastrophe exposed how its half-finished pavements, lack of basic supplies and irregular rubbish collection and stray animals; were some of the problems the municipality urgently needed to solve in this area.

On an uphill road located in the middle of Cerro El Litre, the ‘Pichintún’ nursery stands out between small residential houses, built with different lightweight materials by their owners.
The Municipality of Valparaíso administers this nursery, which provides education and care services to approximately 100 infants aged six months to five years, whose families are considered (by a state definition) vulnerable and/or deprived: single mothers, unemployed mothers, under age parents, ethnic minorities, among others (JUNJI, 2013b). The duration of the regular school day is from 8:00-16:30, but families can request extended attention (if they are able to provide proof of working times) until 19:00.

As a publicly subsidised nursery, the state provides, through external private services, three meals a day: breakfast, lunch and afternoon milk (including a snack for children cared for in extended hours). According to subsidy regulations, children’s absence for more than three days without a justifiable cause (sick leave granted by a doctor) ends in their enrolment being cancelled and they are removed from the nursery’s registry. The waiting list is very long (at least ten children per educational level) and therefore rotation at the beginning of the year is frequent.
‘Pichintún’ nursery is organised in four classrooms, where different levels (separated by age) function:

- two ‘Salas Cunas’ (crib rooms) with 20 children each (separated by age, 6-12 months; and 13-24 months),
- one ‘Medio Menor’ (similar to foundation stage) with 32 children (2-3 years), and
- one ‘Medio Mayor’ (similar to foundation stage) with 32 children (3-4 years).

Besides the kitchen, staff toilet and office, there is another room which changes function according to parents’ and staffs’ needs. Several gates limit entrance, and all classroom windows have bars.

Staffing follows JUNJI’s regulations (2013b). During the year 2013, there was also a teacher trainee student in each classroom. Students worked as another member of staff, attending every day and providing all the regulated planning. Other teacher trainees (physical training, psychology, among others) attended sporadically throughout the school year.

I chose this context because:

At least 42,61% of chilean ECE services are subsidised (by the state (JUNJI) and Integra, MINEDUC, 2015). Although findings of this study are not generalisable to all publicly subsidised nurseries, parallels can be established with other similar settings. This is especially relevant because publicly-subsidised nurseries are rising steadily. According to JUNJI’s official figures (2013a; 2015), in 2013 there were 1685 VTF nurseries, and by 2015, these increased to 1722.

State-subsidised nurseries hypothetically have higher autonomy from the central government than state regulated JUNJI or INTEGRA institutions, and have less gatekeeping limitations. In the case of ‘Pichintún’, the municipality of Valparaíso authorised my access after my doctoral student credentials were proven, and the headteacher and staff accepted my research proposal.

Additionally, this institution had particular advantages that enabled my access. First, I knew well its location and area, as I worked as a practitioner in a neighbouring hill and used live
close to it in the city centre. Second, I shared insider practitioner knowledge as I used to work in a similar context. Third, I was introduced to the nursery by a former colleague, whose son attended this preschool. She facilitated access because she was the head of the nursery’s parent’s board the year before fieldwork. By the time I started the study she had left the seat and her son had finished his education there. Hence, she enabled contact between the nursery and municipality, and me. Last, the headteacher knew me indirectly, as we both were alumni of the same university (different cohorts), which facilitated access and built upon the perception of my presence in the institution. I quickly became familiar with the everyday life in the nursery and was treated by the staff more as an ‘ally’ than as an intruder.

I.II Participants

The Butterfly classroom, level ‘medio mayor’ (similar to ‘Foundation Stage’), was assigned to me by the headteacher after she read and discussed the research project with the teaching staff. When she assigned to me the level, she suggested that children and practitioners would benefit from my presence and work. This group would start reception stage in a primary school the following year (2014).

32 young children (three to four years olds) and four female practitioners (one educator, two assistants and a teacher trainee student in her final year) were the main participants of this study. Most of the children had attended at least one year at this same institution and they all lived around the nursery.

To my surprise, I discovered that the educator in charge (Aunty Lily) and I knew each other from previous work as colleagues in a subsidised nursery. In addition, my initial gatekeeper (who facilitated access to the nursery, and with whom I am friends) was the former president of the nursery’s parents’ board and had not left in good terms. These antecedents, created some tensions because she seemed to not know how to relate to my new role.

Throughout the study I established friendly relationships with parents and families of the Butterfly classroom, engaging in morning or afternoon conversations when they were interested. All the staff got to know me over time and I maintained friendly interactions with them. Staff from other levels covered during lunch times, holidays or when someone was ill. I took these opportunities to explain the study and ask their consent (and pseudonym if necessary) to record when they were around.

8 See Appendix 4
I attended ‘Pichintún’ nursery from March-July 2013 and November 2013. Throughout 2013, staff had several day strikes, which led to periods of low attendance of children. I still visited the nursery, when possible. Similarly, during July 2013, some children stayed at home for winter holidays.

I.III Research Stages

The research process was divided in three main phases: contact, access and authorisation; exploratory ‘data’ construction; and in-depth ‘data’ construction.

Stage 0 – Contact, Access and Authorisation (September 2012- beginning of March 2013)

In September 2012, I contacted the headteacher via email providing a general description of my studies at the Institute of Education (IOE), explaining the research project and my intentions of finding a nursery for it. She showed interest and requested more information about the study, which I provided through digital documentation, telephone conversations and in person (in February 2013 – See figure 8 for a timeline of the research process).

The headteacher informed me that the final project was of interest for the institution, so I requested the official authorisation of the Municipality in February 2013. By March 2013, my documentation (identification as a PGR Student at the IOE and summary of the study) was approved and the headteacher assigned me to the Butterfly classroom. Referring to practitioners involved in my observations, I shared with them the study in a meeting before starting the study. I took this opportunity to negotiate roles and limits, as well as their

---

9 See Appendix, Table 1.
10 See Appendix 4.
expectations and doubts. This meeting was particularly complicated, as my initial gatekeeper was the former president of the nursery’s parents’ board and had not left in good terms. As a result, my presence was initially perceived as surveillance and control over practitioners and their practice, and influenced my first visits to the classroom.

Stage 1 - Exploratory (March - July 2013)

I spent two to three days per week in the nursery, in March and April only for five hours (8:30-13:30), and from May onwards the whole school day (8:30-17:30). I started attending the nursery at the same time as children started their school year (March 2013) and the study extended throughout the first semester (March to July – See figure 8 for a timeline of the research process). Staff already knew families from previous years and children’s siblings, but we (staff, students and myself) still found ourselves in an ‘adaptation’ process, as we were unfamiliar with the work style and daily routine. During this initial phase, I requested consent from staff, families and finally children. This stage was subdivided into two stages: Immersion and Pockets of Participation.

Stage 1.1 – Immersion (April 2013)

The initial phase was exploratory in order to develop general understandings of the classroom. I complied with ethical and administrative considerations, e.g. acquiring consent from direct and indirect participants, negotiating my role within the classroom.
Simultaneously, I immersed myself within the everyday functioning of the classroom as a participant researcher. I followed practitioner’s instructions and participated in any activity when invited.

During this stage I recorded as much as possible in my fieldnotes (Wolcott, 2012) and got to know the setting in an unstructured manner. The record’s usefulness relied in finding information for portraying the context, its dynamics and the participants. Learning from and sharing contextualised knowledge with children and staff of the classroom facilitated relationships (Harcourt and Conroy, 2011) and dialogue. Given the inductive approach of the study, I attempted to gradually integrate novel approaches to recording ‘data’. Writing was complemented with drawings. Children also rapidly started using my notebook for their drawings, stories or issues they considered relevant to record.

Children and staff were able to read, see and hear from me what I had written and drawn in my notes, and they could request omission, eliminating aspects or adding others that they considered relevant and I might have missed. Children asked me to add information about their peers and their behaviours. Practitioners sometimes asked during circle time if I recorded when children did not follow the classroom rules, thus they may have used my notebook as an extension of their pedagogic strategies.

I requested the help of an artist to create several drawings based on these experiences (See Figures 10 and 11). Both practitioners and children approved the drawings after I shared these with them; I used them to produce the informed consent forms for children.11

---

11 See Appendix.
I started writing reflectively about critical episodes in a diary related to the situations I encountered, mostly triggered by children’s and practitioner’s daily questions about me, my role and intentions within the classroom. Unpacking how and what I answered shed light in how I was doing research and discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘research’ in my interactions and writing. This became part of my reflective diary, which was informed by an autoethnographic approach.

Practitioner’s sceptical attitude towards me and what my presence (and study) represented made the first months particularly difficult, as I was continuously in an effort of reflecting ethical responsibility and care towards them and children. During the initial period an overlapping, simultaneous practice of mutual observation developed: I observed practitioners and children, children observed me and how adults reacted to me, adults (parents and staff) observed me and how children reacted to me. This mutual observation was maintained until the end of the first stage of the study, but was especially emphasised by practitioners until end of May, beginning of June. Additionally, these practices were reinforced when supervisors (JUNJI and university) entered the classroom.

Stage 1.2 - Pockets of Participation (May-July 2013)

During the second phase I looked for paradoxes that emerged within the context (Wolcott, 2012). After having a general idea about the daily life in the classroom, I looked at what
discourses emerged and were contradicted in daily interactions. I recorded through notes and drawings the practices that involved children interacting amongst themselves or with adults, and paid special attention to:

- Children’s play in different spaces (‘free play’, directed play, at least three times a day)
- Daily pedagogical routines and habits (repeated every day, at least seven times a day)

As an EC practitioner, I was familiar with everyday rituals in the nursery. However, I was interested in seeing repetition differently, to understand how relationships and subjectivities between children-peers and adults-children were developed.

For example, records of morning greeting routines were insightful for understanding how rituals offered a limited range of discursive positions. Referring to this particular ritual, practitioners cued - ‘Good morning Children!’ - and children and I replied when it was our turn –

‘Goooo-hoooood moooo-hooring Auuunty Liiiiiiily’. Simultaneously, while performing this memorised ‘dialogue’ we rocked our bodies to a swaying rhythm.

Although children and practitioners were not involved with the initial research design and topic, I tried to maximise their involvement in the research process by drawing on them in its redesign and adjustments. I wanted to consider them as ‘stakeholders’ (Franks, 2011, p. 18) of the study, as they were constructing ‘data’ with me throughout the study. Their knowledge
and inputs were central for adapting materials, activities, and the design. Consequently, spaces in which I shared my research intentions and their comments were built within the research design.

For instance, I developed activities to acquire children’s informed consent and participation in the study. Practitioners were also present in these activities, although their participation was limited, possibly because they continued fulfilling their pedagogical roles (e.g. overviewing the group).

These ‘pockets of participation’ (Franks, 2011) sought to explore collaboratively aspects of the research process, making it more ‘transparent’ to everyone involved. The information that was gained in these spaces enabled me to continuously adapt my research practices. By the end of this stage I asked children, staff and families if we could include complementary methods for recording episodes (visual methods like photographs or video). Authorisation and consent were given (in some cases with exceptions) and I piloted audio and photos during the last week of July.

By the same time I approached the staff and offered a feedback meeting to discuss and review everything that I had been doing until then. Drawings, pictures, fieldnotes and my reflections were shared with them. At the end of the meeting I requested to return for another month to the classroom, but in a more intense format (at least three times a week, for the whole school day).

They authorised me without hesitation. After this, I made a feedback video in which I summarised everything I had done with images and sounds. At the end of the video I requested children’s authorisations (in group and then individually) to return to their classroom. Everybody consented to it. This video was screened to children only, as I assured confidentiality and most of the evidence was not anonymised. Between August and October 2013, I returned to the UK to systematise the first exploratory stage. I kept in contact with staff and children through postcards, as they had requested that I shared with them where I live and how my ‘research work’ looked like.

By the end of the first stage, on my return to the nursery in November, and until the end of the study, practitioners were especially warm and caring. I interpreted this response from staff to mean that rapport and trust was built throughout the exploratory phase, despite my presence in the classroom being troublesome initially.
Stage 2 – ‘In-depth’ ‘Data’ Construction (July and November 2013)

My return in November was warmly greeted by both children and staff. During this month, I visited the nursery approximately three days per week (depending on strikes and bank holidays) and spent the complete school day as a participant observer. I refined my participation in regular learning activities, given that I did not want to have a negative effect on practitioners’ work. For instance, my notebook, my lunch or conversations with children were sometimes distracting and affected practitioner’s teaching. I joined circles or table work but sat on the edges and followed practitioner’s instructions without calling attention. Also, I attempted to participate and observe play whenever it emerged, and in any setting (playground and classroom).

In my observations, I looked for practices that seemed so natural that they would not be questioned (Youdell, 2006b). My premise was that it could raise information about naturalised and established discourses about care. This is how I started observing hygiene rituals on a regular basis (whenever authorised by children and staff). I sat in a corner of the bathroom first taking notes and drawing body postures, and frequently engaged in conversation with children. Order, procedures, frequent statements, and space distribution were recorded, paying special attention to gazes and practices that would stand out (e.g. practitioners talking among themselves about personal issues). Both staff (from all educational levels) and children were now aware of my regular participation in free and directed play instances.

Although I attempted to define as clearly as possible my role to children, families, teachers and the headteacher, in retrospective, I realise I may not have been completely successful. For instance, although I insisted that I was unable to assume any role of care or responsibility over the classroom and children, staff sometimes left the classroom and expected me to stay in charge and take care of the children. Similarly, parents sometimes asked me about regulations and requested my authorisation to leave and pick up their children.

Throughout the study, I state that ‘data’ is constructed (instead of ‘collected’). As a researcher and writer of the study, I systematically edited and controlled what information was considered evidence, and used it for the purposes of my own argument. I developed it through a principled process of asking questions and of reflecting on ‘data’ that I had, developing the ‘data’ construction methods as it progressed. This process was informed by Charmaz’s (2006) ideas about constructivist grounded theory. Because I sought creating ‘pockets of participation’ (Franks, 2011), participants (children and practitioners) had a certain amount of control over the type of experiences I could record, by, for instance, limiting access and participation (to activities, places), to modifying my records, and even putting my pen down.
An example of this kind of ‘limiting’ experience is found in the extract below, which describes a child complaining about my note taking.

[Francesco has taken Gary’s truck and Gary denounces this loudly]
‘Matte [Francesco’s twin brother] tells Francesco off and says that he doesn’t have to fight. Francesco says out loud: ‘AND YOU DON’T HAVE TO WRITE!’ [angry tone, he blushes and looks at me]’.
I stop writing’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 08/05/2013, later edited according to Francesco’s observations)

It is possible that Francesco showed that he understood observation practices and their invasiveness. He may also have been aware that he could control what would be recorded, therefore shifted power relationships between participants and me. To respect the limits that they established was an ethical imperative, although sometimes I did not realise that I was invading their spaces. However, and because our power relationships were fluid and shifted from the traditional adult-child/practitioner-student/researcher-researched dynamic; participants could choose to leave issues unresolved or open to interpretation. For instance, children chose to explain their drawings and fieldnotes, and in some cases (see Conejo’s writing in Figure 17) questions about meanings were left unanswered. Notwithstanding, although I invited all participants to partake in the making of ‘data’, only children actively participated it. Practitioners’ professional roles, and understandings of pretend play and pedagogy may explain why they decided not to participate in these instances. This issue will be raised in the final reflection chapter.

By the end of the study, general information was requested by families. I offered two meetings in which a general synthesis about preliminary findings was provided. Information that could identify the participants was omitted. This decision was clearly stated when requesting access, and later consent and assent.

For purposes of clarity, the following table summarises the different stages of ‘data’ construction with participants in the Butterfly classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>I could only access and participate when invited (by children and adults), thus my observations and records are based on what they wanted me to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Diary</td>
<td>Personal, reflective writing and audio diary. In some instances it incorporated my own childhood experiences in the reflection. Although my experiences with participants had effects on this record and on interactions and method implementation further in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>I could only access and participate when invited (by children and adults), thus my observations are based on what they wanted me to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>Developed while doing participant observation, revised or amended by children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Developed while doing participant observation, amended and complemented by children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recollection of Curricular Texts | Headteacher provided the nursery's PEI.  
|                             | Aunty Lily provided the ACP (diagnostic).                                                                                                       |
| Audio recording             | Throughout this period, adults requested editing some conversations.  
|                             | By the end children chose when to start-stop recording                                                                                           |
| Still Photographs           | Initially the still camera (on tripod) was placed only by me, but by the end some children took photographs.                                    |
| Reflective Diary            | Personal, reflective writing and audio diary. In some instances it incorporated my own childhood experiences in the reflection. Although my experiences with participants had effects on this record and on interactions and method implementation further in the study. |
| Participant observation     | I could only access and participate when invited (by children and adults), thus my observations are based on what they wanted me to learn. |
| Fieldnotes                  | Developed while doing participant observation, revised or amended by children.                                                                    |
|                             | Developed while doing participant observation, amended                                                                                           |
I.V Analysis: Theory and Research intertwined in a Game of Cat’s Cradle (with Rapa Nui Influences)\(^\text{12}\)

Haraway (1994) uses a metaphor for knowledge making called the ‘Game of Cat’s Cradle’. It is a game in which player(s) entangle strings into different figures and knots. Haraway uses the game as a metaphor to explore how different disciplines (in her case science, feminism and cultural studies) may weave into patterns, and to think differently about knowledge production and relationality.

Haraway suggests that certain discourses of nature (shapes, string figures) have been naturalised and established as ‘truth’, and that by undoing and re-doing new figures and knots, privileged knowledge and existence is queried. The metaphor enables her to go beyond boundaries (binaries), and therefore queers normalised categories through ‘cross-stitching’ and the creation of new figures in a tangled web of strings and notions, and connected and interwoven possibilities. Though framed within queer nature studies, Haraway’s work and this metaphor is inspiring because it articulates movement, overlap, links and the creation of new spaces which do not depend on binaries or static, straightforward and clear understandings. I concur with her that critical theory is not only about reflexivity but also about transforming our worlds.

\(^{12}\) Parts of this text were initially published in the following article: “Parents’ have to be obeyed!” - Being confronted with (inter)personal (re)production of (your) Childhood in Play’ (Galdames Castillo, 2015)
Using ‘Cat’s Cradle’ as a methodological device, enables opening up ways of developing analysis and the inquiry process. Within this metaphor, theory and inquiry are deeply articulated and do not pre-exist each other. Their entanglement and reconfiguration into new shapes requires being (un)done together. Cat’s Cradle can be played individually or with others. When others (individual subjects, theories) participate, the game can lead to creating new and alternative shapes.

I use this metaphor to conceptualise the writing process and the ways that I build narratives of the research in the ‘data’ analysis chapters. Particularities of Rapa Nui People’s, Easter Island People’s, own variant of the game of cat’s cradle: ‘Kai-Kai’ were introduced in this process. Kai-Kais are ‘string figure poems’ (Makihara, 2005, p. 7) and are considered within the performative arts and crafts. In this variant, the social element is emphasised as each Kai-Kai figure is played along in a performance of a story, song and/or poem; and therefore requires the participation of others. Thinking with this metaphor in my study, all participants (children and practitioners) shaped the study directly, creating collaboratively new figures.

To analyse the evidence of the study, I adopted the strategy of forming Kai-Kais: non-linear analytic narratives of the messy and fragmented entanglement between constructed ‘data’ and the theoretical framework. I thought of the theoretical framework and methodological approach as strings that intersected and created different patterns, i.e. understandings of the constructed ‘data’, and therefore of the realities and discourses that emerged in the classroom. Kai-Kai’s are local creations and particular to their own communities. Although we can find similar Kai-Kai patterns in other contexts, each figure takes into account local stories and knowledges to build upon. This is particularly relevant when reflecting on the possibility of (re)producing postcolonial trajectories of knowledge, by implementing/developing a westernised and Eurocentric approach to research.

The collaborative element of playing Kai-Kai, i.e. ‘data’ construction, also provides possibilities of disrupting a linear story. Different local ‘voices’ (children’s, practitioner’s, theories, curricula, mine) were elicited to show how they shaped and were shaped. The interactive nature of the ‘data’ construction process was also related to a wider community of knowledge (ECE and research in this field) that informs the study. Kai-Kai figures offered a war of writing and presenting the research. The impossibility of providing a straightforward narrative of research and analysis was foregrounded.

A Kai-Kai figure links with a story and/or song which is narrated when shared with others. Following this idea, in this inquiry each ‘figure’, representing a particular discourse of ‘the
Child’ and Aunty, was developed and thought as a Kai-Kai performance (a weaving together of themes), and constituted an analysis chapter.

II Research Rationale

II.I Postmodern Paradigm

The postmodern argument contests western thought by challenging assumptions that our world is explainable through unquestionable universal truths. Rather, ‘truths’ are local, diverse, and specific to socio-historical contexts, and consequently also political and defined through power relations (MacNaughton, 2005; Sarup, 1988; St. Pierre, 2000a). This thesis is marked by ‘incredulity toward metanarratives’ (Lyotard, 1979/1984, p. xxiv, in St. Pierre, 2000a, p. 25). Accordingly, it framed this inquiry by seeking ways to unpack and deconstruct worldviews that have been left unquestioned and continuously shape our lives.

Problematisation opens possibilities for introducing new methodological approaches and subjecting these to critique as well. Responses to this challenge range from conceiving writing as a means for knowledge production (Richardson and St. Pierre, 2005), or acknowledging the researcher in the text (Lather, 2007), among others.

What these critiques have in common is the challenge towards simplified and instrumental research narratives that are also based on inconsistent views of knowledge and reality (St. Pierre, 2011), which pre-define what signifiers like ‘voice’, or ‘data’ can be (St. Pierre, 1997; 2013a), and limit what can be learned (McCoy, 2012). For instance, the value of ethnographic studies of children’s play is frequently placed on the accuracy and richness of ‘data’ (observation, whether written, or video-, audio recordings); or children’s statements are conceived as unique and representative ‘voices’ of their group and identity category. I wanted to explore ways of approaching my research that could challenge the linear and transparent (re)presentation of knowledge, opening ways of producing it differently. I attempted to extend this approach beyond analysis purposes, and acknowledge its relevance for the whole inquiry process.

Tensions in doing postmodern research in ECE

Several scholars (Childers, 2012; Jackson and Mazzei, 2012; Lather and St. Pierre, 2013; MacLure, 2011) argue for the need to stop ourselves from (re)producing narratives that seem transparent, that limit the multiplicity of readings, and that create the illusion of ‘the “mythic
immediacy” of the educational present’ (MacLure, 2006, p. 730). Ignoring the messiness of our reality/ies does little to impact favourably in oppressive contexts, but rather serves to create a ‘hygienic practice’ which forecloses complexity and assumes certainty and clarity (McCoy, 2012). For instance, ‘data’ is a signifier that carries assumptions about what it represents and that its meaning is given – as St Pierre (2013a) puts it, ‘We are not separate from the world’ (p. 226).

If through practice, we ‘do’ theory (Taguchi, 2007), it is necessary to refute innocent, a-political and unethical approaches to inquiry, and to embrace complexity as a source for new possibilities of thought. Following scholars’ critiques (Britzman, 2003; Lather and St. Pierre, 2013; St. Pierre, 2011), I wanted to ‘escape’ (Lather, 2013) the familiar qualitative research practices in ECE, specifically with/on children. Thinking of the performative constitution of subjects (in this study, ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’) raises epistemological issues (St. Pierre, 2006) and has implications for research methodology (Youdell, 2000).

One of the strongest critiques postmodern research has faced is not providing concrete practical alternatives to the problems it ‘unveils’ (see e.g. Cole, 2003). However, as St Pierre has argued, providing solutions (potential recipes) is not its purpose. Drawing on Foucault, the problematisations that inquiry raises can ‘show which space of freedom we can still enjoy and how many changes can still be made’ (Foucault and Martin, 1988, p. 11). Indeed, Foucault (1997) insists that principles for practice should not be provided within analyses, rather that each person should use these to build their own ethics and transform normative prescriptions.

To challenge unified and universal truths provides a space to reconceptualise ideas that have been defined as normal and natural (MacNaughton, 2005) and to question our everyday practices. For instance, the analysis of naturalised and self-evident discourses about how women are (re)produced, has disrupted discursive categories that violently affect our and others’ lives (Jackson, 2004). Similarly, universalising needs, categories or identities has unethical effects because they become normative and foreclose the possibility of questioning their condition and origin (Butler, 2005). As with other grand narratives, these have the potential for becoming successive regimes of truth.

Authors within the RECE community (Blaise, 2010; Cannella et al., 2000; Dahlberg and Moss, 2005; MacNaughton, 2005; Taylor, 2013; Tobin, 1995; 1997), have called for appropriating postmodern approaches to understanding the field and knowledge embedded in it. Examples of how qualitative researches in the field of childhood studies has been used for social justice goals (Denzin and Giardina, 2010) are found for instance in the field of sociology of childhood. These emerged as a response to hegemonic notions of childhood, research on children, and an
astonishing gap in integrating children’s views, opinions and experiences (Christensen and James, 2008a; James and Prout, 1997). The relevance of the work in this field rests in the effort to promote and pursue children’s rights, and to challenge lack of participation, silencing of voices, and extreme disadvantages that children face as a minority (Smith, 2011). It is in this framework that I set out to explore how discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ are produced.

II.II   Research question

Previously in this thesis, I proposed that Butler’s (1996; 1999) notion of the performative can be useful for researching how discourses of the Child are produced. Discourse ‘speaks us’, makes us, and our practices display how we become the subject through discourse. Thinking with~through the performative, my research question is:

How are discourses of ‘the Child’ performatively produced in an Early Childhood Education (ECE) context?

As explained before, the research design aimed to create a set of ‘data’ construction/generation tools which would enable me to explore the ‘performative production’ in an iterative and contextually sensitive way. Gallacher and Gallagher (2008) suggest designing (participatory) research as ongoing inquiry, by engaging participants (children and adults) in a ‘process without predetermination (...) in the present continuous tense’ (p. 510). Although this idea could not be fully developed given the limitations of a doctoral study, it resonated with the attempt of weaving a performative methodology: an approach that acknowledged its epistemological and ontological baggage and effects impacting on subjects involved in the process.

In this sense, the concept of ‘data’ will be used, but it will also take into account its fictionalised root, as it is produced as a narrative (Pitt and Britzman, 2003). Moreover, ‘data’ is not seen as being ‘collected’, but as local and as constructed in encounters with others (Youdell, 2000). I developed different strategies to open up a methodological threshold in which my methods and modes of thinking and (re)presenting inquiry could be unsettled. By weaving rebelliously theory and practice (Kirkwood, 1985), I hope to resist the fabrication of foreclosed narratives about (doing) research in childhood studies. For example, all analysis chapters link drawings, fieldnotes, and transcriptions from audio recordings. Chapter Eight presents a registry of a learning activity, cut into four parts in order to interweave analysis, and it concludes with braiding all parts together into one.
In the following sections, the chosen methods for ‘data’ construction are explained, and I illustrate how these were appropriated and transformed throughout the research process.

III Braiding Research Methods: Borderland Mestizaje Feminism

Pinar (2001) used the metaphor of bricolage to think about research that blurs the interdisciplinary limits of (traditional) research, calling this ‘boundary work’. For him, this approach rejects the colonising effects of hegemonic knowledge if other knowledges and fields can be re-assembled. His reconceptualist work echoes with Chicana feminist epistemologies that permeate my thinking and writing in this thesis.

The decision to entangle two approaches with different epistemological foundations – ethnography, specifically participant observation, and a reflective diary informed by anautoethnography~Auto-historia-teoría approach - was influenced by ‘Borderland-mestizajefeminism’ (BMF, Saavedra and Nymark, 2008). Understood as an ‘extension of knowing and being’ (Saavedra and Nymark, 2008, p. 78), it acknowledges how inquiry is embodied and performed. As a tool, BMF opens a site to embrace feminist poststructural theories and to articulate and challenge these by appropriating and reconstructing them towards more inclusive and transformative approaches.

Inspired by Foucault’s notion of ‘toolbox’ (Foucault, 1974, in Fenech and Sumsion, 2007), methods were not applied as doctrines, but were re-assembled. I extended Pinar’s metaphor of bricolage, by drawing on a braiding/trenzar (Calderón et al., 2012) methodology, because it emphasised movement, entanglement and continuous reshaping.

The (re-appropriated) methodology was an attempt to acknowledge the hybridity of knowledge production and the discursive positions of the subjects involved. Methodological mutations aimed to subvert research practices that invisibilised the ‘nos/otras’ (Us/Them, Keating, 2006) in inquiry. In other words, I wanted to consider how ‘we’re in each other’s world, how we’re each affected by the other, and how we’re all dependent on the other’ (Saavedra and Nymark, 2008, p. 268).

This methodology braided two approaches to ‘become more cautious about the ways qualitative research can reinscribe Western imperialistic ventures’ (Saavedra and Salazar Pérez, 2014, p. 78), and to help reshape how research is done in the ECE field.
III.I Ethnography revisited

Ethnographically informed approaches, broadly understood as the participation in people’s daily lives for an extended period in order to develop understanding (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995), have been popular within studies about/of children’s lives. These provide rich accounts of children’s lives, their ‘real’ interactions and understandings in an everyday context (Bitou and Waller, 2011; Christensen, 2004; Corsaro and Molinari, 2000; Holt, 2004; Löfdahl and Hägglund, 2007).

However, Denzin reminds us that ‘[e]thnography is not an innocent practice. Our research practices are performative, pedagogical and political. Through our writing and our talk we enact the worlds we study’ (2009, p. 209). Coming from an interpretivist stance, ethnography has traditionally aimed at achieving understanding about a specific setting (Creswell, 2007). It is centred on the researcher as the tool for collecting, analysing and interpreting ‘data’ which is ‘out there’ in the setting (Britzman, 1995; 2003). Yet, the modernist assumptions of ethnography as ‘narrating the “real” through the words of the researcher’ (Tsolidis, 2008, p. 271) are challenged under a postmodern and poststructuralist stance, and offer the possibility for re-creating it (Tamboukou and Ball, 2003). Chicana~latina feminism influenced my efforts in re-claiming this approach to avoid re-inscribing western imperialistic power/knowledge (Villenas, 1996).

Latin-american authors (Quijano, 2014) discuss the colonial tensions of applying ethnographic methods, and the modernist epistemological foundations underpinning this approach. ‘Othering’ is at the core of the ethnographic endeavour, especially because it is part of a Eurocentric scientific approach. In this sense, I wanted to take stock of this challenge and offer a critical approach:

Instead of reproducing modern/colonial classifications in social sciences, it is about acknowledging the heterogeneous and historically diverse differentiation processes of humanity, and the hierarchies that are implicit because of the power and knowledge asymmetries in all spheres of social existence, to expose these processes as an exception — to exotify them! This would be the project for an intercultural and transdisciplinary anthropology of Modernity/Coloniality that anthropologises the same paradigmatic anthropological question, and that studies why, how, with what results and with which different power (dis)arrangements can the human alterity be (re)produced’ (Garbe, 2012, p. 126, personal translation).
Participating, observing and taking fieldnotes

An important aspect was identifying my researcher status among children and practitioners. The design considered developing an atypical adult role (Corsaro, 2011). I assumed that it would provide the necessary flexibility to observe and participate in classroom activities without creating any distractions or problems in the classroom dynamic. But tensions arose when participant observation, which was the main strategy for immersing and understanding the setting, positioned practitioners as opposed to my atypical adult role. I discuss this issue in depth in the final chapter of the thesis.

Although ethnography aims to reflect local cultures and contexts, it also reaffirms a condition of exclusion, while basing its knowledge on traditions of the disciplines of imperialist knowledge (MacNaughton, 2005). For example, to position children as a different culture that needs to be observed to be understood, (re)created child subjects as a tribal group. Additionally, and because the ethnographer-researcher is assumed as the main technology for collecting, analysing and writing ‘data’, information from the setting is reduced to ‘raw material’ and knowledge becomes such only through the researcher’s gaze.

To resist the perpetuation of these forms of knowledge production, different strategies were adopted. For instance, to avoid writing in a linear sequence (e.g. people speaking in an ordered manner, one after the other) and to capture overlaps and abrupt endings, interactions and statements were written in an episodic manner. Fieldnotes were mostly written in Spanish, and were promptly transcribed. These were only translated to English for analysis purposes.

Krog (2010) warns about the power of the academic community to acknowledge (or not) something as valuable knowledge, and that whatever is written must be thought for that community. This idea also echoes with Bernal and Villalpando (2002) discussion on the production of ‘apartheid knowledge’ in higher education. They use this concept to refer to perpetuating Eurocentric epistemologies as the source for ‘legitimate knowledge’ creation, and simultaneous marginalisation of coloured knowledges in academia. This is a useful idea for developing any critical inquiry process that aspires to refute the imperialist baggage that approaches like ethnographic observation-participation bring.

Having these ideas in mind, concerns arose about making my writing available to participants during the process of ‘data’ construction. Observations were readable for (literate) adults, but were not necessarily accessible to young children. One of the ways children and myself attempted to bridge this distance was through drawings. Children could record whatever they considered relevant (stories, portraits, among others) through drawings; and they could also
read my drawings (of body movements, space distribution, and facial expressions of themselves, their peers and aunties).

Interestingly, the ethnographic drawings initially had an instrumental aim, based on an ethnographic thirst of ‘capturing’ whatever was ‘out there’ (Britzman, 1995). They recorded how bodies were used and performed different roles in the classroom.

Children also used the notebook to depict whatever they wanted, seeming to enjoy the power an ink pen and ‘book’ provided to them and their drawings. However, the further my researcher subjectivity became evident (to me and others), the more the drawings – children’s and mine—started illustrating other things: how bodies were shaped and shifted in the space of the classroom, movement, important people and stories, joy and complicit entanglement.

![Figure 14: DRAWINGS AND FIELDNOTES (15/11/2013)](image)
I hoped that these drawings would represent a shared understanding of what the study was about and what was considered relevant. Similarly, Gallacher and Gallagher (2008) explain how children appropriated their notepads through writing, staining, painting, and tearing pages out. I concur with their analyses that children’s notebook appropriation also extended to their methods, as that the ‘data’ resulting from these encounters was of shared authorship. The following drawing also illustrates that point.
Because all participants (children and adults) had open access to the notebook, children demanded re-reading my writing and drawings, suggesting additions (e.g. writing extra information, or drawing eyes) and editions. Practitioners were also invited to draw in the notebook, but they did not express interest in doing so. Although they were aware that they had access to it, they preferred observing my drawings (not children’s, as some of them did not authorise other people seeing their drawings), possibly because their continuous effort to respond to professional requirements reduced significantly their time to add to the notebook.

Nevertheless, practitioners sometimes told me to add information (‘Write that they’re a little nosy!’ – Aunty Lily, Fieldnotes Extract, 15/05/2013) and were excited when notebooks were changed because they were ‘full’ of information everybody had contributed (‘Wow! We’re awesome!’ – Aunty Celeste, Fieldnotes extract, 22/05/2013). Therefore, became a ‘multiliteracy’ approach (Knight and Rayner, 2015, p. 95) that rejected a literal, romantic-and/or mystified reading of children’s~child-like drawings.
Children’s inputs in writing and drawing were asserted as ‘research artefacts’ (Knight and Rayner, 2015, p. 95), but also as creations that opened up different readings - of the artefact, its meaning and its creator.

(Collaborative) drawings, and the open access of these, created shifts in the relational power amongst drawers and researcher-drawer: both actively shaped and produced meaning in a drawing that did not need to have one interpretation (and there was not one discourse to ascribe to). During this production, subjectivities possibly shifted and folded into each other, potentially exploring the hybridity of their creations and selves.

Under this possible reading, Conejo (Figure 17) may have used the notebook to re-write himself. His page drew upon familiar aesthetics of a school notebook. Then, and following the traditional left-to-right, and top-to-bottom literacy skills, he proceeded to write. During the school day, Conejo communicated mostly through gestures, but when I asked him if he could tell me what his writing was about, he replied with a clear ‘No’. His decision to leave his words and writings open~closed to interpretation may also illustrate how power relations between researcher-researched shifted and how the knowledgeable and all-knowing adult researcher was subverted.

Conejo’s drawing ‘silence[s], blocks and produces analysis’ (MacLure et al., 2010, p. 493) about the illusion of authenticity that written observations bring along. Conejo’s narrative resists my interpretation and analysis (Koro-Ljungberg, 2012), and may expose how his writing does not represent an ‘authentic voice’ for the author to ‘capture’. His drawing may have actively rejected the epistemological and ontological baggage ethnography brings.

Most of the children wanted to see and manipulate the notebook. It could not always be lent to them because notes were being taken or because it distracted everybody, and affected the development of practitioners’ activities. Some children decided to bring their own notebooks to the nursery; others negotiated their notebook use with me and peers (‘Can I have it in the
break?’ adapted from Fieldnotes, 23/04/2013). In another occasion, someone attempted to take it by force and other children recovered it, making sure that the notebook was left open on the page the author was writing on (adapted from Fieldnotes, 25/04/2013). Importantly, it repositioned children in power relations in which they controlled the threshold of meaning.

Practitioners did not have personal notebooks, but I regularly left the notebook within their reach, and invited them to read through it if they liked. However, they never did. On some occasions (especially during the initial integration phase) they checked with me what I had written down and in what language, and looked at the drawings. They never suggested changes or asked me to delete text. Practitioners’ engagement with my notebooks may have been limited for several reasons. First, during a regular school day, they hardly had time to sit down, and even less to read. Second, the notebook may have been understood as a ‘territory’ they could not enter: I did not engage with their planning or administrative documentation, and they did not engage in my fieldnotes. Third, practitioners may have not wanted to know what was in the notebook, either for fear that I was examining them negatively; and/or for fear that the fieldnotes’ descriptions would mirror back to them their practices and selves. I discuss these issues further in the last chapter of the thesis.

Audio

After the adaptation month, audio recording was gradually incorporated. The intention behind this decision was to complement note taking and/or photographs. First, songs, routines and signals were recorded. After everybody was used to the device, learning activities (variable and regular) were also recorded. Most recordings were transcribed and were only translated to English for analysis purposes.

Figure 18: ‘FREE PLAY’ IN THE CLASSROOM (21/11/2013)
NOTE AT THE FAR LEFT, THE AUDIORECORDER IS PLACED ON MY LEG.
During the final week of the exploratory stage and initial formal ‘data’ construction stage, play instances (in which I also took part) were recorded. This enabled me to participate with less concerns for excluding myself for writing purposes. At this point I started carrying the audio recorder around my neck, as I needed my body free to play and because we moved through different spaces. This sometimes affected the quality of the recording, but it enabled everyone to play more freely and fluidly.

Photographs

Between April and May, most children requested that pictures of their artefacts should be taken, e.g. clay moulding, drawings, toys.

After getting children’s and adult’s consent, the camera was used in two modalities:

a) Single pictures:
These photos of the space (classroom, playground) were taken by myself and children. Some children used the camera freely to take pictures in the playground, during recess, and of peers and practitioners. Photos were taken until the end of the study, and participants could (and did) erase photos directly on the camera, if they wished to do so.
b) Sequenced pictures (programmed):
The following images illustrate how sequenced photos were initially taken of routine activities like greeting and play. The camera was programmed (1 photo every 30 seconds) and set on a tripod in a corner of the classroom, with the aunties’ permission and considering their suggestions. Later in the study, sequences of play instances in which the author was participating in were also attempted. During play this was a hindrance (e.g. no stability on the sandy surface and constantly falling), consequently its use was eliminated.

![Figure 22: SEQUENCE OF MORNING GREETING ROUTINE (10/07/2013)](image)

SINGING MORNING GREETING, IDENTIFYING WEATHER (COLD WINTER), DANCING TO THE WEEKDAYS, GOING TO BATHROOM FOR HYGIENE HABITS AND MATE CHECKING IF THE CAMERA WAS STILL TAKING PHOTOS.

As with note-taking and drawings, children were explicit in delimiting the use of the camera, manifesting both orally and physically if they did not consent. In the previous sequence, Mate was extremely concerned that the camera would be positioned in a way that could capture the whole classroom, and would not turn off. The following sequence could be interpreted as how Mariposa, aware of her hybrid position as an observed subject and participant, decided to limit the inquiry’s gaze with her hand.
Similarly, practitioners also resisted on some occasions (Figure 24). I am fascinated by how participants assumed discursive positions which went beyond the researcher-researched binary. They regulated how invasive a photographic device could be in their everyday lives and interactions.

Practitioners took regular pictures with their phones and the nursery’s camera for pedagogical and accountability purposes, which may explain why they did not take pictures with the research camera. I was not authorised to see or access pictures taken for these purposes, as my role in the classroom was not a pedagogical one. Regulations of the nursery forbid any outsiders (non-staff) to access the photos taken in the nursery. These regulations were developed to protect children’s and practitioner’s wellbeing, as they considered that these could be used against them (e.g. accusations).

This is why unfortunately their pedagogical perspectives were not included in the ‘data’ construction process, because the ‘data’ they generated, were private and for their own purposes. I did try to facilitate the camera, so they could photograph situations or interactions that they considered relevant for the study, just like some children did. Unfortunately, they did not take pictures. Aunty Celeste explained that she was concerned that it could become ‘a distraction from the work she needed to do’ (informal conversation, fieldnotes), Aunty Bedford took some pictures of the nursery when it was empty, ‘because it looks tidier’ (informal conversation, fieldnotes); and Aunty Lily did not want to take the camera, because she had to leave the classroom frequently for other administrative tasks.
These examples led me to reflect that another overlapping reason practitioners possibly did not engage with this aspect of the ‘data’ construction process, is that they were concerned that they could not give me what they thought I would want to research.

The different strategies (e.g. leaving, turning the camera off, pushing the device away) children and practitioners drew upon, also pushed me to ask myself how this inquiry and in particular, my role within it – observer, writer, participant - lead me to embody a coloniser/colonised positionality (Villenas, 1996). The history that this approach carried and produced every day through my practices was difficult to shake off. It required that I confronted humanist traditions of binary thinking and (knowledge) production of subjects with other research approaches. In the final reflective chapter I consider the ramifications of my privileged position in relation to the practitioner’s wellbeing.

Curricular Texts

The collection of documents was also part of the ethnographic approach of this study. I drew on MacNaughton’s (2005) use of the concept of ‘curriculum texts’, which vary from resources (books, decorations, routines) to documents which are used in planning. Curriculum texts are heavy in meanings and configure the classroom reality in a particular manner. Access to curricular documentation was limited, due to accountability practices. However, the headteacher facilitated the PEI and Aunty Lily shared the ACP, which included the daily timetable and specifications for regular activities. Although practitioners planned every day at least four learning experiences, they had to display and promptly file these as evidence for audit purposes. Consequently, access to these curricular texts was significantly limited. Only extracts were translated to English for analysis purposes.
Participant observation in play

Several authors argue that children’s role-play and/or socio-dramatic play offers insights into their perspectives (Bitou and Waller, 2011; Löfdahl and Hägglund, 2007) and also reflect cultural and structural topics (Corsaro, 2011). Within ECE contexts, children’s play is a site where ‘power relationships and actions flow’ (Ailwood, 2011, p. 20). Similarly, Jones et al. (2010, p. 291) emphasise that ‘children’s representative gestures (...) are carried by and through different forms, manifestations and expressions of their playfulness’ and have to be politicised.

In ECE, children’s play is an institutionalised and politicised activity. Rogers and Evans’s (2006) findings show that children made sense of how power operated in/within their classroom in role play, and Blaise (2005b) adds that play ‘constitutes real, here-and-now social worlds for children’ (p. 37). Blaise’s (2005b) findings show that gendered discourses and its structures reveal themselves throughout the process of play. Similarly, Taylor and Richardson (2005) indicate that through play, children took gendered meanings ‘from the adult world’ and also gave new meanings (queered) to that world. Hence, play is a setting where discourses that constitute us and our structures are (re)done.

As I mentioned in the introduction of the thesis, my initial approach to researching children’s subjectivity was considering their play as a research space and method. My intention was to harvest play’s potential to expose discourses that could contribute to answering my research question. However, upon discussion with the examiners of the thesis regarding this issue, I am now aware that considering play as a research method could have presented an epistemological tension, in terms of claiming children’s play (and the discourses and knowledges flowing within it) for my research purposes, while attempting to produce a participatory approach to research with children. Furthermore, it is up for debate whether I actually was able to develop play as a research method during fieldwork in the nursery. In this sense, while rewriting this thesis, I have come to reflect that it is appropriate to argue that I was invited to take part in children’s play.

Furthermore, the previous arguments show that taking play seriously as an object of study is important, but given the tensions with colonising imposing/othering aspects of non-participatory observation, there is a problem with just treating play as a thing to be observed. Debates around the appropriate boundaries of participation in childhood studies are multiple (Christensen and James, 2008). Corsaro (2011) argues that children’s cultures are part of the adult cultures in which they live. Based on this argument, Randall (2012) suggests that adults can research children’s cultures that are closely related to their own. The author adds that a
postcolonial critique approach is necessary to challenge adult-centred assumptions that adult cultures are superior. Consequently, I sought to develop a researcher status that valued children’s spaces and knowledges which emerge in play.

The design of this study considered my involvement in children’s play as a participant observer, an adult that cannot deny her status but can attempt to reduce power differences with participants. I initially followed Corsaro’s approach (2011) of minimising the adult role, and entering children’s play (in the playground or free play) areas, sitting down and ‘let[ting] the children react to’ (p.243) me. This led me to suspend my adult-like traits (e.g. power to intervene in conflicts among each other), and positioned my participant observer status as another child participating-playing. These actions gradually shifted towards Mandell’s (1988) ‘least adult role’. She argues that it can minimise physical differences to a point that it has no consequences on the interactions between children and adults.

According to Mandell (1988), I assumed an active observational role which could also be assumed by an older/younger playmate. The designed informed consents for children did not presume adult superiority. Rather, the approach deliberately sought to assume child participants as social members, as it ‘allows us to reveal how much children know in order to act like children’ (Mandell, 1988, p. 436). In addition, my observation and participation in play was based on seeing and acting on children’s social objects as they did. Throughout the study, I sought to coordinate my actions to share a joint meaning that made joint action (collaborative play) possible. Nevertheless, close involvement was only developed with children and not with adults.

Within play, speech, actions and practices are intertwined and embodied; and knowledge about the discourses that are played with, is produced. In this sense, we bring into play what we know and believe about ourselves and lives; and because as players we try to make the ideal come true, overlaps and contradictions happen. In play, I was confronted with others’ worldviews and understandings and I had to actively engage with these. We challenged each other’s performances and reminded-regulated our co-players how roles and narratives were supposed to be played out. These conflicts showed which dominant discourses were drawn upon to play.

Nind’s (2011) discussion on participatory ‘data’ analysis with child participants is particularly relevant on this topic. She reminds us that the key aspect of participatory approaches relies on the relationships participants and researchers establish, and how much effort is put into learning and becoming involved in the process. Taking risks and ‘being prepared to trust’ (Nind, 2011, p. 360) is central for dialogue and knowledge production to happen. In the case of
this study, to really understand the lifeworld of young children, whose oral language cannot be the only source to access their understandings, I needed to be in it. Saavedra and Nymark (2008) explain that one way of refuting western imperialist and humanist modes of theorising and living, involves researchers ‘engaging personally with their research by inviting emotional and personal experience as well as resisting the disembodied nature of research’ (Saavedra and Nymark, 2008, p. 264).

Mandell’s (1988), proposes three basic principles to engage with children in research: minimising social differences between adults and children, valuing children’s social worlds as important as adults’, and trying to find shared meaning with children. These principles have been featured to different degrees in other Childhood Studies, but, as Randall (2012) suggests, it displays an approach to research with children and constructing understanding. The author also explains that by joining in play, adults demonstrate the kind of adult that they are, which helps to minimise differences between adults and children, and shows how children’s abilities are valued.

Other authors have explored how to resolve power differences between the adult researcher and the child participant. For example, some have attempted adopting a ‘least-adult role’ (Mandell, 1988), or a ‘strange’ adult role (Corsaro, 2011). However, scholars like Christensen (2004) critique these approaches arguing that adults are no longer children, and children notice this difference, given that not reinforcing an adult status is insufficient.

However, Warming (2011) suggests that ‘bodily experience gained through performance of the least adult role opens up access to children’s perspectives.’ (p. 45), meaning that some experiences cannot be shared or understood, unless the researcher actively takes part in children’s activities (such as play) in a ‘least adult’ status. By performing a participant role in similar ways that children act, the researcher can access a corporeal understanding, which offers access to ‘less verbal children’s perspectives’ (p. 50).

This discussion about researching children’s lifeworlds through participating in play instances as an adult raises important ethical issues about the limits and responsibility we have with individuals who share part of their lives with us. I will return to reflect on these issues in the final chapter of the thesis, but now I describe how I participated in play during the study.
‘So what does Ximena do with you in the classroom?’ – ‘She plays’

I observed and participated in two types of play spaces: informal and formal play.

A) ‘Informal’ play spaces:

These instances were created by children within the classroom in moments of free play or during recess in the playground. I was invited by players and followed whatever narrative they proposed. My co-players assigned to me a role (‘you have to do/be...’). I followed the pace and shaped my-self according to how play progressed.

I made suggestions like using different materials, moving around, and inviting others; but these were not always considered. This could be related to two simultaneous overlapping discursive positions: the female adult (potential Aunty) and the weaker~vulnerable character (child daughter). As a female-adult in an ECE context, my participation as a ‘non-Aunty’ in free play was something new to everybody. Consequently, although I was granted access, my range of action and power of persuasion was regulated by my co-players. Assumptions about my intentions to participate (of pedagogical or regulatory nature) may have affected the roles I was assigned (child daughter, pet, weaker~vulnerable character), to limit my range of action and influence upon their decisions.

---

33 Azul’s mother recalling a conversation with her daughter when she asked her to explain my research to her, Parent’s Meeting, (December 2013)
B) ‘Formal play spaces’:

These were created by practitioners who designed pedagogical activities framed under curricular aims. Practitioners prepared each space (e.g. corner play, imaginary play), facilitated toys and props, and directed play narratives. They also were gatekeepers and always allowed me to participate within these spaces. Children’s authorisation to join was sought in each opportunity.

I followed every adult instruction that was given to children. However, I had a different positioning in comparison to child co-players. My relationship with practitioners was based on shared identity categories based on adult status, gender, and profession. I avoided disrupting their directed play and performed the ‘ideal’ student-player, by following each instruction. My ideas were welcomed and I was ‘free’ to enter-leave play whenever I liked, but sometimes this meant reproducing discourses of disciplined behaviour.

![Figure 28: SEQUENCE OF AUNTY CELESTE DIRECTING IMAGINARY ADVENTURE PLAY IN THE ‘CLIFFS’ (24/07/2013)](image)

![Figure 29: CONTINUATION OF SEQUENCE, TRAVELLING UNDER ‘TUNNELS’ (24/07/2013).](image)

Similar to ‘free play’, any evidence of these play instances (narratives, dialogues, roles, resources) were gathered, contrasted and complemented with curricular documentation (if available).

**Recording play successfully**

Different attempts were made to identify the best conditions for recording play. Feedback from staff and children was requested. On the one hand, practitioners did not have any
suggestions for either. They stated on repeated occasions that they did not mind recordings, and expressed confidence in my decisions (e.g. ‘Don’t worry, we don’t need to review it [images]. I trust your judgement’, Aunty Celeste; ‘Use the photos as you like, they’re for your thesis’, Aunty Lily). On the other, children were concerned about transparency and talked about the researcher-researched relationship we had established, emphasising that I was accountable to them:

‘I want to see the photos you take’
– Princesa

‘I want to see them [photos] on the TV’ – Mickey

‘I want to see the photos’ – Michael Jackson

(Statements on Second Ethical Consent forms for Researching in play spaces, July 2013)

The previous example illustrates how children delimited access and use of their play spaces. In some cases, children authorised my participation but not recording with visual devices. In other cases, I was allowed to participate but could not record play in any way (e.g. ‘Yes in the classroom, no in the playground’, Wanderino). In the final chapter I reflect on issues involved in participating in play.

III.II      Reflective Diary informed by an Autoethnography~Auto-historia-teoría approach

My interactions with children and practitioners were intersected by my experiences as a former child-female adult-educator-researcher. Consequently, my practices were not always informed by the same discursive frames that informed children’s and adult’s practices of the classroom, e.g. my practices were different to practitioners’ or parents’, as I was attempting to distance myself of those familiar framings and positioning myself as a researcher. Likewise, my stories unexpectedly entangled when I developed participative observation in some children’s play instances. The affect and confusion that emerged in these situations made me more sensitive and aware of my condition of hybridity, shifting between spaces and times.
My reflective diary produced evidence and also impacted on the development of the study. It started as writing continuously about my experiences in the setting and reflecting about my research practices, and initially had two purposes: First, to use my personal experiences to make the unfamiliar context of a Chilean ECE classroom understandable to outsiders (Holman Jones and Adams, 2010). As a researcher, I was not independent of the setting (Roth, 2005b) and I put my own subjectivity(ies) to play through speech and actions with others. This writing enabled me to revisit and examine what patterns were made available through my actions (Roth, 2005b). Consequently, the reflective diary became informed by an autoethnographic approach.

Autoethnography enables unveiling ‘god-tricks’, while exploring uncertainties and triggering conceptual and political opportunities and negotiations (Rose, 1997): I actually did not know what was going to happen, and I had the chance to challenge myself about mixed feelings of everyday interactions, and sometimes went back to participants to understand and discuss their understandings.

Second, and subsequently, this account also developed a ‘vigilant critique’ (Fendler, 2003, p. 23) of (research) practices. I started writing reflective comments on the side and within the same fieldnotes, querying what my writing intentions were, why I chose to present one situation over other, and what discourses these ideas might be serving (Kelly, 1997, in Rodriguez, 2005). Ellis, Adam and Bochner’s (2011) understanding of ethnography informed this study, because it aims to understand cultural experience, by describing and analysing personal experience, and makes a cultural identity’s traits available for insiders and outsiders. According to the authors, autoethnography responded to researcher’s interest in distancing themselves from ‘neutral’, abusive and colonial practices that reproduced hegemonies of race, class, gender, sexuality, education, among others. Retrospective writing is selected and analysed with theory and other research literature. The written result is a thick description of personal and interpersonal experience, with aesthetic and evocative characteristics. Hence, it ‘combines characteristics of autobiography and ethnography’ (Ellis, Adam and Bochner, 2011).

Taking into consideration other types of ‘transgressive data’ (St. Pierre, 1997) challenged assumptions about what was ‘valid’ knowledge and ‘data’ for the study (Roth, 2005b). It is important to emphasise that the purpose of this ‘data’ is not to tell ‘my story’ in general. Aspects only acquire relevance in the context of the researched classroom and my understanding of the research question. As such, I become part of the story of what is happening in the classroom.
Anzaldúa’s auto-historia-teorías, ‘a personal essay that theorizes’ (2013, p. 578) also inspired my reflective writing, and enabled me to revisit it analytically. This methodological aspect led me to acknowledge how I embodied theories - ‘theory in the flesh’ (Moraga and Anzaldúa, 1981, p. 23).

The Audio-Diary

After leaving the nursery and while I walked down the hill towards the city centre, accompanied by stray dogs and passers-by - my first impressions, questions and feelings were recorded (mostly in Spanish) in an audio-diary. By just keeping one exclusive and fixed record of the school day and inquiry process (fieldnotes), my thinking was limited (Roth, 2005c). However, revisiting the study and entangling it with other experiences transformed possibilities of one closed reading into multiple and overlapping. Throughout the inquiry process, the reflective diary opened spaces for examining how I created (research about) ‘the Child’, and how my personal (childhood) stories and experiences were also entangled.

The exercise of retelling a school day, its highlights, the dialogues and interactions, opened possibilities of re-visiting my practices and available discursive position(s) in the classroom and wider context. The reflective diary, informed by an autoethnographic approach, provided a space for productively questioning discourses that produced me, recognising how ‘change happens in mundane conversations’ (Holman Jones and Adams, 2010, p. 150). In the analysis process, some of these questions were linked to fieldnotes, used retrospectively remembering my experience(s) and to add relevant details.

IV Ethics

The BERA ethical guidelines (2011) seem in agreement with the values I pursued throughout the study. Active and passive participants and their accounts were treated with respect and privacy. Importantly, before implementing the study in Chile, the proposal, documents,
activities and other material (e.g. consents) went through and was approved by the IOE ethical committee.

IV.I Privacy and Confidentiality, Disclosure of Information

Confidentiality was guaranteed through changes of names, places and institutions (Alderson and Morrow, 2004). Active participants (children and adults) chose their pseudonyms (Harcourt and Conroy, 2011) and name of the classroom. Likewise, none of their opinions or identifiable practices was passed on (parents, other teachers, headteacher, municipal authorities). Besides me and my supervisor, no other person had access to non-anonymised ‘data’. This was clearly informed to all participants, families and municipality.

IV.II Consent and Assent, Informing Purpose of Study

Adults

How to explain the study in a way that everybody makes a voluntary and informed decision (BERA, 2011) is an important challenge. Practitioners were informed about the study and its aims before the semester started through a short meeting, an information letter and a consent letter\(^{14}\). Parents and family were informed in a parent meeting and also through an information letter. Letters stated relevant information for deciding if they wanted to opt in/out, and that they had the right to withdraw in any given case\(^{15}\).

I explained that I wanted to know how we know who a child is, and how we keep reminding each other to which social group we belong in order to behave accordingly. I was very clear about what I was not going to do (evaluate practitioners or children, teach and take care of children) and what I planned to do (participate three days a week at the nursery, work with children and practitioners to adapt the study, play as a research method). Concerns about privacy and photographs were raised, which were taken into consideration and integrated into the forms of whoever requested it (e.g. one mother allowed her son to be in pictures, but did not authorise these to be used in the thesis). After I sought authorisation of all the families I started exploring the different ‘data’ construction methods. Also, every time I had informal conversations with families, I requested their oral consent to record and use their ideas and comments.

\(^{14}\) See Appendix 7 and 8.

\(^{15}\) See Appendix 5.
Benefits for the institution, children and families were defined throughout the study. Staff and families initially requested play material (e.g. hula-hoops, balls), and I also offered in exchange pedagogical support to staff and headteacher if they were interested. By the end of the study (December 2013), the headteacher requested staff training about the CFECE and its application in everyday planning, specifically for assistants who had not been trained in this area. I made sure that this was implemented after the fieldwork period had been closed, so they would not feel uncomfortable or committed to behave in a particular manner, and I avoided positioning myself as a provider or expert.

By the end of the exploratory phase (July 2013), as well as by the end of the study (December 2013) I met with the four practitioners in order to share preliminary findings. They reviewed my drawings – of the classroom and where they were depicted – showed special interest in these and the photographs, acknowledging the tensions I observed. They did not raise any issues, but rather insisted that they wanted to read the final ‘book’ (thesis) if it was written in Spanish. Relational ethics with practitioners is an important aspect of this study, especially because practitioner’s practices became more relevant throughout the study, unexpectedly contributing to the findings. In this sense, researcher privilege will be discussed in the final reflective chapter.

**Children**

Following the BERA guidelines (2011), children’s voluntary informed consent was sought. However, the children that participated in this study were aged three to four years and proposed an important challenge, as I wanted to make sure that they were making an informed decision about participating (or not) and to what degree, in the study.

Two consent forms (see appendix 9 and 10) were created to enable children to make explicit their opinions, and to limit my range of action within their space. Both forms included illustrations of each action/situation/method and ‘thumbs up’ or ‘thumbs down’. In the first form, children could mark thumbs up or down: how they wanted to participate and what I could/could not do in their presence. The second form enabled children to authorise (or not) the use of different recording devices (audio, photo, video).

---

16 Parts of this section were presented at the International Conference ‘A Child’s World – Next Steps’, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, Wales, UK (June 2014)
In order to explain the study and consent forms to children, I drew examples from different authors’ work (Gray and Winter, 2011; Harcourt, Perry and Waller, 2011; Mauthner, 1997). I created a series of activities in which I attempted to explain what the study was about.

Practitioners supported the activities by assigning a specific moment in the day to develop them. However, they were not present in most of these occasions, and I was forced to develop different strategies to assure a better presentation and children’s understanding.

The activities and consent forms included drawings based on descriptions of our everyday practices in the classroom. These drawings were created exclusively for these purposes and were commissioned to an artist.

**Activity 1: First Phase of Informed Consent (During Exploratory Stage, April-May)**

- **Step 0**
  - Inform and explain study to families through: group activity and conversation on an individual level.
  - Request opt-in/out and consent to parents.

- **Step 1**
  - Participate in classroom routine, no type of records.
  - Redesign Activity 1 material (presentation of study and forms) according to context.
  - Share Activity 1 material with staff, request feedback.
  - Adapt presentation and request support of staff to develop Activity 1.

- **Step 2**
  - Share presentation of the study in larger group (32 children).
  - Subdivide in smaller groups (approximately 15 children) and share last part of presentation.
  - Practice saying yes/no with thumbs.

- **Step 3**
  - Request consent of each child: first read each image together, child marks his/her choice using same strategy.
  - Request assent of each child after sharing Activity 1 to make sure that they are making an informed decisions about my presence and actions around them.
  - Emphasis on the fact that their commitment is not compulsory and withdrawal is possible at any time.
  - Permission to use and share their work is sought (Alderson and Morrow, 2011)

Harcourt and Conroy (2011) gradually discussed and explained their research proposal to children, focusing ‘on what research was and what a researcher might do’ (Harcourt and Conroy, 2011, p. 43). Drawing from these ideas, I explained that I needed children’s help to find more about how we know that someone is a child, because from an adult position I could not fully explore and understand it by myself. I also have been a child, but my experiences
differed to their lives now, therefore my knowledge was limited. My main concern was making my research intentions and my role in the classroom (not a teacher) as clear as possible, so that children could make an informed decision about opting in or out. If they opted out, I would not include their accounts within my work. All the children (32) gave their written consent to participating in the study.

Awareness of children’s reactions, e.g. reluctance or distress, was highly relevant (Alderson and Morrow, 2004; BERA, 2011). Respecting their intimacy, intentions and limits of participation was a tension I constantly faced and which led me to develop Activity 2.

Activity 2: Second Phase of Informed Consent (During Exploratory Stage, May-June)

During this second phase, I attempted to explain in further detail what the study was about. I considered this a relevant step to differentiate research from pedagogical practices. Developing a more in depth-knowledge about the study would also enable children to make an informed decision about participating (or not) throughout the study. Children decided if I could use or not their accounts in my writing, if I participated with them in certain spaces, among other things. Their commitment was not compulsory and withdrawal was possible at any time. In order to ensure that they felt free to state their agreement, assent was requested at every relevant activity. Permission to use and share their work was sought continuously.
However, after I developed several activities with different strategies, and worked separately in smaller groups, I considered the possibility that I was developing expectations about these activities that related more to a pedagogical understanding of them. I attempted to implement an activity within a pedagogical framing, but hoped not to make use of pedagogical and/or disciplinary strategies. These contradictions generated situations in which some children attended and tried to participate, and others did not. It resulted in a very challenging and frustrating activity for me. I could not achieve my expectations (which also contradicted with my experiences as a practitioner) and I was not sure if children understood and were making informed decisions. Nonetheless, this is something that cannot be guaranteed with adults either.

These concerns led me to request using the breastfeeding room/staff’s dining room. Its advantage was at the same time a disadvantage, this space was special and unknown to most of the children.
Activity 3: Third Phase of Informed Consent (June-July and refreshed in November)

There were important differences regarding what activities I was allowed to do in each child’s presence, in what spaces I could construct ‘data’, among other things. Also, children used the thumbs up/down system to make explicit their opinion in other instances and to share their assent. Children’s positive reception was made explicit at my return in November 2013 after my three-month absence, because they still remembered their meanings and use.

Most of the children authorised the use of almost all recording devices (they did not want to be video recorded). I attempted to take into consideration each child’s opinion throughout the ‘data’ construction process, in order to shape the study accordingly. This gradual approach
prevented me from interpreting children’s assent, and from perpetuating assumptions that young children could not understand research.

My notebook was a distinctive aspect for them - e.g. Azul explained to her mother that I wrote down what they learned at the nursery (Informal conversation with Mother, December 2013) - and every child drew at least once in it. Some children started bringing their own notebooks to write and draw things they considered important. Additionally, and because I insisted on the notion of collective ‘data’ construction, by the end of the study (December 2013) I left each participant (students and practitioners) a notebook with a thank you letter as a gift. In the letter, I encouraged participants to continue researching and thinking about what happens around us.

The following drawing is a self-portrait I created to add into the notebook, and it depicts how I defined myself as a researcher. I paid special attention to details: all my recording devices are visible, and my appearance, which involved my researcher ‘uniform’ (not an apron) and my tied-up hair. My position as a researcher was rather hybrid than clear cut defined by the previously enumerated characteristics.

In the following chapters I present Kai-Kai figures which represent the main body of analysis of my inquiry.
CHAPTER FIVE:
The Planned Curriculum in the Butterfly Classroom

The present chapter aims to introduce the reader to the everyday context of the Butterfly classroom, which involves taking a closer look at how a school day is structured in its timetable, and how learning activities are classified. It calls attention to the general structure of learning activities, by describing how the curriculum is represented in the classroom, through material resources (i.e. furniture), and how its use and arrangement may impact in the production of child and practitioner subjectivities. Additionally, it presents frequent strategies developed by practitioners to signal children relevant moments of the school day (e.g. mealtimes, initiation of learning activities). The content of this chapter is also intended to serve as a basis to understand the Kai-Kais that will be developed later in the thesis: the vulnerable child (habit acquisition), and the developing child (variable learning activities).

I Planning

Although CFECE is not compulsory, publicly subsidised nurseries adapt their curricula according to it because subsidy regulations demand evidence (in paper and practice) of how they translate and implement the curricular guidelines (JUNJI, 2007c). In the case of ‘Pichintún’ nursery, the following two extracts (left: nursery’s institutional project (PEI); right: CFECE) illustrate how the pedagogical principle of ‘activity’ framed pedagogical practices in the Butterfly classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The girl and boy have to effectively be protagonists of their learning through the processes of appropriation, construction and communication. This implies considering that children learn through acting, feeling and thinking; and therefore creating experiences for them in a context in which learning opportunities are offered according to their possibilities, and with the necessary pedagogical support that requires each situation and that the female educator will select and emphasise (CFECE, Mineduc, 2001, p. 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to teach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching is based on the general and specific aims and goals to be achieved throughout the year. These will be gradually achieved through children’s direct contact with resources, where the girl and the boy are true protagonists of their learning. Contents are taught through daily planning, in which relevant aspects like the position in which girls and boys will work, the materials that will be used, the moment in which the activity will be developed,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both extracts identify the learner as a (gendered) child who can become a ‘protagonist of their learning’. This concept is extremely popular within Chilean ECE terminology, and may reflect the impact of child-centred pedagogies. The child gradually learns through her actions: by experiences in which she can have direct contact (e.g. manipulate) with her environment and materials. The latter are selected, organised and graduated by a female educator, who knows her students’ range of possibilities and draws on this knowledge to plan and support her.

Interestingly, there are no references to practitioners’ activities that go beyond control and planning, which possibly displays the ‘the Child’ as the centre of pedagogy’s attention.

The final sentence in the nursery’s PEI established the relevance of planning and the implied step-by-step structure (initiation, development and ending) to be followed in order to achieve learning. These ideas were adapted within Chilean ECE curricular tradition (Peralta, 2007) and were also appropriated in the Butterfly classroom’s planning. The Butterfly classroom’s daily timetable differentiated between regular and variable activities. Regular activities (habits, everyday repeating rituals) set out a combination of pedagogic strategies, arrangement of space, and relationships. These created a basis upon which variable activities (planned daily) drew from, and overlapped with other discourses about learning.

I.1 How ‘habits’ became ‘regular activities’

‘Habit acquisition for satisfying basic [and social] needs’ has been part of the Chilean ECE curriculum since 1948 (Peralta, 1987, p. 92). Peralta’s (2007) work about Chilean ECE curricula established the academic foundations for classroom planning. Learning experiences were classified between ‘routine’ and ‘variable’ activities. Routine activities involved meeting basic needs (e.g. eating, hygiene, greeting (Peralta, 1987) and the ‘habit formation linked to these’ (Alarcón, Bonard and Simonstein, 1985, p. 13, personal translation). Variable activities aimed at acquiring contents or developing other skills.
The Chilean comprehensive curriculum (Alarcón, Bonard and Simonstein, 1985), influenced by developmental, cognitive and humanist psychology, and by attachment theories, placed emphasis on repetitive habit formation. The authors argue that creating stable environments with iterative rituals provide security to the Child. Contrary to a hierarchical understanding of power, it could be suggested that one reason practitioners may have appropriated this approach, was because it ‘scientifically’ validated their profession, similarly to what happened with Froebelian philosophy (Cannella, 1997). Taking into consideration practitioner’s current working conditions, this understanding enables them to structure the school day in an efficient manner to respond to social, educational and curricular requirements. For instance, according to regulations for subsidised nurseries (JUNJI, 2007c), ‘Pichintún’ nursery had to ensure that (vulnerable) children acquired self-care habits to display improvement of their wellbeing. Consequently, societal expectations of children’s health and the comprehensive curricula overlapped and reinforced each other.

The school day of the Butterfly classroom - ‘daily routine’ (timetable) - was structured around routine and variable activities. The 2013 ACP was aligned to the CFECE (MINEDUC, 2001a), and planned routines (‘habit formation’, ibid., p. 105) for ‘meeting children’s needs’. According to CFECE, the recurrence of ‘habit formation’ is linked to children’s developmental stage and the assumption of settling through regularity ‘in-depth learning’ (MINEDUC, 2001a, p. 93). Consequently, ‘regular activities’ were based on knowledge about a child subject who required repeating practices to acquire these as habits, and established a relationship between trainer (practitioner) and learner.

Interestingly, since the implementation of the CFECE (2001), ‘routine activities’ were renamed to ‘regular activities’ but maintained the same rationale as 50 years ago (Peralta, 1987). ‘Hygiene and mealtime habits’ (Butterfly classroom planning) were repeated as rituals drawing on iterative practices like singing and mimics. Although ‘hygiene’- and ‘mealtime habits’ activities resembled ritualistic practices, keeping the ‘habit’ noun to classify regular-routine activities suggest how practices acquired through repetition would ensure a fixed result (and way of thinking).

I.II Planning ‘Habits’

The following tables were extracted from the ‘daily routine’ of the Butterfly classroom and include all the time periods in which mealtime and hygiene habits were developed. Both in hygiene and mealtime habits, the ‘child’s activities’ were addressed to a male child (el niño),
written in a passive voice with impersonal verbs (particular to the Spanish language) in third
(omnipresent) person. By emphasising the relevance of observable behaviour as a synonym of
‘children’s learning’, the ‘paper child’ (MacLure et al., 2011) was created. The ‘paper child’ is
produced on the document level and it is framed within a normative trajectory that fixes
knowledge about the existing (present) child subject, and classifies her ‘for future economic
and political purposes’ (MacLure et al., 2011, p. 303).

The paper child of the Butterfly classroom was framed as a malleable and dependent subject
from external adult influences (activities of the adult). In relation to this receptive child, ‘the
adult’ (practitioner) was active through relational verbs - invite, remind, encourage, support,
mediate - written in 3rd person imperative. The neutral, ungendered grammar choice reflects
how practitioner’s profession and gender were also invisibilised and encompassed under the
umbrella identity category of ‘the adult’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habits</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE CHILD</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE ADULT</th>
<th>SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>09:30–09:45</td>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL FORMATION</td>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>- Rolling up his/her sleeves without help</td>
<td>- Invite to put the towel on and roll up sleeves</td>
<td>To adapt to hygiene habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:20–10:35</td>
<td></td>
<td>CO-EXISTENCE</td>
<td>- Pulling down his/her clothes</td>
<td>- Remind of the importance of washing hands after 'evacuation habits', before eating and every time they will need to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:20–12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wiping him/herself</td>
<td>- Remind of the importance of good teeth brushing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:00–13:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pulling up his/her clothes by him/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:30–14:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Washing hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:30–15:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brushing his/her teeth without help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Washing him/herself without playing with water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Helping his/her peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To favour that the Child subject learned how ‘to adapt to hygiene habits’ the planning detailed
subject’s practices. Specifically, ‘Activities of the Child’ emphasised repeating practices that
encouraged autonomy and self-sufficiency, such as (un)dressing, cleaning and washing,
without any help or mishandling resources. Rolling up sleeves and not playing with water
evidenced autonomy and helped preventing colds and other contagious diseases. Planning
displayed assumptions about the Child’s capacity for understanding and remembering, as the
practitioner had to ‘invite’ and ‘remind’ six times a day, every day, the importance of hygiene

---

17 The institution had limited resources, classrooms did not have heating. Additionally, older levels did not have extra change of clothing because given their age, they already controlled sphincters.
habits. Consequently, it seems that training and control was considered necessary for developing child subject’s adaptation in a protected environment.

This also applied to mealtime habits, its pedagogical goal aimed towards developing the Child subject’s autonomy. Placing emphasis on the Child ‘incorporat[ing]’ and ‘acknowledg[ing]’ mealtime practices may denote a gap of knowledge on this topic. Assumptions underpinning these aims could be twofold: either the Child’s habits were non-healthy; or she was not knowledgeable/capable of satisfying her own eating needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habits</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE CHILD</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE ADULT</th>
<th>SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mealtime</td>
<td>09:00-09:15 and 15:15-15:30</td>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL FORMATION</td>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>Singing song • Asking for blessing of food • Taking the cup by himself • Attempting to drink the milk without spilling it • Remaining seated throughout feeding.</td>
<td>Invite to sing and to bless the milk • Hand out the cups • Remind of the importance of milk for the growth of our body</td>
<td>To acknowledge positive consumption habits, whilst fostering healthy life styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mealtime</td>
<td>12:30-13:00</td>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL FORMATION</td>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>Sitting correctly • Eating the food by himself • Thanking • Eating with cutlery • Using napkin • Eating salad • Eating dessert</td>
<td>Invite the children to sing and thank for the food • Remind of the importance of eating the food • Support whomever presents difficulties • Encourage to consume the vegetables • Mediate to achieve the maximum consumption of food • Congratulate the children as they gradually finish</td>
<td>To incorporate practices related to satisfying feeding needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practitioner’s practices drew upon nutritional knowledge and its links with health and bodily growth, while ensuring that the Child ate her serving (state-standardised portion which includes vegetables and fruit). Because of their assumed vulnerable condition, child subjects could not dislike meals or be picky. In turn, practitioners were expected to ‘support’, ‘encourage’, and ‘mediate’ children’s eating, even if they disagreed with the curricula or served food.
Knowledge about healthy lifestyle manners, which included nutrition and the subject’s own responsibility of maintaining them, was articulated to techniques of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977), e.g. self-sufficient (clean) manners. Relations of surveillance were promoted by the curricula. Practitioners were expected to establish ‘normalising judgements’ about each child’s performance. In the case of hygiene habits, adults’ activities emphasised knowledge about hand and teeth washing. Handwashing became a globalised practice in multiagency policies in ECEC, and is fundamental for the prevention and control of contagious illnesses (Plyushteva, 2009).

Finally, it could be suggested that planning of regular activities present an overlap of global and local trajectories when performing habits as rituals. Rituals were methods for maintaining health and self-care knowledge, while also producing ‘docile bodies’ (Foucault, 1977) of children and practitioners. If we think of discourse speaking us, rather than us speaking the discourse, the planning of regular activities as rituals may introduce particular subjectivities of ‘the vulnerable child’ and ‘the protective Aunty’.

I. III Variable Learning Activities

The ‘curricular voices’ for variable learning activities had a different framing than the regular activities. It was reflected in the planning structure of individual variable learning activities.
In the first section, learning goals, extracted from the CFECE, were identified and specified. The second section (under the title of ‘Name of the Activity’) presented the educator’s (in this case Aunty Lily’s and Violeta’s) translation of the CFECE into a planned learning activity to be implemented. The different elements of the planning structure were already established within the nursery’s PEI.

The titles of ‘Pedagogical Activity’ and ‘Pedagogical Mediation’ are important to highlight, as these framed the practices that children and practitioners respectively had to develop. Individual actions were labelled differently to the planning of regular learning activities (‘habits’). In both cases, the term ‘pedagogical’ was included. Children’s actions/activities remained but were now linked to a ‘pedagogical’ intention. However, aunties’ actions were labelled as mediation, which implied a different way of teaching and relating to their students and created tensions between action as support, and behaviourist re-action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision of the Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher shifts towards a role in which learning is mediated, he accompanies children in their internally developed process. The female educator grants the infant her leadership, who takes over a fundamental role in his own process of growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accompanying the active process of students, transforms the educational practice according to the creation of diverse cognitive strategies that may awaken new motivations and curiosity for learning.

(Vision of the Educator, PEI 2013)

This was also explained in PEI, which set out the ‘Vision of the Educator’. In this definition, key progressivist concepts were emphasised: children’s internal cognitive development, as protagonists of their learning and the teacher in a facilitator role.

Interestingly, the second paragraph presented a shift: the practitioner acknowledged children’s protagonist role, so they could take over their own growth, development and therefore also learning. This process was facilitated through strategies that ‘awakened’ qualities.

Two things need to be highlighted:

a) Changing the label for practitioner, from educator to teacher, sheds light on how knowledge and the responsibility for knowledge acquisition now gradually relied on the individual subject who was maturing and required more autonomy to achieve it. The teacher is expected to facilitate/accompany the successful achievement of this process.

b) Consequently, internalisation and individualisation of learning and growth processes are made explicit: the Child as responsible for her own learning and inherent development. A teacher who caught her attention, interest and curiosity accompanied her. It is unclear if the practitioner facilitated the Child’s (inherent capacity for) development, which triggered learning (under a Piagetian lens (1969); or if the practitioner facilitated scaffolding (PDZ, under a Vygotskian lens (1978)).

The description of the learning activity in the planning structure was divided into three parts: initiation, development and ending. This was based on the assumption that there were particular steps to achieve learning: present and model, facilitate and support, and assess if it has been achieved. As with ‘regular activities’, practices for learners and practitioners were different but dependent on each other.

The planning structure also included a section of ‘Key questions’ to assess if children maintained their attention throughout the activity and if they learned, and suggested the use of ‘Indicators’ as complementary evaluation instruments to assess their learning. What could be read as a useful tool for practitioners to follow up how learning developed, could also be used for other purposes. Under an accountability rationale, indicators could also be used to
measure how practitioners were achieving standards, promoting through these their self-
regulation and accountability to the state. For instance, JUNJI supervision involves checking
curricular documents like the daily timetable and planning (JUNJI, 2007c).

As with the timetable and regular learning activities (‘habits’), this planning structure for
variable learning activities suggested a type of relational power between subjects involved in
the learning process: child subjects, Child-Aunty, amongst aunties, and aunties towards
broader society. In its main institutional curricular document, the nursery described what type
of adult-child relationship was aspired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship between Adult – Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The adult is a stimulating individual who starts from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive knowledge about each child, his evolutionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage and the necessary characteristics to make him progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards other developmental levels. (…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the adult who provides the child orientation on how to act,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing an educational moral model, hence the relevance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adult’s role in any context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Extract of Statement about Relationships amongst individuals in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the institution, PEI, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first paragraph of this definition presents overlapping discourses. The idea of an
‘individual’ stimulated to become a subject could resonate with behavioural psychology, and a
cause-effect rationale. This may explain particular pedagogical practices as ‘signals’ or
instructions (see next section). For instance, Chapter Eight of this thesis shows an episode in
which the same instruction was repeated several times until the (correct) expected behaviour
was performed. When the task was achieved, positive reinforcement was provided.

However, if we continue reading the same definition, another current of thought marked the
subject of the female teacher and child learner. The knowledge embedded in the terminology
(evolutionary stage, progress, and developmental levels) is related to Piagetian constructivism
and Vygotskian scaffolding; internal individual cognitive development triggered by action, the
universal child as a curious individual that requires stimulation. It is based on the practitioner’s
role of modelling and facilitating activities that enable children to learn through their actions.

The idea of the adult as a moral model is particularly interesting and could be linked to
romantic notions of the Child, who has to be protected from adult contamination (from their
surrounding world, which is non-innocent). She is produced as a blank-slate and amoral child,
who acquires morals step-by-step (Kohlberg, 1981; Piaget, 1969) and whose female
practitioner, the Aunty, is her carer and moral guide (Froebel, 2000). The practitioner, as a
subject, is also determined to act as a standardised role-model, potentially risking invisibilising her unique traits. Behaviourism could be suggested by shaping children’s behaviours in order to educate their character and therefore subjectivity. Moreover, the idea of ‘capturing’ children’s attention may explain the need for ‘signals’ (see next section) and ‘motivation’ in the first part (initiation) of the learning activity.

II  
Signals and Everyday Pedagogical Strategies

Hayashi and Tobin (2015) analyse Japanese EC practitioner’s ‘embodied practices’, placing special attention on how they use their bodies as pedagogic tools (gaze, touch, location) in the classroom. They suggest that practitioners’ performances are ingrained in their ‘muscle memory’, i.e. emerge unconsciously, because these belong to the culturally specific tacit pedagogic knowledge. Parallels can be established with this study, as everyday pedagogical strategies like signals (señales) and expressions are representative of Chilean ECE contexts, and were implemented regularly by aunts and children.

In the Butterfly classroom, before mealtimes, practitioners drew on pedagogical strategies that involved ritualistic performances to reinstate knowledge about nutrition and produce mannered intake behaviours. These strategies were also implemented in variable learning activities: ‘señales’ (signal-songs) and expressions. The next section deals with these everyday strategies, their relevance and impact upon daily interactions, and how they were part of the (re)production of child and Aunty discourses in the classroom. These practices shed light on how the curriculum discourses enveloped everyday pedagogies, and (re)formed a common ground upon which discourses drew upon.

II.I  
Mealtime Señales: ‘La comidita, que rica está’

La comidita/lechecita, que rica está  
La comeremos/tomaremos toda hasta el final  
Para crecer, para estudiar  
Y para estar sanitos y poder jugar!

How delicious is our [little] meal/milk  
We will eat it all up  
In order to grow, in order to study  
And to be healthy and to be able to play!

Señales (signal-songs) were short songs that reminded singers that a particular activity or moment was coming up. They were used to capture children’s attention, to promote silence, to introduce mealtimes (lunch and afternoon milk) and/or prayers. They were all rhythmically structured and most of these had a melody. Choreography and singing were followed in choir,
guided by a practitioner. A popular expression in the Chilean ECE field is that the louder this song is sung/recited, the better is its assessment.

In the case of mealtime habits, everyone in the Butterfly classroom had to participate in the performance of a prayer and mealtime song (see lyrics quoted above). If children did not recite the prayer simultaneously, or if they did not sing the mealtime song loudly enough; practitioners would say that it ‘would not count’ or ‘it was not heard’ by lunch ladies, and that they had to repeat it. It is important to mention that this practice was not part of the nursery’s regulation. The nursery is secular and therefore cannot engage with any religious routines. However, Aunty Lily was catholic and she promoted this practice in the classroom. The mealtime prayer involved choreography for its introductory song. Hands had to follow different movements that ended in folding hands. Lyrics emphasised children’s small size.

Links with Kaščák and Gajňáková’s work in Slovakia (2012) can be identified. They suggest that prayers like these reinforce the process of homogenising students within school culture. Prayer legitimises symbolisms derived of subordination and conformity to a higher authority. Its synchronic performance ‘encourage the conformity of pupils and on a behavioural level as well’ (p. 382). Furthermore, their analyses illustrate how pastoral power operated through the leading qualities of practitioners, as they ensured that synchronised recitation was achieved in the wake of personal moral development and ‘subordination and group co-ordination’ (ibid., p. 388). Similarly, the Butterfly classroom’s prayer involved requesting baby Jesus’ blessing of the food and children.

Niño Jesús, que naciste en Belén,  
Bendice esta mesa, y a nosotros también.  
Amén. A comer.  

Little baby Jesus, who was born in Bethlehem,  
Bless this table and us as well.  
Amén. Let’s eat.

The prayer and signal-song linked Christian morals of gratitude for blessings with nutrition knowledge and eating the whole meal. Humility, accompanied by gratitude legitimised the relevance of eating in the signal-song. Lyrics stated that the (small sized) meal was delicious,
and children ate it all up in order to grow/gain weight/learn, be healthy and to be able to play. As a prayer, this signal may have created a stereotype of a vulnerable hungry child who gratefully accepted gifts, as for example food. The mealtime signal suggested a pattern upon which variable activities were based: they were all led by a practitioner, had to be performed by children simultaneously.

This signal is well known in any Chilean ECE context and is generally known by the population. It possibly became part of popular culture during the dictatorship period (1973-1990) in which INTEGRA’s and JUNJI’s main goal was abolishing child malnutrition. Consequently, a sociohistorical trajectory may have overlapped with current multiagency ECE initiatives. Additionally, thinking of civilising discourses and values that permeate school meals (Metcalfe et al., 2011), it was expected that vulnerable children acquired as a manner, to like any kind of meal.

The poster from CEMA Chile, dated 1974, is called ‘your children have to learn’ (see figure 38) and specifies what behaviours parents have to teach their children to ensure them ‘the opportunity to be well received and loved anywhere’. Besides greeting practices, children should for example: ‘Be satisfied with what they have on their plate’, and ‘Not interrupt grown-up conversations’. This poster illustrates how within Chilean ECEC, civilising discourses promoted during military dictatorship were entangled with the education of young children, towards the control of their feelings, dispositions and thoughts according to the circulating morals and norms (Millei, 2008).

Figure 38: CEMA CHILE, 1974
RETRIEVED FROM: WWW.BIT.LY/1OGNQ8P

---

18 Main providers of free ECE in Chile for ‘vulnerable’ and economically deprived population.
19 In the original version of this signal, the lyrics said ‘to gain weight’ instead of learning.
20 CEMA Chile, non-profit foundation created in 1954 ‘to provide spiritual and material wellbeing to the Chilean Woman’ (www.bit.ly/1Sxk2Ph). Pinochet’s widow, Lucia Hiriart is its president for life.
II.II Signals for motivation and silence

In this section, I present other types of signals used to generate silence in the classroom and capture children’s attention for learning.

**Signals for Silence and Attention**

1) The owl, the owl

   *It does shh, it does shh* [shh mimic, index finger perpendicular on lips] Everybody's silent, like the owl That does shh, that does shh [decreasing volume, same shh mimic]

2) Little opened mouths – ah ah ah [open mouth]

   Little closed mouths – mh, mh, mh [close mouth]

*(Fieldnotes and Audio Recordings collected throughout the ‘data’ construction period)*

The previous examples involved rhythmical singing and mimics. These were also performed in chorus, suggesting to children that they had to be silent and more attentive learners. The focus on repetitive behaviours could suggest shaping future actions and learning, which would be reminiscent of behaviourist theories and underpinning assumptions that subjects were shaped by external forces (environment, others).

![Figure 39: MIMICS FOR MORNING SIGNAL (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 05/12/2013) FROM LEFT TO RIGHT: HELLO – WAVING; MARRI MARRI (HELLO IN MAPUDUNGUN) - FIST DRUMMING; IORANA (HELLO IN RAPA NUI) - SAUSAU MOVES.](image)

Children had several routines which included repetitive movements, singing and even shouting. Similarly, Kaščák and Gajňáková (2012) explain how, analogous to prayer routines, rhymes and other strategies are promoted to re-synchronise the disruptive mass of voices into a ‘collective chorus’ (p. 389). As with this Slovakian example, aunties in the Butterfly classroom guided children’s behaviour by exercising pastoral power over the group.

*Good practice* was partially assessed on the use of strategies like these signals, which are normalised practices in Chilean ECE classrooms. Their repetition and naturalised use
throughout the country has created expectations about what aunties’ professionalism involves, and consequently what a child and an Aunty have to do and be.

![Figure 40: AUNTY CELESTE MAKING SOUNDS WITH VOCALS. (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 18/11/2013)](image)

Silence signals were used at the beginning of variable learning activities and were considered part of the initiation phase, as they ‘captured’ children’s attention and interest. In Figure 39, Aunty Celeste (upper left) first used her hands to ask children to shout louder the different vocals (AAA, EEE...); then opened up her arms to ask for complete silence (right corner). This dynamic was repeated several times until a general silence filled the classroom. Then, as part of the initiation of the variable learning activity, Aunty Celeste (lower left) invited us to guess her mimics, in this case, what she could have wrapped up between her arms: ‘What could I have here?’ (whispering in an intriguing tone). Someone replied: ‘A little baby!’

In order to engage children, aunties performed different dramatic initiation actions such as the previously described (see figure 40-41), prior to the development phase of a variable learning activity. Initiations were exaggerated in volume, shouts like surprised ‘Ohh!’ were common, or on the contrary, became hardly perceivable whispers. Mimicry and their speed of speech was more articulated and slower, cutting every word into sy-lla-blies.
Interestingly, as a former practitioner and teacher trainee tutor, I too developed these initiation practices to ‘ensure’ a ‘successful’ variable learning activity. Their existence and iterative production, i.e. present in every daily variable learning activity, was completely naturalised in my profession. In fact, throughout the study, I did not notice it as a practice until the final period of ‘data’ construction. When I became aware of how discursive practices shaped practitioners, I discovered a whole range of body movements that differed from the ones adopted during mealtime or hygiene habits. ‘Getting into character’ seemed to acquire a different meaning, as a pedagogical purpose was embedded in aunties’ gestures and
movements. Aunties’ bodies were key for engaging an audience of children, and served curricular discourses about the Child subjects to be produced.

II.III ‘¡Nada que ver!’ – Expressions

Besides signals, other important and recurrent everyday strategies were practitioners’ use of expressions. These could be classified into two types: for signposting, what behaviours and qualities were not accepted. The most commonly used by children and practitioners in the Butterfly classroom were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not accepted Behaviours</th>
<th>Not accepted Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¡Nada que ver! – How inappropriate!</td>
<td>¡Huevo duro! – Hard boiled egg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Qué feo! – How ugly!</td>
<td>¡Es guagua! – (S)he’s a baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Fea la actitud! – What an ugly attitude!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Extracted from audio records and fieldnotes)

It is important to note that in the Chilean context, these expressions are considered normal. In fact, these are regularly used in the different ECE levels. Expressions about not accepted behaviours were used in any space of the nursery (including playground), and signalled when somebody was engaging with an inappropriate behaviour. Interestingly, ‘How ugly!’ and ‘What an ugly attitude’ established links between acceptable practices with beauty, implying an aesthetic value for doing the right ‘thing’, as the following example illustrates:

‘I hear Abeja telling Eloisa that “big children don’t pee themselves!” Eloisa replies that she wet herself. Hello Kitty says: “What an ugly attitude!” and repeats it as a rhythmical chant three times. She then continues with “She’s a baby! She’s a baby!”’ (Fieldnotes extract, 15/11/2013)

In this extract, Eloisa’s soiling may have been interpreted as a lack of body control of an immature (younger~smaller) child, which was inappropriate for the Butterfly classroom, because everybody there was three years or older. Eloisa did not seem to engage with this discursive position, because she explained her actions and did not add any value judgment to it. However, Hello Kitty may have understood Eloisa’s actions as a lack of will, linking it with physical and moral development. Being a baby was consequently understood as a negative quality which needed to be overcome by Eloisa.

Expressions about not accepted qualities (second column) were used by both adults and children alike. The following episode happened in the morning circle in which Abeja was called a ‘hardboiled egg’ (an adjective referring to foul smell):
'After staff and children sing “hardboiled egg”, Abeja tries to hide behind Aunty Lily’s back. She tells him to come and sit next to her, he doesn’t move. She insists. It seems like he doesn’t want us to see his face, he covers it up and hides it behind Aunty Lily. She sits Abeja next to her. He has a red face and doesn’t look anyone into the eyes, he hides his hands and cries in silence. He looks downwards and even seems smaller.'

As previously mentioned, these expressions are naturalised throughout Chilean ECE, and in the Butterfly classroom were implemented repeatedly as rituals. Interestingly, it could be suggested that both columns point towards regulating the production of undesired behaviours of children.

The previously presented arguments and examples lead me to suggest that the planned curriculum provided the discursive framing through which the ECE classroom was materialised. In the following sections, the configuration of the bathroom and classroom (adapted for mealtime habits and variable learning activities) will be presented and analysed. Both mealtime and hygiene habits (‘regular activities’) provided the foundation for variable learning activities which involved the production of other pedagogical discourses, present in variable learning activities.

III  The Bathroom and Classroom

III.I  The Bathroom

According to the classroom planning, the physical space of the bathroom aimed to promote children’s ‘acquisition’ of hygienic habits. According to mandatory standards of the subsidising institution (JUNJI, 2013b) the bathroom included:

- three toilets “infant type” (‘tipo párvulo’, JUNJI 2013, p. 59),
- three sinks (0.60 meters high),
- a small tub (110 x 0.60 x0.36 meters) at 0.80 meters height; and
- one adult-sized sink.

Mirrors were placed over sinks. A rack for cups, tooth brushes and one hook (for towels) were also arranged within this space. The following photographs display how the space of the toilet suggested that it was only exclusive to a particular group of people, whose physical characteristics enabled them to use these.

Figure 45: VIEW FROM THE BATHROOM ENTRANCE, LEFT SIDE.

Figure 46: VIEW FROM THE BATHROOM ENTRANCE, RIGHT SIDE.

Figure 47: VIEW FROM THE BATHROOM ENTRANCE, AT THE BACK.

The mandatory tub could be used to bathe children, either because they arrived unclean to the nursery or soiled themselves; but this hardly was the case in the Butterfly classroom. The mandatory status of the tub may have suggested the nursery’s responsibility of assuring children hygiene and cleanliness. This could be interpreted as a discourse of child vulnerability, and their need of care and protection, which possibly also overlapped with developmental discourses that informed mandatory regulations (JUNJI, 2013b, informed by CFECE, 2001, p. 20). Children’s ‘maturation’ and ‘bodily conscience’ acquisition (MINEDUC, 2001a, p. 31 and 37)
could be promoted through specific equipment that enabled cleaning up ‘accidents’. The tub also may have promoted relationships of dependence or care and protection between child and Aunty subjects, as children could not reach the tub and the Aunty would have to lift, overview and clean the Child’s body. Practitioners were accountable for children’s wellbeing, irrespective of their condition of vulnerability and family’s income or status. This involved ensuring that children were clean throughout the school day.

III.II The classroom

Contrary to the bathroom, which had a pre-defined and exclusive aim based on habit acquisition, the Butterfly classroom layout changed constantly. It was used either for pedagogical activities or for regular activities such as mealtime habits. First, I will present the furniture that was common to both types of activities, and then will focus on the particularities of habits and variable learning activities.

Space and Furniture arrangement

Furniture arrangement showed how the classroom was designed to respond to curricular framing of habits and variable learning activities. Almost every object was colourful and/or bright, and everyday furniture (tables and chairs) blended with the decoration and resources.

The furniture was limited (36 chairs and 9 tables), came in bright primary colours and was used variously in different activities (e.g. mealtime rituals). Tables and chairs were arranged according to the number of children attending.
As with bathroom implements, subsidy regulations (JUNJI, 2013b) established size and shape of the furniture: square shaped tables (70x70x51cms) and chairs (27x52cms) with small seats (27x28cms) designed for particular sized- and abled- bodies, without sharp edges. There were no chairs or tables for larger sized bodies, which led adults to use children’s furniture if there was any available. One effect of their use was emphasising differences between subjects in the classroom, and suggested how their bodies had to be shaped, respectively.

For instance, in the drawings below, practitioners accommodated their bodies and shaped them differently in order to use furniture and still fulfil the established requirements of the nursery. Perhaps the absence of adult-sized furniture might be related to curricular (progressivist) foundations and social programmes in which activities are child-centred and practitioners are conceived as facilitators.
Having already discussed shape and height, I now look at other classroom elements. Other furniture (racks or shelves) was not moved for mealtime habits, and acquired relevance according to the learning activity. The following photographs show how materials (pencils, finger colours, toys, etc.) were organised.
Shelves were accessible to children at a reachable height. Organising strategies differed according to the type of material and where it was placed within the classroom. Toys that children played with were left at the ‘back’ of the classroom and were generally piled up. But materials that were used for work - writing, drawing, painting, gluing, and cutting - were all labelled and arranged neatly. The CFECE pedagogical orientations also suggested that the classroom should be organised into particular areas for children to discover what they were interested in. This type of organisation can be linked to child-centred pedagogies and the relevance of the environment offering a diversity of materials and opportunities.

‘The educational level has free time for amusement, where the infant can explore in a free manner and according to his/her interests, the different spaces and materials of the nursery. This is why the nursery has shelves, located in the edges of the classroom, in order to enable children to make use of didactic and tangible material that is within their reach. All these measures enables us to respect each infant’s individual’s interests’

(Extract of Statement about Time Distribution, ACP 2013)

Again, it was expected that practitioners arranged the environment so as to enable the Child to be in charge of her own learning. The ‘self-made-learner’ – capable of moving freely and choosing what to learn from her environment – was produced in parallel to the ‘in need’ child who required an adult’s help in routine activities.

The pedagogical orientation, framed under the ‘Identity’ nucleus cannot be ignored. Learning- and work-material was not chosen ‘freely’ by staff, but was rather fixed by the same legal documentation that established the conditions to receive the monthly subsidy (JUNJI, 2013b). Hence, the institution and practitioners were legally bound and accountable for providing materials and spaces that (pedagogically) interpellated both child and Aunty subjects.
Practitioners – individually and sometimes with children - spent an important amount of time and effort decorating the classroom. Although children’s individual work sheets were rotated on a daily basis, some decorations were permanent. Most of it was prepared with recyclable material, which blended with colours, animals, insects, shapes, and words. It is possible that assumptions about children’s tastes, interests, learning and stimulation were embedded in these choices.

Figure 56: DIFFERENT CHILDREN’S RIGHTS ON SEPARATE POSTERS (21/11/2013) THESE HANG ABOVE THE WINDOW AND ARE NOT EASILY SEEN.

Figure 57: PICTURE OF THE CEILING (21/11/2013) IN THE FOREGROUND ARE LADYBIRD DECORATIONS. IN THE BACKGROUND ARE GEOMETRIC FIGURES, NUMBERS AND A POSTER THAT STATES: 'THIS NURSERY STANDS UP FOR THE FAMILY'

Figure 58: MAP OF CHILE CREATED WITH CHILDREN OF THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEAR (21/11/2013)
Decoration which involved values (rights and morals) was hung over our heads, and required us to look up every time they were pointed out. Aesthetic purposes were also satisfied with decoration of living beings, fantasy characters (fairies, witches) and other images depicting ‘children’.

Practitioners used the space by constantly moving around the classroom to oversee to ensure the maximum attention span and coverage. The following figures show the different ways the space was distributed in variable learning activities.

Figure 59: AUNTY VIOLETA IN SEMICIRCLE ARRANGEMENT (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 05/12/2013) SHE MOVES FROM THE CORNER TOWARDS THE CENTRE: “OK, LET’S SEE WHO IS TIDIEST AND SITTING IN HIS PLACE”. THE SEMICIRCLE SYMBOLISES HOW CHILDREN’S SEATING WAS ARRANGED.

Figure 60: CLASSROOM DISPOSITION FOR LEARNING ACTIVITY. LEFT: IN GROUPS OF FOUR. RIGHT: IN GROUPS OF SIX (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 04/12/2013 AND 05/12/2013 RESPECTIVELY)
Circle or semi-circle (Figure 59) distribution was used in the morning greeting routine and in story or conversation types of activities. Sometimes these variable activities were followed up by writing or drawing, and space distribution was re-organised according to Figure 60. In both cases, children and aunties moved throughout the space. But in seated activities, as with mealtime routines, practitioners searched for places where they could reach a larger number of children.

The most frequent space distribution corresponded to tables of four children spread throughout the classroom (Figure 60, left), possibly because of the shortage of furniture and space for a large size group. Mealtime rituals and individual- or group hands-on activities were organised according to this format. Figure 60 (right) was used when organising group activities or corner play. The different arrangements favoured the promotion of children’s learning through activity, which ranged from playing, singing and mimicking; to writing and listening whilst remaining seated.

Mealtime implements were particular to the context of public and publicly subsidised institutions (nurseries, primary and secondary schools). Lunch was served in plastic ‘flight trays’, with separate sections, and both morning and afternoon milk was served in plastic cups. These cups and trays were handed by female adults (either classroom staff or dinner ladies) to children, who were expected to wait seated for their milk/meal in tables of four.
Children received a tablespoon for any type of meal, and a teaspoon depending on the type of dessert. The type of cutlery provided could suggest intentions to promote children’s autonomous intake of food. Practitioners covered the far left square with a napkin (Figure 62), which sometimes was empty. The types of implements and strategies like covering dessert facilitated practitioner’s overview of individual children, tables and larger groups, to ensure that everybody ate up everything on their tray.

Practitioners and staff sat at tables with children who usually took longer or were considered ‘mañosos’\(^2\). There also was a pre-established sequence of food intake, depending on the meal. For lunch, the main course was eaten first, followed by the side salad and finally dessert. For morning and afternoon milk, children had to drink their milk before eating their bread or biscuits.

Parallels could be established with Metcalfe et al. (2011) study, who identified ‘civility discourses’ converging in dinnertime services and routines of UK primary schools. Manners, good nutrition, ‘proper food’, responsibility and choice, are elements of discourses of civility which are mobilised by different actors (dinner ladies, teachers, children) and which also shape them as ‘healthy, responsible and individualised subjects’ (Metcalfe et al., 2011, p. 378).

IV Concluding Thoughts

This chapter sets a common ground for the reader to understand the general Chilean ECE setting. It suggests that the curriculum frames and provides a discursive rationale to ECE spaces, material resources, and practices. Setting out and analysing the logic embedded in the

\[^2\] Picky, whimsical, difficult (referring to food intake) in Chilean Spanish.
context enables me to later analyse how discourses of child vulnerability-protection are suggested and possibly produced as regimes of truth.

Arguably, the classroom and bathroom space are framed by the curriculum, pre-defining subjective positions through the shape, size and use of implements and furniture. Regular activities (habits, everyday repeating rituals) set out a combination of pedagogic strategies, arrangement of space, and relationships of dependence-protection. These create a basis upon which variable activities (planned daily) draw upon, and overlap with other discourses about learning and development. Variable activities could vary in topic and approach, however in this chapter I presented common elements of these.

Regular and variable activities are articulated with romanticised and developmental notions of the Child stemming from the curriculum. This entanglement frames relationships and practices of (self)care and of surveillance. Practitioners’ pedagogical strategies are based on local tacit knowledge and by drawing upon these; they possibly reify the available discursive positions for children and practitioners.

Variable learning activities were related to step-by-step rationales and presented a shift in the relationship between the Child and practitioner. Strategies like signals had similar purposes to the ones implemented in regular activities, but these had the particularity that they suggested the discursive production of child subjects waiting to be ‘awed’ by a histrionic practitioner. Aunties, as facilitators of interests, knowledge and resources, had to design spaces, and overview simultaneously the larger group and each child to respond timely, and to favour their development. Becoming a child was not only related to training the body and assumptions of vulnerability and, but also with a need for stimulation, a developmental stage, and inherent playfulness.

In the following two chapters, I develop the Kai-Kai of ‘the vulnerable child’ and ‘the protective Aunty’, and explore how they were produced through hygiene and mealtime habit practices. Drawing on several authors’ analyses of ECE spaces (Millei and Cliff, 2013; Taylor and Richardson, 2005), the settings for ‘hygiene habits’ (bathroom) and ‘mealtime habits’ (classroom) will be presented, identifying the framing of everyday interactions in the Butterfly classroom22. Bodies are central to developing habit rituals and according to performative theory, also to the production of subjectivities. After these chapters, a second discourse of the

---

22 I used the bathroom for washing my hands and teeth, at the same time with the children, following the same procedures. Observations were not made if not every person the bathroom authorised my presence. This implied more fragmented records, as I sometimes had to leave in the middle of the activity if someone (children and staff) asked me to leave.
Child and the Aunty intertwined and overlapped. This second Kai-Kais displayed ‘the developing child’ in variable learning activities.
CHAPTER SIX:
KAI-KAI FIGURE OF HYGIENE PRACTICES

In Chapter Two, I explored how populational reasoning initially shaped Chilean ECE to control specific populations that escaped idealised notions of white middle class normalcy: non-delinquent, innocent, savage and blank-slated child subjects. Historically, public Chilean ECE focused on deprived population and primarily emphasised the satisfaction of basic needs, and was specially promoted during dictatorship (JUNJI, 2006). It became part of the social expectation of ECEC, linking the quality of ECE services and future social mobility with children’s hygiene and tidied appearance. Similarly, Burman (2012) discusses how within the UK context, the need for cleanliness and tidiness was linked with social mobility.

It is important to emphasise that these analyses do not question the relevance of care and hygiene practices in ECE contexts. In fact, given the diverse age range in ECE and ensuing diversity of needs, these are necessary practices. What I will attempt to ask in the following sections, is the normative effect that discourses attached to hygiene practices can have in ECE settings, defining the subjectivities of children and adults alike.

I  Care, vulnerability and the Child’s body

Practitioners were expected to take care of children’s wellbeing through the arrangement of time and space, and prescription of movements. The relationships between children and female practitioners may have been influenced by practices and knowledges associated to repetition and protection. This ritualistic repetition could produce truths about both subjects: the vulnerable child and the protective Aunty.

In particular, the bathroom space in the Butterfly classroom facilitated the production of these discursive positions by creating a disciplinary space. As such, the bathroom operated openly with total visibility, and hygiene practices, as norms, existed through power/knowledge that legitimised different techniques of control over children and practitioners. The bathroom established identity categories (the Child, the Aunty) and consequently re-defined everyday power relations between these, through hygiene practices.

In this chapter, I explore how discourses of ‘the vulnerable child’ and ‘the protective Aunty’ were produced through the iteration of hygiene habits in the bathroom of the Butterfly classroom. Using extracts from fieldnotes, drawings and photographs, I explore how regulatory
gazes and access operated in this space. Analysis on body training follows, as the bathroom pre-defined narratives of care which possibly suggested normalised trajectories of ‘the Aunty’ and ‘the Child’ in other learning activities.

II The disciplinary space of the Bathroom

In Figure 64, the reader can observe how, through gazes and positions, relations were established in the bathroom space. The child stood at the back of the bathroom, holding her implements (toothbrush and towel) and looked upwards towards the Aunty. The Aunty stood at the entrance, held the toothpaste with both hands, looking downwards towards the Child. The differences between their bodies and how they used them in this space were configured according to the planned curriculum, which established power/knowledges and available discourses to draw upon. The planned curriculum can configure the bathroom as a disciplinary space, in which young subject’s private self-care practices become publicly controlled and observed. Moreover, it is possible that the associated learning objective prompts children and practitioners to adapt to the subjective positions of the ‘vulnerable child’ and the ‘protective Aunty.

The following extracts do not aim to provide a generalisable representation of everyday hygiene rituals, but help to develop a general understanding of these and enable us to understand how the repetition of rituals created an illusion of repeating regularity.
‘Children are put into rows so they can brush their teeth. Some of them brush, others drink water. Aunty Bedford is showing them her back and puts pre-cut toilet paper on the toilets. She can see on the mirror reflection what the children are doing.

Some children say: “Aunty, (s)he’s playing with water!” and “(s)he doesn’t leave me any space for brushing!” She replies: “What did I tell you? Brush your teeth!”, “no pushing”, “where’s the towel?!”

Aunty Bedford shows concern that everyone uses their own towel, has toothpaste and that nothing is thrown on the floor.

After washing their hands, children hang up their towel and put back their cup’ (Fieldnotes extract, 15/04/2013)

In Figure 65, Aunty Celeste’s broad ranging glance was emphasised (see arrows). The gaze enabled practitioners to work with large groups of children when promoting a step-by-step procedure to ensure that everyone’s hygiene needs were satisfied. Their control functioned to assess children’s practices according to the expected curricular standards. Also, in the extract above, Aunty Bedford reminded everyone the procedure to follow, by either checking or orally making the norm explicit. Aunties also controlled access to bathroom facilities and basic supplies, such as soap, toothpaste, and toilet paper. How these supplies were used for bodily hygiene, were explained by the Aunties who controlled its delivery. Similarly, in the drawing below, Aunty Lily turned into a multi-tasking subject whose gaze provided the illusion of overview of the bathroom and classroom, the latter being a space where other discourses also had to be produced. (see Figure 66).

Narratives of ‘vulnerability’ and hygiene, linked to social mobility and middle-class values, in addition to romanticist notions of ‘the Child’ were manifested in curricular statements like ‘Washes him/herself without playing with water’ (Activities of the Child, Hygiene Habit on Timetable). This statement assumed that children needed to be protected from themselves and their exploratory and playful urges. The idea of children not being able to ‘know better’ created the need to depend on a caring female Aunty to measure and provide whatever they might need. Implements like mirrors and door frames possibly reinforced these notions. According to Froebelian pedagogy, the playful child subject needs protection and care from a
female adult who can guide her through her explorations while keeping her safe (Cannella, 1997).

Similarly, the flock of Foucault’s pastoral care (Foucault, 1982) is led by the shepherd, and the flock trusts her guidance. The shepherd maintains a protective gaze over her flock and sacrifices anything to fulfil this task. Links can be made with the socio-historical trajectory of Chilean ECE, which operates through female practitioners and whose femininity is framed by the Catholic image of Mother Mary (Montecino, 1990); and whose profession emerged as a key element to promote a Catholic morality in a secular state (Orellana Rivera & Araya Oñate, 2016). Selfless maternal care and total surrender to her children (flock) and faith (norm), still rules over practitioners as a female example to emulate.

![Figure 66: AUNTY LILY AT THE DOOR FRAME, LOOKS INTO THE TOILET, HANDS TOOTHPASTE AND CHECKS THE CLASSROOM (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 20/05/2013)](image.png)

II.I ‘Category-Maintenance Work’ (Davies, 2006a)

Throughout the period in which I participated and observed the bathroom, practitioners drew on different practices to promote children’s ‘adaptation to hygiene habits’ (Learning outcome, Timetable) and to signal what behaviours deviated from the norm. Referring to gender (re)production in ECE contexts, Davies (2006a) explained how deviations from the norm triggered ‘category-maintenance work’ (p. 72). Maintaining categories reinforced its relevance when confronted with a deviation that put it at stake. The following examples show different strategies that practitioners used, and which promoted the identity category of ‘the vulnerable child’ in the bathroom. In addition, these strategies also promoted the ‘protective Aunty’ and her role in this space.
A) **Instructions:**

‘Aunty Bedford asks Antonella to wash herself. Antonella washes her hands and face and stands, her face is wet. Aunty Bedford tells her: “Okay Antonella, now go dry yourself” Antonella looks for her towel.’ (Fieldnotes extract, 15/04/2013);

B) **Reminders:**

‘Aunty Monroe: Brushing your teeth isn’t the same as playing with water!’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 15/05/2013);

C) **Rule Transgression:**

‘While I’m passing by the bathroom, I hear Hache tell Aunty Lily that he’s done [cleaning himself] and that he’s leaving [the bathroom]. Aunty Lily replies: “What do you mean by leaving? You don’t follow your own rules here, young man!”’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/12/2013).

These three examples show different ways in which practitioners, drawing on their gaze and assessing children’s performance, entangle speech, affect and bodies, to remember and keep within the norms the different identity categories. Arguably, category-maintenance work practices places practitioners, opposite from ‘the Child’ within a binary relationship, becoming ‘the Aunty’.

For instance, in the first extract, Antonella was not autonomously developing tasks of self-care but depended on prescriptive indications from practitioners. This could be interpreted as reflecting assumptions of children’s ‘vulnerability’, i.e. unfamiliar with the procedures to follow. Similarly, the playful approach to the ritual (i.e. playing with water, second extract), although consistent with the discursive positioning of ‘the innocent child’, could conflict with autonomous practices of self-care, which legitimised aunties’ reminding statements.

In the last extract, Hache’s statement (‘he’s done’) indicated his assessment that he had appropriately completed the hygiene practice. Furthermore, his performance also successfully produced him as a child who adapted/adopted the ritual. However, within the spectre of a ‘vulnerable child’ his power/knowledge would be limited (‘young man’), which would not align to Aunty Lily’s rules and timings, and consequently he still depended on her authorisation.

Albeit both were drawing on the same discursive framework, Aunty's position in the classroom entitled her to a power/knowledge that legitimised her practices of control and gatekeeping.

The following examples show how relational power operated between children and adults, children prompting Aunties to intervene.
In the first quote a child called a practitioner into the identity category of the Aunty, to assume responsibility and role within her conflict. This example shows how relational power could operate from children towards adults, as this child asked for a practitioner’s intervention to perform ‘the protective Aunty’ who reminded them of the relevance of the ritual. The child perpetuated a regulatory gaze by identifying transgressions (e.g. playing with water), judging it as inappropriate (out of the norm) and demanding the practitioner’s attention.

Likewise, in the second quote Vijenje asked Aunty Lily to be her extension. By becoming part of the regulatory gaze, Vijenje was able to draw on the same techniques of control that aunties did, and could tell his peers to leave the bathroom. Through the exercise of discipline, and interpellating others to follow the bathroom’s rules, he produced a child who could judge others’ condition of vulnerability because he drew on practices of self-care.

These extracts illustrate how discipline ‘manages and makes use of’ (Butler, 2004, p. 50) subjects—children and adults alike, to perpetuate discourses of the Child and Aunty and to establish their everyday relationships. Alongside these iterative practices, the repetition of bodily actions was key to shaping practitioners’ and children’s bodies.

Practitioner’s physical presence was complemented with important oral statements in which difference and distance was highlighted between subjects. On the one hand, Aunties used a loud and ‘public’ voice to make reference to rules of gatekeeping. On the other, physical actions like washing, drying, and brushing were only performed by children, sometimes with the help of adults, and these were repeated and controlled physically and verbally. Through pedagogic micropractices, ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ were individualised and as an effect, became figures of public domain (regimes of truth).
Access and Gatekeeping

Figure 67: SEQUENCE OF CONTROLLED BATHROOM ENTRANCE DURING/AFTER LUNCH (05/12/2013, 12:24-12:25)

A managerial rationale was necessary to organise a large class (32 children), with little space and limited staff. Resemblances to Fordist approaches were frequent, as hygiene rituals were developed en masse in 15 minutes, six times a day, and required speed and effective actions. Although staff attempted several approaches of group organisation in order to personalise the process, e.g. always at appointed times, in rows or in smaller groups (see Figure 67); it frequently turned out to be very crowded. Consequently, and as part of the control and observation of the toilet, gatekeeping involved observing who entered (or not) the bathroom, how and when.

Gatekeeping produced differences amongst subjects. The bathroom had only one door and children’s entrance was controlled by adults. The differentiation of subjects through access produced a notion of privilege for only larger~taller able-bodies, such as parents, practitioners, staff and myself, who could enter at any time and use a lock placed on the upper left side of the door.
‘I haven’t called anyone to be washed!’ (Fieldnotes extract, 08/04/2013) was a frequent reminder that children had to be invited by a practitioner who also authorised their exit. The phrasing of the statement, with a third passive person, emphasised that children had to request access if they needed the facilities at a different time than the scheduled ones. This can be observed in the following example:

‘[during an activity] Eloisa wants to go to the bathroom, she asks me to open the door. I ask for permission to open the bathroom for her. Aunty Celeste authorises, then she stands at the door frame and looks at Eloisa and the classroom’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 20/11/2014).

Although as an adult I had access to the toilets because of my body size, my discursive position as an atypical adult with a least adult status, involved following access regulations that depended on practitioners’ authorisation. In the example, I ‘ask[ed] for permission’ and it was ‘authorise[d]’, which reinforced the production of a regulatory framing of the bathroom and the discursive positions in which female practitioners and/or parents were entitled to decide who could access the bathroom. Aunty Celeste assumed a protective role, checking if the bathroom was used appropriately, but because staff was limited, she also drew on surveillance strategies to maintain her attention on the classroom. Consequently, the illusion of an all-seeing Aunty was produced. Interestingly, the gaze also had protective functions. The bathroom space was kept open and visible, possibly to enable practitioners to be present everywhere, in any moment, in order to protect the children in their care. Children could not be (left) alone in the bathroom, and when it was being used, an open-door policy ruled. Children frequently attempted to close the door, but practitioners avoided it, reminding children that they could not be alone or disappear from their sight.
Another narrative may have been overlapping through the total visibility policy. Protectionist-innocence narratives could have entangled with fears of risk and/or physical and sexual abuse, as research elsewhere has highlighted (Silin, 1995). Aunty Celeste protected children in ‘risky’ spaces like the bathroom by making these as public as possible. She was accountable for the correct use of the bathroom, children’s safety and clean appearance, and for protecting them from any sexual abuse that could happen in this space. Moreover, currently in Chile, ECE practitioners are under public scrutiny given the frequent accusations of abuse in educational spaces. Thus, these practices also could enable practitioners to protect themselves from false accusations.

Although children’s naked bodies were common in the space of the bathroom, these were not acknowledged as sexual. Rather, sexuality was omitted. For Robinson (2013), the intersection of child development and childhood innocence constitutes children as cognitively and emotionally immature, and ‘becomes a mediator/regulator’ (p. 24) of children’s ECE. Similarly, Silin (1997) influenced by Foucault (1979), links adult silence (sex as taboo) to child abuse, and explains how figures of ‘the homosexual as predatory paedophile’ (Silin, 1997, p. 214) are paired to the ‘innocent child’. The male (homosexual) represents the complete antagonistic figure, and women ‘are charged with protecting the Child’s (and their own) innocence from those who would seduce them away from their “natural” heterosexuality’ (ibid., p. 217).

Parallels can be established on two observed occasions. Both during the visit of a male plumber, and of a male supervisor from JUNJI, Aunty Celeste did not leave the bathroom until every child had finished. She explained to me that she would not allow male strangers into the toilet whilst children were there. Children were ‘at risk’ because of a multiplicity of understandings of ‘vulnerability’: economic deprivation, social and sexual.

Care and protection can become problematic if they are governed exclusively by underpinning notions of victimised innocent children, leading to practices of overprotection, disinformation and annulment (Robinson, 2013; Silin, 1997). In this case, these practices can risk ignoring and dis-acknowledging child subjects in the classroom, because these could produce them as lacking any awareness about their environment and bodies, with limited range of action, self-care and self-defense. Practitioners are also entangled in this rationale: their selves and bodies have to serve a greater good, protecting children in their care and attending to their needs, resulting in the invisibilisation of their qualities and characteristics.
II.I Resistance to Gatekeeping

Following a Foucauldian understanding of power, exactly because the bathroom was a regulated space, resistance to gatekeeping emerged.

’Some children got into the bathroom without authorisation. Aunty Lily asks “What are you doing there?”
Aunty Celeste replies: “That’s because they have some nerve!”
Aunty Lily tells the children in the bathroom: “What an ugly attitude! And you don’t even have a towel! What an ugly attitude!” (Fieldnotes Extract, 22/05/2013)

This example shows how children continuously found ways to resist the bathroom’s gatekeeping rules and their subjection into vulnerable subjects. Children did not tell on each other and consequently resisted discursive practices of mutual regulation. This type of resistance to rules has been reviewed in literature informed by sociology of childhood exploring children’s cultures (Corsaro, 2011). However, my reading does not necessarily relate to children finding ways to resist imposed rules. Rather, it is about thinking how the bathroom was accessed and used differently, and by doing so, how children resisted ways in which they were expected to produce themselves and other children as vulnerable subjects.

Aunty Celeste’s explanation (‘they have some nerve’23) can have a twofold reading: first, it emphasised the outrage at children accessing the bathroom without any remorse. Second, the metaphor of the ‘patudo’ suggested unwelcomed irruption of a strange body to a civilised space. Aunty Lily emphasised the severity of the situation with the normalising expression ‘what an ugly attitude’, articulating, through morals and aesthetics, her disapproval.

II.II Changing relational Power Dynamics?

Each time I wanted to access the bathroom, either to wash my hands or to record the routine, everyone’s (aunties’ and children’s) permission to enter and observe the bathroom was requested. When I started observing bathroom space, everyone would assent. But as time passed, boundaries were blurred. Practitioners and children always welcomed me if I wanted to use the facilities, but decided if I could access when I observed, as the following extract illustrates:

‘I go to the bathroom, I ask for everyone’s permission. Suddenly Francesco and Mate stand in front of me and complain that I haven’t asked for their authorisation. I ask them again, each individually. Francesco authorises me, Mate doubts. ‘NNNNyes’. Vaca then approaches me

23 The literal expression is ‘porque son patudos’. The Chilean word ‘patudo/a’ comes from ‘pata’, animal foot or an inappropriate expression for human feet. It is used to call people who put their ‘foot’ wherever they can to get things. However, a ‘patudx’ is not necessarily abusive.
Francesco and Mate created a conflict in how we related to each other and how they related to adults, shifting the relational power that was generally held amongst children and adults in the bathroom. Until my participation as a researcher in the classroom, adults could enter at any time. Now, Francesco and Mate shifted the ‘vulnerable child’ discursive framing which depended on adults observing, protecting and satisfying needs. Drawing on bathroom access rules and the study’s ethical guidelines, they changed the power rationale and now their involvement in the decision making process was needed. They ceased being completely docile bodies, and were able to decide who entered the bathroom, conditioning access to personal consent.

My presence and practices in the bathroom frequently challenged taken-for-granted assumptions about the available discursive positions for adults in the space. Aunty Celeste pointed this out, explaining that she had not thought about alternative ways of treating children in the bathroom until she authorised me to enter the bathroom and then observed how I asked for children’s consent as well (Informal conversation at debriefing meeting, December 2013). Consequently, she challenged the discursive position of ‘the protective Aunty’, and a threshold for reconceptualising her role in educational spaces (specifically in the bathroom) was opened.

It is important to note that Aunty Celeste, resisted normative discourses about ‘the Aunty’ in this space, and used the bathroom to talk about her feelings, health and life beyond the nursery. Here, she talked about her exhaustion, the regular sickness she felt, and the high demands she had to fulfil as a practitioner and mother.
The space of the bathroom drew on discursive framings in which larger adult bodies were not conceived as users. Female practitioner bodies were invisibilised. I only became aware of this when I attempted to participate in hygiene habits and I adapted my adult body to use the sinks. Children initially told me that the sinks and toilets ‘were not for me’, either because I was ‘too big for them’ or because in the case of the sinks, they had to be used according to the gender shown on an image above each.

‘I was told earlier that I couldn’t use the male sink because it was for males. I tried to explain what I thought of it, but I was ignored’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/11/2013)  

“We go inside to wash our hands. Mama Cerdita sees me washing myself and laughs: “La Gimela” (in a mocking tone). I ask her if this makes her laugh and she says yes. Barney adds: “me too.” I ask them why it makes them laugh and they tell me because I am washing my hands. I explain to them that I had to wash, because my hands were dirty’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 22/05/2013)

The shape and size of the sinks and toilets signalled a particularly sized subject, as well as a way of adapting the body in order to use them adequately. In this sense, my larger body looked absurd and out of place and my ‘observable’ gender limited access and use as well. Children reinforced differences by delimiting my access and interpellating me according to what they read as appropriate. The first quote illustrates that although I attempted suggesting otherwise, children ignored or even forced me to use the ‘right’ sink. My body was exposed as different.
Nonetheless, in the second quote, my ‘ridicule’ position enabled children to laugh and enabled me to continue washing my hands in a sink that looked too small for me. Still, I did not successfully transform the rationale, as I drew on hygiene discourses to justify my actions. Likewise, others used their bodies to resist using the sinks in only one way, as the following quotes illustrate:

‘Children stick their brushes and foam on the mirror. They spit out a lot of water and brush their hair exaggeratedly. When Aunty Violeta and Celeste notice, they tell them to leave. Aunties talk amongst themselves while Vaca, Hello Kitty and Vijenje brush their teeth, make more foam, laugh and brush their faces. Aunty Violeta tells them that the brush is for the mouth: “Wash your face and turn off the faucet”. While turning off the faucet, she tells them “Alright, good-bye!” (Fieldnotes Extract, 02/12/2013)

‘Hombre Araña asks me to open the bathroom door so he can pee. I open the door and the twins get in. Aunty Lily says that they went to play with water. I’m next to the bathroom and cannot do anything. Aunty Fuxcia (cleaning lady) goes and leaves the door open because Vampira is peeing. Hombre Araña, Wanderino and Mario Bros enter. (...) Wanderino gets on the sinks, Aunty Lily sees him from the classroom and shouts: “OOOHHH Wanderino is on the sinks!!!” He gets off and Mario Bros climbs on them too.’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 20/11/2013)

Figure 70: WANDERINO ON SINKS (20/11/2013)

In the first example, children were following the ritual in an exaggerated manner, making more foam, using the mirrors for other purposes (and blocking practitioner’s sight), and using more water than expected. This could have a twofold reading. On the one hand, it could be considered a trivialisation of the procedure. On the other, children’s behaviour also made the Child innocence discourses of the curriculum true/real (‘Washing him/herself without playing with water’), which demanded in turn an Aunty’s intervention.

The reminders - how water and brushes had to be used - were a call for returning to ‘normal’. These slippages would not have been possible if practitioners had not resisted the ‘protective Aunty’. Their attention and gazes were on their conversations, and drew on discursive positions of ‘care’ when they all defied efficiency rationales. Additionally, practitioners did not draw on the usual practices of shouting or close control, but simply turned off the water faucets and told children to leave. This example may shed light on practitioner’s efforts in reshaping their discursive positions in the bathroom.
In the second quote, I opened the bathroom door instead of awaiting the practitioner’s authorisation. In this instance, I made use of my privileged position (lager body size and able to challenge the practitioner’s authority) to follow others’ requests. I challenged the boundaries of the adult researcher and my solidarity with female practitioners. However, when the twins (Mate and Francesco) accessed the space unexpectedly, I returned to a position in which I could not (or chose not to) intervene, nor tell on them. My actions also affected practitioner’s work, because I forced them to fulfil a role of surveillance.

As an external observer, I saw how the twins transgressed gatekeeping rules and enabled Wanderino and Mario Bros to climb on sinks. Through the swift transgressive use of their bodies, Wanderino and Mario Bros’ subjectivities could shift. But Aunty Lily denounced Wanderino, he responded to it by getting off the sink. Mario Bros climbed on the sinks nonetheless.

![Figure 71: PEPPA PIG SITTING ON THE TOILET (20/11/2013)](image1)

![Figure 72: ESTEFANI (LEFT) AND PEPPA PIG (RIGHT) ON THE TOILET (05/12/2013)](image2)

Similar to the sinks, toilets interpellated subjects to adapt and train their bodies according to a particular standardised seating posture (see figure 71-72). The drawings show a similar posture to sitting on classroom chairs: sitting, putting hands on thighs, looking forward (to mirrors and the practitioner who stood at the door). Male children urinated without help, standing and aiming into the basin. Nonetheless, occasionally some children resisted the normalised way of sitting on the toilet by rocking on it.

---

24 Male children also urinated standing, but I did not draw any of these postures for ethical reasons and tensions with the sexual protection debate mentioned in the previous section.
In Figure 73, Estefani rocked on her seat in front of Aunty Celeste, who simultaneously observed her and what was happening in the classroom. This behaviour could be understood as resistance, although hardly noticeable and not acknowledged and/or corrected. But it may also represent a shift in the familiar power relationships amongst children and adults: children let adults know what they had ‘done’, received toilet paper or were wiped. On the contrary, Estefani and Aunty Celeste observed each other and used their bodies differently: Estefani rocked, while Aunty Celeste applied sunscreen, i.e. took care of her own body.

The toilet produced a relationship between female practitioners and children that reinforced the binary discourse of ‘vulnerable child’ and ‘protective Aunty’. Aunties controlled the use of toilet paper by handing children a piece of it, or wiping children. This relational power came at a cost for practitioners, who never used these facilities because these were not shaped for the size of their bodies. Many of them had to control and ‘forget’ their own bodily needs during the day. I observed on several occasions how they had to run to the staff’s toilet in the evenings, because only then they ‘remembered’ that they needed to urinate. As a practitioner, I remember similar experiences and recalled how responsibility for attending children’s needs became a priority over my own body.

These examples resonate with the shepherd’s sacrifices for her flock and her own redemption (Foucault, 1982). Female practitioners did not have observable bodily functions/needs. Rather, their bodies were in service to attend to subjects who needed to train their bodies to use the toilets appropriately. Hence, both children’s and practitioner’s bodies were made docile to produce ‘the vulnerable child’ and ‘the protective Aunty’.

Sphincter control was an important issue within this classroom, especially because of maturation and readiness notions linked to the preparation for the next year in school. Aunties called out on children who soiled themselves. Millei and Cliff (2013), whilst analysing bathroom practices, identified situations in which children deliberately did not ‘control’ their...
bodies (urine, feces) to resist the timing and rules imposed upon them. For instance, male children of the Butterfly classroom used the toilets collaboratively while urinating in pairs. They were frequently interrupted by any adult (staff and parents alike) and reprimanded as inappropriate. In these cases, male children could avoid the individualising practices of the hygiene ritual that made them into objects. On the contrary, their strategies were playful and emphasised the shared aspect of the bathroom space.

III.III Neat Gendered Appearance

Protection and care practices not only related to the acquisition of hygiene habits, but were also promoted by a neat appearance. Throughout my bathroom observations, and especially in the afternoon shifts, before children left for home, practitioners took long and demanding turns to assure that girls’ and boys’ hair was combed appropriately and smelled nice. Parents of girls who returned the following morning with the same hairdo they left with the day before were assessed as careless.

Peppa Pig’s parents were assessed as careless and neglectful by Aunty Lily. She used this case as exemplary for other parents, and emphasised what was inappropriate and signalled how the nursery had been testing her family to respond to care needs. In contrast, practitioners seemed concerned and protective, which related to parent’s response of pity. Peppa Pig’s messy hair was interpreted as (lack of) adult intervention, given that under a rationale like this, she was incapable of taking care of shaping her body according to this type of need.

As Bloch and Popkewitz (2005) illustrated, assessing families as ignorant or negligent has important effects on educational practices. It legitimises actions into the microspheres of

Note: Peppa Pig authorised me to draw her and to write down what happened. She says that there’s nothing else to be added, and doesn’t want to draw anything extra either’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 15/11/2013)
families and subjects’ lives. In this case, practitioners were also held accountable to make
gendered children ‘look’ as they should: ‘(female) long hair is brushed and turned into pigtails,
braids and other hairstyles, sometimes pulling too hard. Male children have their faces washed
and their hair wet, combed back’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 21/11/2013). Families donated cologne
bottles that were shared among all children. Only practitioners could control its dosage, they
applied a considerable amount of cologne to both groups. Given that it was a large-size group,
practitioners could easily spend at least 45 minutes or more combing hair. On several
occasions, I overheard practitioners complaining about back pains because the uncomfortable
positions they had to engage in making visible the level of care that was put ‘into’ the children.

Care and protection was materialised through a gendered, neat and clean appearance,
especially through female - child and adult - bodies. This type of intervention also impacted on
female practitioners, who adapted their bodies in a way in which they could fulfil their task
efficiently, making children’s bodies look as the gendered ideal result of hygiene rituals. Hence,
although female adults were exercising power over female children’s bodies, both were object
of gendered discourses. For instance, practitioners are also accountable for their appearance,
considering make-up, hairstyle, and clothing, among others (JUNJI). This issue will be further
analysed in Chapter 10.

Abeja and Cologne

The following episode was re-constructed with two extracts that involved Abeja’s continuous
attempts to become the opposite of the ‘vulnerable child’: a clean, neat and autonomous
child.

‘Abeja is found by an Aunty in the
bathroom. He’s soaked in water and
cologne. His hair is perfectly swept back’
(Fieldnotes Extract, 22/05/2013)

‘Before we leave [to play outside], the Aunties
open the bathroom door and find Abeja who is
soaked in cologne and has a happy and satisfied
face (I think). His hair is combed back.

Aunties tell him he can’t go out for recess.

Abeja gets mad and yells, hits his head against the
table. He cries loudly, we all observe him.
He is ignored by everybody, we go out to play and
he stays in the classroom’ (Fieldnotes Extract,
05/06/2013)

Abeja challenged relational power amongst practitioners and children through the
transgression of gatekeeping rules. His attempts became a hyperbolic performance of the ideal
child, soaked in cologne, with autonomous access and self-care. But by producing the exaggeration of the ideal child, the figure of the ‘abnormal’ (Foucault, 1979) emerged. Abeja’s effort to be acknowledged as the ideal child was entangled with the resistance to normative discourses of the vulnerable child. He possibly attempted to explore a different subjectivity, but practitioners still drew on the protective Aunty, in this case, to denounce his behaviour as a deviation from what was considered ‘normal’.

After being ‘discovered’ in the bathroom and realising that his performance had not been positively assessed by practitioners, Abeja started to cry, possibly to return to being seen as an innocent and vulnerable child, but he was ignored and scolded for transgressing the classroom rules. Arguably, his exclusion from recess playtime was practitioners’ attempt to set an example for everyone in the classroom of the consequences of breaking the rules, and positioned Abeja as ‘the abject’. At the time, I interpreted that this warning also applied to me, and it pains me to recognise that I was not able to respond to his yelling, crying and hitting his head on the table. We all drew on the same discursive framing, legitimising aunties’ regulations, and positioned ourselves as the obedient normal, reaffirming Abeja’s ‘abnormality’ by not acknowledging him as a subject. This issue will be revisited in the final chapter of the thesis.

“I have facial cream and cologne at home”

The following episode happened an afternoon while Aunty Celeste was calling children to comb their hair and wash their faces. Vijenje resisted having his hair combed and to have cologne applied on him:

‘Aunty Celeste says to Vijenje that she won’t put cologne or cream on him. Vijenje leans on the wall and says in a low voice: “It doesn’t matter”. (…)’

Figure 75: VIJENJE STANDS BY THE WALL WHILE AUNTY CELESTE (AT THE BATHROOM ENTRANCE) CALLS HIM TO THE BATHROOM

‘Aunty Celeste repeats herself and Vijenje points to her and says: “I have facial cream and cologne at home” (Fieldnotes Extract, 12/06/2013)
Vijenje may have actively resisted following the ritual and dismissed its importance, because it was irrelevant to him or because he had access to self-care products. Arguably, he did not feel that he was called out and did not respond to the naming. Following Butler, resistance could have emerged because there was no guarantee that Vijenje would hear the same way as Aunty Celeste intended. However, when she insisted, he used his pointing index finger (see Figure 76) to talk back. This latter gesture could be understood as Vijenje capturing Aunty Celeste’s attention to resist her calling. The image depicts challenge coming from a lower position towards a higher site, and unveils how stature and size was used to differentiate the position and power relation amongst child and female adult subjects.

*Michael Jackson’s Star*

The last example was recorded during the morning reception. It entangled another simultaneous narrative about how (deprived) families are held accountable for ‘proper’ parenting (protecting, giving a clean and neat appearance to their children) and are judged negatively if they do not accomplish the established standards.

‘It’s early morning and children are arriving with their parents. Michael Jackson has shaved the side of his head into a star. Aunty Bedford notices it. She laughs and calls Aunty Lily to see. Aunty Lily cries out loud: “What did you do to him?!” Michael Jackson’s mum answers: “He wanted it!” Aunties remain silent; they do not look very approving, but return to their things (…)

9:00am. Breakfast arrives, Vijenje and Hache admire Michael Jackson’s hair. Hache asks how he did it, touches Michael Jackson’s shaved star. He smiles.’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 18/11/2013)

Conflict emerged between female adults (Michael Jackson’s mother and staff), who are expected to protect and take care of Michael Jackson’s wellbeing, development and appearance. His star (see figure 77) affected practitioners’ understandings of male neat
appearance, but also may have impacted on adult’s perception of him as a quiet and obedient child.

Aunty Bedford’s reaction of laughing and pointing, and Aunty Lily’s question to Michael Jackson’s mother – ‘What did you do to him?!’ - may suggest that his body’s reshaping was negative. The mother refuted the argument of lack of care and drew on a discursive position in which her son’s choices (although she may not agree with them) were legitimate.

If Michael Jackson was perceived as a vulnerable child, he was not capable of taking appropriate decisions about his appearance and body. Furthermore, adult working class (chav) styles were contrary to the educational purposes of the nursery. A simultaneous narrative of Chilean masculinity, class, and social mobility possibly overlapped. The shaved star emulated a style promoted by Chilean football players (see Figure 78 and 79) whose successes on national and international levels have made them popular. Particularly, Gary Medel (left) and Arturo Vidal (right), became patriotic models of self-made men who challenged the odds of their social class origin.

The Chilean footballer subjectivity carries trajectories of poor~limited education, and represents an idealised notion of maleness. It is possible that although Michael Jackson’s shaved head was consistent with heteronormative identity categories of ‘the male Chilean’, his discursive position (a vulnerable child) in the nursery limited the legitimacy of following an uneducated adult subject.

However, Michael Jackson’s attempt to change his body (and possibly subjectivity) beyond the established discourses of the male child may have been recognised by his male peers. His hair became a topic at his breakfast table and was admired by Vijenje and Hache. Perhaps resistance emerged because this change pointed towards classed and gendered subjectivities,
which were not only contradictory to the purposes of the institution, but inappropriate for his status of child innocence.

IV Summary

In this chapter, I presented examples that illustrate how the bathroom can turn into a disciplinary space where young subject’s hygiene practices became publicly controlled and examined by peers and practitioners. Through the repetition of rules and actions, practitioner’s and children’s bodies could be shaped, and children’s bodies possibly were made into public objects as an effect of total visibility and control.

Relational power operated between children and adults and the facilities (such as sinks and toilets) emphasised a gendered discourse of dependent, innocent children and protective and caring Aunties. For instance, gatekeeping and access to the bathroom space may have configured particular relational power dynamics, in which practitioners’ adult bodies (presence and gaze) were used to protect, regulate and examine children’s bodies.

Pedagogic practices created a ‘vulnerable child’ who required intervention and body training by a ‘protective Aunty’. The practitioner had to ensure that the vulnerable child was protected through hygiene rituals. The fulfilment of this pedagogical aim was related to broader social policies that responded to national multiagency health trends, which echo globalised trajectories (Plyushteva, 2009). Protection and care practices within the bathroom space could manifest as the ritualistic acquisition of hygiene habits, and/or through the promotion of a neat and gendered appearance. Child and adult bodies turned into a site of power/knowledge about protection, care, gender and class.

By participating in hygiene rituals, I was made aware of these protection and care practices, and the effects that these had on our subjectivities. It allowed me to observe how both children and practitioners resisted and transformed the production of subjectivities. Fenech and Sumsion (2007) analyse Australian EC practitioner’s perceptions of regulation and provided a support and critique to reconceptualist analyses which ‘frame the regulation of EC services as repressive’ (p. 109). In addition to the identification of repressive regulation, the authors, thinking with Foucault’s concept of power (Foucault, 1982), acknowledge that within regulation, practitioners are able to exercise freedom. Their analyses inspired me to revisit my evidence and analyses, to explore if regulation was experienced by all practitioners in the same way and if power operated in other sites simultaneously. Although technical ritualised practices produced the discursive position of the Aunty, practitioners also used it in enabling
ways. Similar to Fenech and Sumsion’s findings (2007), regulatory discourses were used strategically to exercise power in other ways and sites.

For example, embracing the discursive position of child protector enabled practitioners to assert themselves as professionals. Also, producing a panoptic illusion in the bathroom space facilitated practitioner’s performance of multiple Aunty roles in the classroom, and mitigated the precarious conditions they had to work in. Both examples illustrate how although regulation was linked to accountability purposes, practitioners drew on discursive framing of the Aunty to professionalise their labour and autonomy.

As a result, dichotomist notions of vulnerability vs. protection produced the dyad of ‘vulnerable child’ and ‘protective Aunty’. Knowledge about health and wellbeing (influenced by multiagency policies) shaped relationships and practices of (self-)care in the classroom. Relations of surveillance were promoted. Practitioners drew on pedagogical strategies like signals and habits, to assess each child’s performance.
CHAPTER SEVEN:
KAI-KAI FIGURE OF MEALTIME HABITS

Mealtime routines were established in several moments of the school day (morning and afternoon milk, and lunch). These were framed under the CFECE and adapted to the context of the Butterfly classroom (see table). Organised under the ‘Autonomy’ nucleus, its aims emphasised children’s gradual acquisition of knowledge about self-care and healthy lifestyles (see learning objectives in table: ‘acknowledge positive consumption habits’, ‘incorporate practices’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mealtime Habits</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drink my Milk</td>
<td>09:00-09:15</td>
<td>To acknowledge positive consumption habits, whilst fostering healthy life styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>15:15-15:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30-13:00</td>
<td>To incorporate practices related to satisfying feeding needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Extracted from Timetable)

Mealtime ‘habits’ of the Butterfly classroom established a common ground of body training upon which variable learning experiences were based: body posture (sitting), precise manipulation of smaller objects (cutlery), order (manners), efficiency and autonomy (fast, in silence and without help), and obedience. These practices may enable the production of the ‘vulnerable Child’ subjectivity, while preparing her for the acquisition of basic skills, echoing other international evidence problematising school-meals and mealtime rituals as modes of disciplining bodies and inculcating civilising norms (Grieshaber, 1997; Metcalfe et al., 2011; Pike, 2010).

This chapter reviews examples of the daily implementation of mealtime habits, which were classified under two main practices: the regulatory gaze that closely oversaw children’s actions; and techniques of discipline and control. These practices operated through space distribution, and control and assessment of particular behaviours (manners and eating). Also in
this chapter, examples of how practitioners and children resisted and transformed these practices are examined. Extracts from fieldnotes, drawings and other evidence will be used to query the discourses that underpin the subjective positions of the ‘vulnerable Child’ and ‘protective Aunty’.

I     Panoptic Control during Mealtimes

‘Several children have one eye drawn on their hands. It has long voluminous eyelashes. I ask who made it, and they reply that it was Aunty Bedford. I ask Aunty Bedford for an eye, she asks me: “You want me to watch you? Because it’s my eye... and it’s upset”. She then shows me a tear next to the eye. “It’s because they [children] don’t eat up their food!” Francesco adds’ (Fieldnotes extract, 20/06/2013)

Most of the ‘disruptive’ children were given the eye as a sign for others and themselves. In this way, the practitioner’s gaze (and also the tear, if children showed bad behaviour) accompanied children throughout the school day. This gaze established a particular relationship between the observed and the observer. Francesco read this gaze according to the performance of particular actions during mealtimes, and I believe he was not the only one.

It is unclear if this omnipresent eye influenced children’s behaviours and interactions, and if it did, if this change was triggered either because they were being observed; or because others were aware of it too. However, it is a good example of how regulatory surveillance was considered especially relevant for mealtime habits. Aunty Bedford did not continuously draw eyes on children’s hands, but this symbol was enacted through surveillance practices.

I.1     Distribution of Space and Furniture

For mealtime habits, the classroom layout was much the same as during other learning activities. Before each serving, practitioners sat children at tables of four, while they moved around the classroom space, organising or tidying up, and making sure everyone was seated. Staff did not serve any meals until everyone was seated. Practitioners signposted the start of the mealtime by singing a signal that emphasised this moment of the day as different. This ritual is described in more detail in Chapter Five.
Children were expected to eat their meals autonomously, and practitioner’s work was to make sure this was the case. The figures above show how staff adopted several strategic positions to ensure that children ate everything on their trays. Practitioners moved around surveying trays/children or sat with those who took longer to eat their food; the apparent aim of this was to promote autonomy and good manners.

I.II Distribution of Staff and Children

When space and staff were limited but child numbers were high, practitioners developed different strategies to be effective with the time frames and maintain their performance. In these sequenced photographs, although lunch had arrived and everyone was seated, Aunty Lily explained that the trays would not be served until the last child had put her apron on. Aprons had to be worn throughout the school day, but during meal times wearing them was considered especially important, because it was assumed that children would inevitably stain their clothes with food.
Figure 83: AUNTY BEDFORD AND AUNTY CELESTE TALK TO EACH OTHER DURING SEWING ACTIVITY (11:40)

Figure 84: AUNTY LILY ASKS OUT LOUD TO WHOM THE APRON IN HER HAND BELONGS TO (12:30) SHE ASKS WHY THESE ARE ON THE FLOOR. VAMPIRA SITS ON THE TABLE.

Figure 85: DINNER LADIES ARRIVE (12:32)
AUNTY LILY EXPLAINS TO DINNER LADIES THAT THEY SHOULD NOT SERVE THE TRAYS YET, AS THERE ARE STILL SOME CHILDREN WITHOUT THEIR APRONS AND NOT EVERYBODY IS SEATED. MARIO BROS HESITATES TO GET UP TO CHECK THE TRAYS. IN THE BACK, SEVERAL GIRLS LEAVE THEIR TOWELS IN THEIR BACKPACKS.

Figure 86: AUNTY LILY TIDIES UP APRONS. (12:33)
SHE RETURNS THE APRONS TO THEIR OWNERS.
EVERYBODY IS WAITING FOR LUNCH. PELO CHANGES HER SEATING POSITION. FRANCESCO 'SLEEPS' ON HIS TABLE WHILE HIS TWIN BROTHER, MATE, STANDS UP TO CHECK THE TRAYS.

Figure 87: MORE LUNCH TRAYS ARRIVE. (12:33)
MATE ASKS AUNTY LILY AND DINNER LADY IF THEY CAN EAT NOW. AUNTY LILY REPLIES THAT THEY HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL EVERYBODY'S READY AND HE IS SEATED. PELO CHANGES HER SEATING POSITION.

Figure 88: AUNTY LILY HELPS SOMEONE TO PUT ON HER APRON (12:34) (24/07/2013)
SOME CHILDREN START SINGING THE MEALTIME SIGNAL (HANDS ARE UP FOR PRAYER). MATE SIT DOWN TO WAIT FOR LUNCH. HIS TWIN BROTHER, FRANCESCO, STANDS UP TO CHECK WITH THE DINNER LADY IF THEY CAN EAT NOW.
The sequence reveals several important points:

The layout is the same for learning activities and mealtimes (from 11:40 to 12:30, Figure 83 and 84), which illustrates the multiple functions the classroom space can have, and in which simultaneous relations of power can operate, similar to what is reported in research elsewhere (Jones et al., 2010; Millei and Cliff, 2013).

This distribution of tables created small paths, used by practitioners to move and observe children’s behaviour (manners), but were also used by children to access food and talking to peers.

The sequence also shows that children had to complete certain actions before the routine could continue. It is possible that Aunty Lily resorted to conditioning practices, perhaps informed by behaviourist psychology, as any deviation from the mealtime routine halted the progress and delayed the reward for appropriate behaviour (food consumption). For instance, she stopped the routine and blocked any access to lunch when she realised that aprons were not being used and the space was not set. But this halt shows what kind of relationship was possibly established during this sequence: aunties as caregivers versus careless children who need guidance to be taken care of. Additionally, performing these conditioning practices empowered practitioners as professionals by legitimising their efforts to educate these children to learn to behave appropriately.

Another element that stands out from this sequence is the use of aprons. Different colours and sizes differentiated subject positions: colourful small aprons presented children as students of an ECE classroom; and adults wore their distinctive uniform that highlighted their caretaking role. Arguably, aprons signalled the role of each subject, making them recognisable to each other. Therefore, besides practical benefits, aprons were relevant for the embodiment of identity categories.

Practitioner’s practices and the type of power relationship they established with children, could be underpinned by a particular knowledge about children as subjects in need of civilising. However, some child subjects challenged practitioners’ rules and authority. For example, in Figure 84, whilst Aunty Lily was talking loudly to the group, Vampira sat on a table and Eloisa got up to look out of the window. In Figure 85, Mario Bros hesitated to get up to check lunch, but in Figure 87 Mate stood up to ask if they could have lunch, while his twin brother – Francesco- ‘slept’ on his table. Then, in Figure 88, Francesco went to the Dinner Lady to demand his lunch. Similarly, in Figures 86 to 88, Pelo changed her way of sitting, which did not correspond to the ‘correct’ posture, keeping her back straight. I argue that these are all
examples of how children could challenge the assumption that they depended on adults to access food, and perhaps show the artificialness of the mealtime. Standing up, asking for food, and checking the trays were practices that challenged the subjective positions assigned to children for mealtime habits.

These examples can also suggest that children explored different ways of ‘doing’ the Child subject. Although the space seemed tightly regulated and controlled, in order to induce adequate behaviours in children (sit straight with their aprons on, waiting in silence to receive their trays), they moved around and used the furniture and paths to disrupt the mealtime setting and, quite possibly, the curricular discourse that framed this space. Thus, the regulatory structure of mealtimes became an illusion that was only maintained if one ignored the constant movement and shifts within the classroom.

Nevertheless, these little transgressions and explorations did not lead to the transformation of mealtime practices. Like Mate, who sat down to be served (see Figure 88), everyone returned to their places and started performing the prayer and signal when food serving was imminent. In the episode captured in the sequence of images, Aunty Lily’s delay of the food serving, until children were all seated and wearing their aprons, exposed the clash of two competing aims of her subjective position as ‘protective Aunty’: as responsible for making sure that children were fed in a timely manner, and as responsible for controlling children behaviour in order to become well-mannered, autonomous subjects.

Children’s dependence upon adults who adopted protective roles was also common during milk intake in the morning mealtime routine.

*Milk arrives (…) I sit next to Mario Bros, Estefani and Hache. Aunty Lily checks that all children are seated to have their milk. Even if they already drank milk at home [which means that they will not drink any now] they are seated at tables (like Azul or the twins). (…) some mothers give their children milk in their arms’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 02/12/2013)

‘9:00 Milk arrives. (…) During breakfast, some mothers are still here, they sit next to or with their children’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 11/11/2013)
Interestingly, during the lunch mealtime ritual, this exact dependence behaviour was assessed by adults as ‘not grown up’, ‘baby like’ or even ‘lazy’.

‘Staff give lunch to whoever hasn’t finished yet, I hear at least two times in the background that they call Vampira picky, that she’s too big to be fed, and that this is all because she’s lazy’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 17/07/2013)

Vampira’s manners and slow-paced eating did not align with the normalised discourse and her behaviour was interpreted as a whimsical resistance. Practitioner’s statements implied that she chose not to eat and that this decision was based on a lack of effort, and her behaviour was, therefore, publicly exposed in order to be re-shaped. Vampira’s resistance produced a ‘child in need of attention/protection’, thus rendering practitioners’ practices of feeding and control necessary. Ironically, and as mentioned for the case of lunch, this produced a tension in the protective Aunty subjectivity, who through control attempted to ensure children were fed but also to become self-sufficient and autonomous.

At this point, it is important to note that there were brief instances when practitioners challenged the ‘protective Aunty’ subjectivity. For example, Aunty Violeta, a teacher trainee in her final year, was especially aware of her practices, because she was supervised by the municipality staff and university tutors26. In the following drawing, although her body adopts the caring position and subjectivity that was expected of her (feeding Conejo), she looks down and her left hand is hidden under the table in order to check her mobile phone.

---

26 Taking into consideration that Aunty Violeta was finishing her degree, I sought her consent to analyse the episode. She gave her permission.
Although Aunty Violeta’s actions would seem like a detachment from the caregiving subjectivity assign to practitioners in the classroom, she was still handling the spoon, and the speed and amount of food that Conejo consumed. Interestingly, Aunty Violeta’s disengagement is made more evident by Conejo’s performance as an obedient child.

Similarly, in the reconstructed extract below, Aunty Celeste playfully disrupted the rationale of the mealtime routine by evicting her colleagues. As an Aunty, she was positioned as more powerful in comparison to the teacher trainee (Aunty Violeta) and child students, and her power/knowledge entitled her to adapt or change the classroom rules. In her oral expressions, Aunty Celeste drew upon familiar expressions described in Chapter Five. When children employed one of these expressions used by aunties to publicly expose unacceptable attitudes and behaviours, she called it out as a challenge to her position.

‘12:20 Lunch arrives and while trays are served, Aunty Celeste ‘kicks out’ a teacher trainee student from another classroom. Children start shouting rhythmically “ugly attitude!” (“fea l’actitud!”) repeatedly at Aunty Celeste.

Aunty Celeste stands in front of everyone, puts her hands on her hips and asks: “Who else do you want me to kick out?”

She then pushes Aunty Violeta out and says that she will kick all aunties and me out, and that she’ll stay alone with them [the children].
Perhaps Aunty Celeste’s grin after closing the classroom door was triumphant because she was enjoying the shifts and contradictions of her Aunty subjectivity. A minute after Aunty Celeste grinned and rubbed her hands, she returned to the routine, serving lunch to the children who were still waiting.

It is difficult to read this episode, as it is disruptive of the mealtime routine and of the discursive position aunties are expected to assume. Aunty Celeste put us in an ambiguous position, performing a new discourse in which outsider~insider spectators (child subjects) could challenge and denounce her practices. Child subjects drew on the expression ‘Ugly attitude!’ in order to re-position Aunty Celeste within her ‘correct’ Aunty role.

Interestingly, in my fieldnotes, I established an analogy between her actions (‘grins and rubs her hands’) and the figure of ‘a little witch’, slipping a common female figure of fairy tales. Similar to animal figures like ‘the wolf’, witches have ‘predator’ qualities and are positioned in advantageous positions because they are more knowledgeable than the victims they lure and
trick. Possibly, because of my privilege as a researcher over staff, I assumed and ascribed certain qualities to Aunty Celeste’s practices. However, by positioning myself as an observer of this episode, it is possible that I also (re)produced the subjective position that was expected of practitioners, as the ‘protective Aunty’ is in direct opposition to the ‘little witch’ figure I employed in my fieldnotes.

Moreover, my restricted participation (I sit in the background in Figure 93) reinforced judging Aunty Celeste’s disruption as inappropriate and an ‘ugly attitude’. Within three minutes, her subjectivity shifted, and returned to the familiar ritual. This episode illustrates how practitioners were also caught in the performance of ‘the Aunty’ during regular activities like mealtimes, and how child subjects also drew on expressions to re-frame and regulate them.

II Control and Disciplining Techniques within Mealtimes Rituals (Grieshaber, 1997)

As mentioned before, practitioners of the Butterfly classroom were accountable, among other things, for children’s wellbeing. This aspect involved ensuring that children had three meals a day that contained the appropriate nutrition. The following sections unpick how the lunchtime routine played out in the Butterfly classroom (approx. 12:30pm on 05/12/2013) and illustrates common staff practices.

During lunch, I hear in the background how an Aunty tells someone (…) that skipping lunch is completely inappropriate [Nada que ver!]. Then I hear another Aunty saying very loudly:

“Oy, Chinita is soo good at chaaaating!! – “Oy, and Michael Jackson, he still hasn’t eaten his salad!”

Aunty Bedford sits at a table to feed someone. She cuts the pasta, takes some of it to his mouth. She does this quickly and doesn’t talk to him’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/06/2013)

Aunty Violeta stands and observes how everybody is eating. She tells them to eat, to have lunch. Aunty Lily passes by several tables and tells children about their posture and manners:

Mickey Mouse

Figure 96: LUNCHTIME (27/11/2013)
AUNTY VIOLETA OBSERVES CHILDREN EAT. AUNTY CELESTE GRABS A CHAIR TO SIT DOWN. IN THE BACKGROUND, AUNTY FUXCIA PUTS EMPTY TRAYS AWAY.
“Lady Roja [and her last name], sit straight, bring your tray up closer”

“You eat with a spoon, all the food, not far away”.

She has her hands on her hips and then in her pockets’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/04/2013)

The learning objective, ‘To incorporate practices related to satisfying feeding needs’, defined the nature of the relationship during mealtimes: children’s behaviour depended on adult’s intervention (e.g. see Figures 85-88). Practitioners were entitled to denounce any behaviour that did follow the normalised standard (‘Oy, and Michael Jackson, he still hasn’t eaten his salad!’). Standing over seated children, or by putting hands on their hips (like Aunty Violeta) set the illusion of a regulatory gaze. However, the idea of total surveillance was illusory, as Figure 96 shows.

Mickey played with her peer’s napkin ignoring the gazes of two aunties. This highlights how the classroom was a flexible site of power during mealtime rituals.

Figure 97: AUNTY CELESTE FEEDING SEVERAL CHILDREN (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 05/12/2013)

Figure 98: AUNTY VIOLETA DURING LUNCHTIME (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 05/12/2013)

Figure 99: AUNTY MARIA BETWEEN TWO TABLES (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 05/12/2013)

SHE PUTS THE TRAYS TOGETHER AND THE BOWL WITH DESSERT (FRUIT) BETWEEN HER LEGS. SHE FEEDS MICHAEL JACKSON THE LAST SPOON OF LUNCH, THEN HANDS HIM DESSERT. SHE THEN TURNS TO GATO (TO HER LEFT) TO CONTINUE FEEDING HER.

SHE GIVES FOOD TO CHILDREN FROM BOTH TABLES, TELLS VIJENJE (AT ONE OF THE TABLES) TO EAT UP.
Aunties adopted different strategies to ensure that children ate all of their food: they sat at one or more tables and insisted that they ate by themselves, quickly, in their seats and in silence. This resonates with Metcalfe et al. (2011) findings about nutrition, and how it has served to inculcate ‘civility’ in schooling contexts. The authors analyse UK dinner-halls and suggest that ‘civility discourses’ (composed by several other [economic] interests) shape ‘healthy, responsible and individualised subjects’ (p. 378). Similarly, practitioners’ strategies link to Grieshaber’s findings about how mealtime rituals ‘function as techniques of discipline through which young children are normalized’ (1997, p. 649). In her study, children negotiated daily and contested adult’s mealtime rituals, making the process of normalisation incomplete and open to resistance.

My presence in this mealtime ritual was disruptive to the normal procedure, as adults did not eat during lunchtime. Adhering with children to rituals (singing signals), following the rules, and eating autonomously in a specific order without spilling, seemed just as bizarre as my vegetarian food in plastic containers. I frequently attempted to avoid children standing up to ask me what I had for lunch and asking if they could try it, because I interpreted that this could be disruptive of the routine i, as the following extract from my fieldnotes illustrates.

‘12:40 Lunch arrives and I go to warm mine up. When I return I decide that it’s better that Aunty Maria decides where I should sit. She looks around, then says: “At the table over there”. There’s no one sitting at the table, there is only one tray. I sit down by myself and eat. (...) Vijenje tells me to write down that they ate for lunch and to record who didn’t eat up their salad. He tells me: “Write down: Bad! Who didn’t have their salad? Mate, and Abeja. Roja didn’t eat it by herself, and she’s a crybaby, tell her!”’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 28/11/2013)

When I subjected myself under Aunty Maria’s practices and the discursive position she wanted me to produce, I understood what it meant to objectivise one’s- self to respond to particular discourses. It sent out a very strong message to everyone in the classroom: First, aunties could move whoever they decided. This aligned with the power Aunty Celeste exercised when she ‘kicked out’ Aunty Violeta and asked whoever wanted to challenge her authority. Second, and linked to the previous idea, although I had a privileged condition, I placed myself under the same regulations as children and therefore similar rules could be applied to me. Third, since I was framing my-self under the same rules as children during mealtimes, I was able to access how children were positioned and positioned themselves in the expected subjective position promoted during mealtimes. Perhaps this may have been the reason why Vijenje asked me to record what had happened during lunch. I became an accomplice to recording whoever was resistant to eating up or to eating by herself. It emphasised the feeling that we all were subjected to ‘the eye’ which assessed our behaviours and attitudes.
II.I Resistance

Some children showed resistance to mealtime routines. Until this point, different examples have been shown (standing up and moving, talking, eating in a different order, among other things), but in this section I add examples in which children used silence, crying, dropping or spilling food (accidentally or deliberately), and resisting eating at all.

12.15 (...) Aunty Violeta straightens up Eloisa and pushes her chair closer to the table. Eloisa shouts: “Ay Aunty, you’re squeezing me”. Aunty Violeta replies that she didn’t squeeze her, that she only pushed her closer. She then sits with Vampira, who doesn’t seem to like green beans. Every time Aunty Violeta tries to give her a spoonful, Vampira moves her face away and makes a disgusted face.

‘12.35. Lunch arrives (...) and I chat with Prima and Vaca. Aunty Lily passes by twice and tells us: “more food, less talking”. Aunty Celeste tells Hache that his grandpa will love him twice as much if he eats up, but he doesn’t open his mouth for a spoonful of tomato.

Practitioners were expected to ensure that children ate everything, as they were accountable for children’s wellbeing, and presumably assumed that these were the only healthy meals they would get in the day. In the two quotes, children did not open their mouths to be fed vegetables. Hache and Vampira were successful in avoiding eating something they did not like or were simply satisfied. These resistances were exceptions, and did not enable child subjects to shift towards a discursive position in which their tastes and wishes were legitimate. Rather, on the contrary, their practices triggered disciplinary power, prompting aunties to position children as vulnerable, immature, and/or dependant of adult intervention.
Disciplinary power operated also over/through practitioners who had to adapt their bodies for efficiency in the classroom during mealtimes. In the following pictures, larger female bodies were re-shaped to furniture that was not designed for them.

Interestingly, as a former practitioner, I was so used to adapting my own body to this type of space that I did not notice how female practitioners’ bodies were shaped in classroom activities until I started recording episodes such as the ones above. The discourse of the Child subject required an Aunty who dedicated herself completely. In the last term of the schoolyear, my drawings showed how the production of this discourse was extenuating and exhausting, invisibilising practitioners’ needs, as in some cases they had to skip their lunch break to continue with the routines and activities.

‘3:38 Milk arrives. Aunty Celeste sits at a table with Prima, Hombre Araña, Vaca and Estefani. She tells them that she’s sleepy and that they don’t have to be noisy. The children giggle’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 26/11/2013)
‘11:55 Lunch has arrived. I sit next to Hello Kitty, Monster High, Peppa Pig, Vaca. From where I’m seated I can see Aunty Celeste, she looks very tired, her eyes are tiny, almost as if she’s falling asleep’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 02/12/2013)

For instance, in figure 105, the extract describes that children giggled possibly because the situation was strange and unexpected: the fact that Aunty Celeste needed to sleep seemed absurd. She did not demand that they followed the rules, and even asked for their sympathy. Aunty Celeste showed her vulnerability to children but it is not clear if they engaged with her. She could not move towards a different subjective position from the one she has been ascribed to (re)produce. Perhaps, falling asleep, keeping her body immobile was a resistance to her production as Aunty.

Finally, disciplinary power also operated over/through child subjects and myself in the classroom. Children and I controlled each other, as in the following example:

‘Earlier, I discovered myself straightening Pelo’s chair. She was eating while sitting on her side and she could spill food over herself. Why am I doing it? Is it some kind of essential help? (…)

Mariposa drinks her milk. She ‘scolds’ her peers, points them out with her index finger and states that if they don’t drink it, they’ll have to go back home by themselves. She shakes and points her finger constantly’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 25/06/2013)

In this extract, different subjects worked in producing the mealtime routine. On the one hand, Mariposa was not only trying to model the ideal child, but also called others out (verbally and physically with her index finger) to respond and follow this discourse. Going home by themselves was the consequence or punishment if they did not drink their milk, the complete opposite to the care and protection they were receiving from aunties. On the other, my impulse to straighten Pelo’s chair was ‘natural’. I ‘discovered’ myself while re-shaping her body and I drew on an Aunty subjectivity to justify my disciplinary practices (‘Is it some kind of essential help?’).
II.II  Manners

According to the curricular planning of the Butterfly classroom, within mealtime routines, children’s behaviour should display the following manners:

- Sitting correctly
- Eating the food by himself
- Saying thank you
- Eating with cutlery and using napkins

Sitting correctly, thanking, and using implements in an appropriate manner was also promoted in other rituals (see planned variable learning activities in Chapter Eight). Their iteration was relevant to maintaining a rationale whereby subjects already knew what their position was. The specification ‘eating with cutlery’ implied that children ate in an uncivilised and immature way (with their hands), which reinforced the discourse about their savage uneducated and uncivilised status. Parallels can be established with the CEMA poster presented in Chapter Five (Figure 38), which showcased appropriate behaviours for children.

The arrangement of the meal tray and the order in which food was eaten, suggested a way and order to consume food and was regulated and reinforced between children and aunties; even my food and my eating practices were assessed:

‘Wanderino comes to tell me off because I’m eating my salad first. He says that I have to eat the main meal first. Aunty Celeste tells Wanderino to sit down, I tell her that he’s there to show me that I have to eat my food first and salad next. Aunty Celeste calls him “Patudo!” Gato agrees with Wanderino, she says: “Food has to be eaten first, then dessert and salad!”

While I’m writing this up Gato comes and scolds me: “Eat your food! Eat your food!” Everybody tells me that they’re going to beat me to finish lunch. I finish my lunch and Chinita says that it cannot be that I finished before them. Then we hear Aunty Lily say loudly and in a high-pitched tone: “Look at that table! What a dirty table!”?

‘I show them that I follow the same rules as they do: I eat first my main meal, then my salad. Vjenje and Mickey congratulate me for eating all up, and in a high-pitched voice shout: “AUUUUNTYYY you ate up aaaaalll your fooooood!” (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/06/2013)

The first quote belongs to my initial attempts to bring lunch and participate in mealtime routines. Although I did not eat with a tray, I brought along my main meal and a salad in separate containers. Children paid a lot of attention to see if I followed the same rules as they did (order, speed, leaving everything clean and tidy). In this extract, conflict emerged precisely because Wanderino broke some (implicit and explicit) rules while reinforcing others. Eating my salad before my main meal created a problem for Wanderino, who felt the need to get up
from his chair and correct me. I thought that if I explained his legitimate reasons for standing up, he would not be scolded, but the effect reinforced Wanderino’s rule transgression. Aunty Celeste interpellated him as ‘*patudo*’, a meddlesome subject that had the courage to tell an adult what to do, the extreme opposite of an obedient, silent and civilised child.

Gato also highlighted how Wanderino’s actions were legitimate; I was the one breaking the rules, not ‘them’. She made the rules explicit loudly and publicly in third person imperative. Her use of wording may have drawn on common knowledge about the classroom rules, which empowered her to continue regulating my practices (‘*Eat your food! Eat your food!*’).

In the second quote, children’s practices resonated with the specification of practitioner’s actions in the learning objective for mealtimes: ‘*Congratulate the children as they gradually finish*’. This particular congratulation possibly drew on the same discursive framing as aunts were using: I was praised in a public way with a loud and high-pitched tone of voice to call everyone’s attention. This extract also shows how I was interpellated as an ‘Aunty’, which I did not challenge. Maybe by taking this position, I enabled Vijenje and Mickey to subvert the subjectivity of ‘the Aunty’ which was not under mealtime rules.

Thanking and using napkins was also continuously promoted. Napkins were generally used to cover dessert and salad and were handed out by staff only. In the following quote the napkin, playfully enabled children to challenge and call~make Aunty Celeste differently:

> ‘*Some children tell Aunty Celeste: “Aunty: napkin”. She replies that she’s not called “Aunty Napkin”, that her name is Aunty Celeste. The children repeat it again, and she repeats her explanation. It makes the children laugh*’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 12/06/2013)

The comedic situation was triggered because of its absurdity, and also because Aunty Celeste was the person who actually called herself ‘Aunty Napkin’ in the first place, and created a threshold through which children could use it to call her back. Our language is vulnerable to be reappropriated and changed (Butler, 1997a), and this potential was taken up by children and Aunty Celeste to resist the available discursive positions during lunchtime. Similarly, mealtimes rules and manners were transformed in other ways:

> ‘*Trays are served, and Aunty Celeste says: “Lentils for the elderly!” Ahh?!*’ [in a joking tone]. Some children laugh, others repeat amongst giggles: “the eeeeeeelderly!”

> *Abeja says: “I’m going to eat like an animal!” and takes a large overflowing spoonful of*

> *During lunch, Aunty Lily sits next to me, Mama Cerdita, Eloisa and Pelo. Lily starts feeding Eloisa, who doesn’t remain seated and competes with us for who will finish first, she says she will. She talks louder in a very high-pitched tone, Aunty Lily tells her: “Shut up,*

---

27 Chilean rhyme, ‘¡Lentejas pa’ las viejas!’ which jokingly pairs lentils with old people.
Abeja and Eloisa playfully exaggerated their eating practices. Both may have subverted the discursive position that they were ascribed to in this particular routine. Abeja defined his style as ‘animal like’ by taking more than he could and making sounds while eating. Eloisa exaggerated (in)voluntarily Aunty Lily’s interpellation of behaving like a lady, silent, obedient, still, and seated in a particular way, through her incessant movement and sudden unexpected burp.

In both quotes Aunty Lily signposted how children trespassed rules: Vijenje called her old, Eloisa did not engage in the same power relationship she had with other children; and these behaviours were inappropriate for the classroom and mealtime. I will comment below on the use of aesthetics (ugly vs. beautiful) and its links to classroom morals.

II.III Autonomous and Individualised Intake linked to Beauty and Strength

The learning objectives and pedagogical purposes built into mealtime rituals entangled with health and social policy agendas, co-existing in ECE as argued in Chapter one, and aiming to provide care for vulnerable children. Strength and growth, defined as becoming an adult, was related to maturation and beauty, which were qualities gained if all of the meals were eaten autonomously.

“Eloisa says ‘I am big!’ to Aunty Violeta. Aunty Violeta replies that she’s going to be big and that ‘she’ll become so pretty’ after eating up the yogurt. She adds that next time she has to eat by herself” (Fieldnotes Extract, 23/04/2013)

It is possible that Eloisa’s emphasis on her ‘being’ big, showed that she was positioning herself as ‘grown up’. Aunty Violeta challenged her, establishing that she was in a state of becoming

---

28 Punchline from ‘El Chavo del Ocho’, a Mexican TV show about a small working-class neighbourhood. Chavo, the main child character, lives in a barrel and exasperates Kiko (another child) with his ideas or comments up to a point where Kiko screams in a high-pitched voice one of his punchlines: ‘¡Cállate, cállate, que me desesperas!’
Strength and Autonomy

‘Vijenje shows me that he can carry two chairs simultaneously, I ask him why he has that strength, he replies that it’s because he ate up his lunch’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 08/04/2013)

‘Kids, kids, kids, you’re going to start shrinking if you don’t eat up’ (...) ‘How else are you going to grow up to the roof?’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 15/04/2013)

Beauty

‘[during lunch I hear in the background] “so beautiful, you’re like a queen! That’s because you eat!” (Fieldnotes Extract, 23/04/2013)

‘Aunty Lily tells Prima that the cucumber is good for making her hair beautiful, and that her “eyes will turn green with the kiwi” (Fieldnotes Extract, 08/05/2013)

Exaggerated statements depicted children’s bodies as radically changing if they did/did not eat their meals. Physical growth became entangled with gendered beauty improvements, which in the case of Aunty Lily and Prima, she possibly shed light on white classed definitions of female beauty (green eyes). As a mestizo society, blue and green eyes are more common in white upper middle- and upper-class sectors. Browner skins and brown eyes are more widely common but also not necessarily conceived as beautiful as the whiter green-eyed minority. Aunty Lily may have drawn on homogenised white discourses of female beauty to convince Prima of eating up her food, although she had brown eyes herself.

In some cases, children used the expectation of autonomous eating to their advantage. They either took food remaining on anonymous trays (practitioners called it ‘stealing’), or they shared amongst peers. These following extracts show how Abeja created secondary adjustments (Corsaro, 1990) by subverting the rationale of individualistic possession; working towards solidarity and sharing by being accomplices of each other’s’ resistance:

‘Chinita doesn’t want her dessert. Abeja asks her if she likes it, she says she doesn’t. Abeja asks her if he can have it, she says yes. Abeja starts eating and Chinita tells me what I’m writing about. I tell her that it’s about this, she explains: “It’s because I don’t want anymore”, then adds: “Write that down, write down that I don’t want any more”. She asks me to add that she told Abeja to use a napkin after finishing dessert’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 22/05/2013)

‘[during morning milk] Abeja comes to show me his bread. I ask him what he’s eating, he says that it’s bread with margarine and puts it almost under my nose. I tell him, “hm, how yummy.” He breaks off a piece and gives it to me. I eat it and tell him that it’s good’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 25/06/2013)

In the first quote, Chinita showed solidarity with Abeja. She shared her dessert and explained that this decision was not a whim, but because she was well-fed. By showing herself as knowledgeable and argumentative towards me, Chinita showed how her reasoning was relevant to be recorded in my fieldnotes, and possibly to other (adult) readers. She explained
and informed us about the reasons underpinning her actions. This practice reflected Chinita not as a vulnerable child. Rather, she may have been aware of the rationale and underpinning discourses of her environment. She legitimised her practices by guaranteeing that Abeja ate according to the expected manners, reminding him to use his napkin.

In the second quote, I became Abeja’s accomplice by sharing food with him. By eating what he offered me, we may have shifted the rationale of female adult bodies who did not eat in the classroom during mealtimes, nor ate the same food children did. Although this episode emerged because of the regulatory framing of the mealtime ritual, sharing food was not based on familiar practices. On the contrary, talking, eating together and enjoying the flavour of bread showed how relational power was fluid and could be more horizontal during mealtimes in the classroom.

III Summary

In the Butterfly classroom mealtime rituals were framed by the education and social policies that configured a disciplinary space in which docile bodies (of children and practitioners) were shaped to produce ‘the vulnerable child’ and ‘the protective Aunty’. Different examples of the daily performance of mealtime habits were presented, and its civilising effects were unpicked. Analyses contribute to other literature examining school meals and their disciplining effect on children (Grieshaber, 1997; Metcalfe et al., 2011; Pike, 2010).

Discourses of care were constituted by dichotomist notions of vulnerability vs. protection, and framed activities of nutrition for children: First, civilising ‘vulnerable child’ subjects through developing manners and autonomous capacity for self-care. The educated vulnerable child was produced using rituals of ‘habits’ that operated as pedagogical strategies. The acquisition and (re)production of manners, such as politeness, cleanliness, and correct body use, was made possible through repetition and reinforcement.

Children’s wellbeing and development towards autonomous self-care was tightly linked to practitioner’s practices of care. ‘The vulnerable child’ could only develop her autonomy with the closely regulated help of ‘the protective Aunty’. The reproduction of these different discourses through repetition also enabled the emergence of different types of resistance, in which both children and practitioners explored other discursive positions.

However, because practitioners were accountable for the pastoral care of children, conflict arose when conditions were not fulfilled, either because the environment was not suitable or
because of resistance. Similarly, Tobin (1997) denounced how practitioners, whilst ‘leading’ children to control bodies and desires, put their ‘own bodies and desires at risk or erasure. The preschool teacher is herself disembodied’ (p. 19). Practitioners sacrificed themselves for their herd to be saved (wellbeing) in order to save themselves (acknowledgement of ‘good’ female carer) relating through pastoral power (Foucault, 1982). This effort of overseeing and caring for each of her students, links also to the origins of the Chilean female practitioner, who served a secular liberal state influenced by a Catholic rationale (Abett de la Torre, 2011).

Mealtime rituals set a common pedagogical ground for the acquisition of other skills. Certain pedagogical practices, related to body training, iteration and the regulatory gaze, that were repeated routinely in ‘regular learning activities’, were also drawn upon in ‘variable learning activities’ which will be developed in the following chapter.
In this chapter I reconstruct one variable learning activity, sewing with a cardboard template, which took place in July 2013, just when the first phase of my fieldwork was ending. The activity extended for approximately one hour (11am-12pm) and involved 28 children and three members of staff. As a participant observer, I took part in the activity. The number of participants may have varied throughout the activity, given that a child from another classroom was left there for the day, and practitioners (from this classroom and others) moved frequently in and out.

I did not have access to the planning for this activity, as everyday planning was quickly archived for accountability purposes. Nonetheless, I had access to ACP that outlined the pedagogical work plan of the Butterfly classroom for the school year 2013, which stated (p. 18):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Expected Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Specification of the Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Indicators for Assessment (Observable Behaviours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL FORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nº 1 To coordinate with more precision and efficiency their fine motor skills, exercising and developing the necessary coordination, according to their interests in exploring, in the graphic expression of their representations and recreation.</td>
<td>- Cuts with scissors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCLEUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop fine motor skills through graphic expression</td>
<td>- Colours inside the lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop fine motor skills whilst constructing/building.</td>
<td>- Dots/picks inside the lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR SKILLS AND HEALTHY STYLES</td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop fine motor skills in their representations</td>
<td>- Assembles jigsaw puzzles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Performs folding activities [origami]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Copies simple figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although sewing with a string and needle was not explicitly stated as a learning outcome, developing fine motor skills was emphasised. These aims were framed by Learning Goals for the category of motor skills (Motricidad) in LPM (MINEDUC, 2008):

29 Consent and authorisation of the child and her family were sought and acquired. Unfortunately, I had to assign her a pseudonym, as she could not choose it.
The documents suggest that children aged around five years are prepared for and capable of performing ‘more precise movements with [their] fingers and use tools like scissors and needle’. As other authors have suggested (Peralta, 2012; Silva, 2002), the LPM display its developmental psychology foundations, establishing particular standards of learning and achievement according to age/developmental stages. This was especially true for age groups four to six, as children were expected to be better prepared for school (Adlerstein, 2012; Umayahara, 2011). Children of the Butterfly classroom were starting school (Reception stage) the following year. During this period, many of them were sitting entrance exams and were assessed by staff for mid-term report cards.

School readiness notions linger throughout Chilean ECE and its CFECE (Adlerstein, 2012; Tokman, 2010) but are especially evident in LPM. It assumes that developing the fine motor skill of holding a needle and sewing is beneficial in the short term for writing, and in the long-term for literacy and numeracy skills.

For this chapter, instead of analysing a variable activity related to numeracy or literacy skills (learning numbers, writing numerals, counting, separating syllables, inventing stories, amongst others), I deliberately chose a less obvious one; the reasons are twofold. First, if school readiness and maturation discourses were promoted in variable activities, these permeated every practice and interaction, even if these were not made explicit in planning or oral conversations. Second, practices like sewing, which were initially part of progressivist pedagogies (Montessorian, Deweian), have been entangled with developmentally-led pedagogies (Walkerdine, 1990), making each an essentialised truth about how child subjects become autonomous in their everyday lives. Consequently, the learning activity and episode analysed in this chapter (sewing with a template) was representative of a planned variable activity and it displayed fragmented and hybrid dynamics.
Structure and Rationale of the Episode

The title of the re-constructed episode (‘¡Para abajo, para abajo!’) comes from practitioner’s and children’s statements. It reflects how oral and physical practices were supposed to provide direction while iteratively shaping children’s subjectivity. The structure of the chapter interweaves evidence with analysis by separating the episode into four parts. At the end of each part, I invite the reader to pause, look closely and untangle with me the different extracts while thinking theoretically (Koro-Ljungberg, 2012).

To understand the classroom’s rationale and how other ‘voices’ (Mazzei, 2009) of~in the classroom influenced how subjectivities were (re)produced, resisted or transformed; different extracts of ‘data’ were entangled (curriculum - official and planned - as well as reflective diary). This approach shows the overlapping and messiness of the classroom dynamics, how subjects constantly assumed different positions and relations, and shifted within them.

The following table displays how the different ‘data’ sources about the episode were transcribed. Inspired by the rationale(s) of graphic novels, the narrative of the episode is (re)constructed with different extracts of ‘data’ which aim to complement each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend for the Episode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes Extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum – CFECE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1 – Initiation

Re-constructing the Episode: ‘¡Para abajo, para abajo!’

The activity of sewing is up.

Aunty Bedford: SIIILEEEENCEEEE
Barney: Silenceeee
Aunty Bedford: Look what I have here (shows a sewing template made out of beer can box cardboard)

Figure 107: SEWING TEMPLATE

Everybody is talking at the same time. Practitioners tell children to sit at different tables. Aunty Lily says out loud that it’s four friends per table. Children continue talking amongst themselves.

They giggle and chairs move in the background. Aunties talk too.

Aunty Bedford says that she’s going to give [the sewing material] to whoever is sitting correctly, straight and in silence.

Aunty Celeste: Ooooonoh! (in surprised tone). What do you have in your hand? [asks Aunty Bedford] Is it a square?

Children and Aunties suggest other geometric figures, and Aunty Bedford says that it’s a circle.

Aunty Bedford: AAAAAAAAAAH! (Background noise decreases) so, what do you know?
Aunty Lily: OOOOOOY! (surprised tone) look at Aunty Bedford’s circle?! It has some little holes. What may these be for?
Aunty Bedford: To look! (puts it in front of her eyes and watches through one hole)
Barney: Nooo!
Aunty Lily: To put your tongue through it!
Giggles in response.
Anonymous 1: no, no, no, no, no!
Aunty Celeste: Maybe it’s for blowing (blows loudly through one hole)
More giggles
Several Children: NOOOOO! *(In choir)*
Prima: No, it’s for putting the string.
Aunty Bedford: To put wool through it, ok? How do I put it through?
Anonymous 2: Into the hole.
Aunty Bedford: Into the hole, but how do I put the wool through it?

Some children stand up, want to walk towards Aunty Bedford. Aunty Lily warns them.

Anonymous 3: With the needle. *[holds up the plastic needle]*
Aunty Bedford: With the neeeeedle. And how are we going to do this? *(asks something to Aunty Lily, then starts showing how to sew in a template)* Ok, so I puuut the neeeeedle throooough the... how do you call it? Orifice?
Aunty Lily: Orifice.
Aunty Bedford: Ooorifiice. *(continues modeling the sewing movement)* And, I pull it until the eeeeeeend, look... Like that. I tuuuuurrrn it arouuuund again, and I put it agaaaain into the orifiiiiiiicce. And puuuull. Because if you start to ... put it into any hole, it’s going to be ... badly sewn. It has to be in order. One hole first, then the other, then the one that foooolllows. Not skipping towards the ones, the ones that are in front, ok? Like that, I pull my striiiiiing, I put it iiiiiin, and puuuuull until the end.
Aunty Lily: We’re always going to put the needle downwards, ok?
Aunty Bedford: and puuuuull. Is it ordered if I sew like this? *(shows a template with sewn circle)*
Some children: Yes!

Autonomy

That the child consolidates the desire for autonomy depends on the possibility that he has to act, rehearse and acquire security in his own actions. Autonomy is tightly linked to processes that are initiated at an early age and that throughout the first years manifest in the capacity to explore, adventure and act, as well as in the exercise of giving one’s view, suggest, contribute, decide, direct oneself and self-regulate, coexisting with other and educating oneself within socially shared values.

*(Extract of Definition of the ‘Autonomy’ Learning Nucleus, MINEDUC, 2001a, p. 36)*

Children talk amongst themselves, murmurs and giggles. Aunty Celeste: We’ll be able to sew our own buttons after this.
Aunty Bedford: If we learn to do this, we’re going to learn to sew our own buttons! With string.
Aunty Lily: OOOOOOOOH! (Excited tone) Of course, because whenever your buttons fall out of your apron, you’ll be able to tell your mums: “Mum, I know how to sew!” – Why did you loosen up your hair? *(Talking to Roja who loosened her pig tales)*

Anonymous 1: My mum knows how to sew.

Aunty Lily: We’re going to learn to sew now, do you want to learn to sew?
Untangling the Episode: Part 1 – Initiation

Staff changed their ways of interacting during the brief initiation, where they presented the material and explained the activity. Their suggestions on how to use the material (to look and blow through the holes) showed a playful and silly facet, different to the ‘protective Aunty’ role. This was received with giggles from the children.

Still, their laughter might have also been triggered by the absurdity of the situation: aunties acted as if nobody had ever seen a circle cardboard with holes before. Children’s quick responses display that most of them knew about sewing, or at least that their suggestions definitely were not accurate. As described in chapter four, this type of motivational interaction assumed an easily impressed child, who needed to have her attention captured to learn.

Aunty Bedford checked her wording (‘orifice’) publicly with Aunty Lily, and reinforced Aunty Lily’s position as an authority figure. Her knowledge may have been linked to professional hierarchies within the classroom, as she was the only university-trained educator, versus the public (state funded) secondary school-trained assistants. Very early on in the study (my second visit, 8th April 2013) Abeja informed me that if I misbehaved, they would ‘kick me out!’ When I asked him, who would actually do it, he replied ‘Aunty Lily.’

Aunty Celeste’s input on the usefulness of learning how to sew is important. The implication for autonomous self-care became evident (children would be able to sew their own buttons), and may also have been related to purposes of everyday life. In contrast, Aunty Lily emphasised a specific type of self-care: the relevance of learning to sew was useful for having tidy aprons. Choosing an apron as a relevant piece of clothing underlined the production of the ideal discourse of the neat and tidy child in this (and future) classroom(s).

Children used templates made out of cardboard. The string was knotted to the template and colourful plastic needles were not sharp. According to the aim of ‘developing fine motor skills’, the material was adapted to smaller (young children’s) hands. It pre-assumed that these younger hands only had developed gross motor skills, and to acquire precision, smaller size, less risk and malleable resources had to be introduced. By using colourful material (strings and needles) assumptions about what was attractive and pertinent to ‘children’ was evidenced.
Finally, the template was to be sewn in a linear and ordered manner, in a left to right direction, hinting at laterality, which is one of the basic cognitive competencies when teaching literacy according to LPM (MINEDUC, 2008).

END OF UNTANGLING PART 1
Part 2 – Help!

**Aunty Lily:** We’re going to learn to sew now. Do you want to learn to sew?

Some children respond yes, but they get lost within murmurs, shouts and conversations that are happening simultaneously. Someone starts singing ‘Tiburón’. The needle is not knotted to the string, so it frequently falls off and children ask for help. Many ‘Auuunty’ calls are shouted out simultaneously.

Practitioners go around the classroom, checking that everyone is sewing. In some cases, they put the string in the needle, at other times they make the children start all over again because they didn’t sew in the correct order.

I help children to thread the string in the needle. Several children ask me for help, to sew ‘correctly’. I tell them that I cannot help them with that, but while I’m saying that I feel horrible. I know that I can help, why am I denying it to them?

Because I’m afraid to look like an Aunty.

Several children call out for Aunty Lily. She says that she’s coming. There are different screams in the background, Aunties’ are heard amongst them:

‘downwards, always downwards’ ‘The one that comes next!’

In fact, the staff didn’t teach the children how to sew, they gave them the material and told them to sew the whole circle. I know that if I help, I will start showing them strategies and explaining as if I was teaching how to do it. How is help different from teaching in this case?
There is persistent calling of Aunties by the children:

‘Auuuntyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyy!’

After some minutes, Aunty Lily tells them: ‘Don’t-stand-up’ Amongst the calls and conversations, some children cry.

Aunty Bedford: ‘There, there, well done, always in the hole that follows’

There is constant and overlapping background conversations, many children calling Aunties out. Many sounds of movement (running shoes, tables and chairs moving) and of children getting up and asking for help.

But help can come from any person, it doesn’t have to be/you don’t qualify as an Aunty, or do you? So I try to help some in a way less pedagogically possible.

If that’s at all possible, I rather think now that it’s more some kind of illusion. My intention of helping will be tainted by my belief that they have to learn and understand certain things in order to achieve the task successfully. Even if it’s just modelling, someone has to do it.
**Aunty Lily:** “Aaah!? What happened here?”
(Disapproving tone, pointing towards the template) You have to pull it out from that little hole... But you skipped one, look, you crossed it. Why did you do it!? *(Louder, for everyone to hear)* Kids, you have to follow the little hole that comes next, you don’t have to cross the template

Background conversations, calling aunties for help – ‘Auuuuntyyyyy’ - never ceases.

**Aunty Bedford:** WELL DONE LITTLE MIIIIICKEY!
**Aunty Lily:** Why did you skip all the holes?
**Aunty Celeste:** But you skipped all the holes!
**Aunty Lily:** To the side, to the side... downwards, downwards.

**Figure 111:** AUNTY CELESTE SHOWING HOW SOMEONE DID NOT SEW CORRECTLY

**Figure 112:** AUNTIES CHECK EACH TABLE HOW CHILDREN ARE WORKING AND THREAD THEIR NEEDLES

**Figure 113:** MARIO BROS (LEFT) AND ANTONELLA (RIGHT) ARE SEWING ACROSS THE TEMPLATE.
Untangling the Episode: Part 2 – Help!

In this section of the episode, the iterative re-production of particular actions was emphasised. Staff’s instructions were based on directing children’s actions down to a micro-level (left, right, up, down). Every time a child did not follow directions for sewing, they generated a small conflict which went beyond simply following the instructions.

An extract from a similar learning activity, which involved sewing a CD with string that would later be embellished and used as Christmas tree decoration, can help us unpick further the role of adults in this type of activities.

Figure 114: ‘SEWING’ A CD

‘Mate attempts to sew his CD with the help of Aunty Lily. It seems that she feels that he takes too long. She tells him to hurry up “you take so long to think, and to do this you don’t even need to think!”’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/12/2013)

Aunty Lily (hand at the left) holds CD whilst Vampira (hand to the right) attempts to sew into the orifice. (Fieldnotes Extract, 05/12/2013)

The behaviourist assumptions of the previous quote, not needing to think about how to put the needle in and sew a CD, but rather, just doing it, were possibly related to ‘activity’ (triggering development/learning) assumptions that framed the episode. Children were left to sew by themselves, but practitioners immediately moved towards tables, assuming that they ‘needed’ help. This practice led to the production of the facilitating Aunty, inciting child subjects to start calling them out because the string needed to be threaded.

Relationship between adult and child

‘(…) it is also suggested that the adult keeps an attentive attitude and that when he interacts with the child, he uses a clear and simple language; adapts his body posture to the situation they are living. Above all, adults have to observe and interact according to their developmental level, being attentive to what they think, their needs and interests, seeking to favour learning experiences according to each child’

(Extract from Statement about Relationship between Adults and children, PEI 2013)
Although children may have had problems holding the needle, the fact that they were not sewing simultaneously may also have been problematic. Most children needed individual help, which contradicted the rationale of mass sewing; the Child subject needed the Aunty next to her to do it ‘right’.

The child-centred approaches of the nursery’s curricular framing also emphasised how practitioners had to observe children and adapt to ‘their developmental level’. These extracts resonate with Jones et al.’s (2010) analysis of how practitioner’s observation, based on ‘the paper child’, echoed with past progressivist discourses, entangling past and present through assessment gazes.

Child subjects, positioned at a lower level than adults, required personalised learning experiences with aunties. The photographs of the episode show how practitioners moved and shaped their bodies (bowed, kneeled, sat) to attend to children’s needs. Children also ‘congregated’ around practitioners to get help with threading or doing the task. The following drawings (of the Christmas tree decoration activity) reflect that this is something that happened frequently in desk-work-type learning activities.

Figure 115: AUNTY LILY SITS ON A CHAIR AND IS SURROUNDED BY CHILDREN. SHE HELPS EACH CHILD WITH THE TASK (HOLDS THE CD). MANY CHILDREN ASK SIMULTANEOUSLY, SHE REPLIES THAT SHE DOESN’T HAVE 100,000 EYES LIKE A FLY.
Returning to the cardboard template episode, I also became part of this dynamic. Some children asked for my help and I threaded their needles. It seemed to go smoothly but it triggered a conflict for me as my diary reveals.

My refusal to help sew ‘correctly’ triggered mixed feelings (‘I tell them that I cannot help them with that, but while I’m saying that I feel horrible. I know that I can help, why am I denying it to them? Because I’m afraid to look like an Aunty’). Threading the needle felt like it ‘just’ was not enough help, but I also feared that if I offered (what I defined as) ‘help’, I might become an Aunty. ‘Helping’ became an ambiguous and complicated term for me, possibly because I related it to a ‘facilitator’ role that I developed as a practitioner. In this case, my understanding of ‘help’ was linked to my pedagogical ‘self’, and the hybridity of the binaries was made evident: providing it (or not) positioned subjects within a binary, the knowledgeable or the ignorant, the teacher or learner.

Children’s open interpellation of ‘Aunty’ could be received by and shape any subject who responded to it. Although I was not named as an Aunty, I was approached as a knowledgeable female adult subject and I fought to shift towards a subjectivity that was more obvious and clear for me: the practitioner. In the photographs, I sat at a table like other adults, and, although I was not surrounded like practitioners, many children came to ‘my table’ to ask for help.

My pedagogical judgement –though not explicitly stated – still shaped what I did and how I related to children. It affected my reading of interactions and practices. For instance, I focused on the lack of explanation on practitioner’s side, whilst also assuming that modelling had to be
done in order to successfully achieve the task. My records emphasised my resistance to do Aunty, fearing that it may take over and put at risk my researcher self.

END OF UNTANGLING PART 2
Part 3 – Chinita and Vampira

Figure 118: DURING SEWING ACTIVITY.

While some children sew, others move around to request help.
(At the back (far left) in the corner, I am sitting at a table with Vampira, Camilo and Chinita)

Chinita comes up to the table where I am sitting and has an upset face.

Chinita has problems, I tell her that Vampira can help her out. Chinita asks her, then tries to sew again. She gets it wrong.

Vampira gets angry, makes noises (‘tss’) and holds her head as if disappointed or needing patience.

Ximena: (To Chinita) What happened? You had progressed so much.
Chinita: Yeeeah. It’s just that, just that I made a mistake. (With a frustrated tone)
Vampira: It’s downwards, let me, give me the needle.... Nooooo, Chinita!
Aunty Celeste: (simultaneously to another person) Nooo, downwards!
Vampira: Chinita! Chinita! But Chinita! But Chinita! Look, look, look! Give it to mee, downwards, did you listen to me? This one goes here. Look. It goes downwards. But Chinita, Chinita, Chinita, I’m going to ...

Figure 119: CHINITA ATTEMPTING TO SEW ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONS WITH VAMPIRA.
Aunty Lily: Why did you take out the brushes? Whoever has finished, can take out a storybook and read it whilst seated.

Chinita: I finished.

Vampira: don’t-take-it-out, ok? Don’t-take-it out. NO! That’s the little hole! No, downwards! Downwards! DOWNWAAAAARDS! But this one goes downwards!! Downwards, downwards, downwaaaards! Chinita! Chinita, don’t! Chinita! Downwards, downwards, downwards, downwards!

Chinita has sewn across the template which does not correspond to the expectation. Her [Vampira’s] voice tone sounds more and more angry. ‘Do I do it for you?’ (It gets gradually higher pitched).

Vampira: Do I take it out for you? [the knotted string]

Children have gone into the closet; there are a lot of loud screams and noises of running around.

Aunty Lily: Get out of the closet! What did I tell you? I said that you could get storybooks, nothing other than storybooks!

Vampira: Don’t-get-up Chinita.

Vampira says to Chinita:

“sit down, s-i-t d-o-w-n. Sit down, sit down. Ah and take this out, look, take this out and I teach you”

These are the comments she made while Chinita tried to do the exercise. Vampira unties everything to teach her.

“There, don’t stand up, Chinita. You show it to the Aunty. You show it to the Aunty”

Vampira finishes Chinita’s work and tells her to show it to Aunty.

She insists: “Tell her that you did it”

Vampira: You’re showing it to Aunty, ok? You’re showing it to Aunty, ok? [the template]

Chinita: Should I show it to Aunty, then?

Vampira: Aunty Lily! Aunty Lily! (shouting out loud to be heard). Aunty Celeste isn’t here, so show it to Aunty Lily then. Show it to Aunty Lily, show it to Aunty Lily. Show it to Aunty Lily, [tell her] that you did it.
Different conversations in the background, mostly between children.

**Aunty Lily:** Did all the children work? Well done, Chinita!

**Chinita:** I did well.

Vampira starts calling Chinita, first in a low tone, then shouting. Staff continues repeating downwards and congratulating with “well done” everyone who finishes.
Untangling the Episode: Part 3 – Vampira and Chinita

Attempting to help children achieve what was expected of them without disturbing the rationale of the classroom, led me to suggest to Chinita to ask Vampira for help. Vampira did engage with it, but not in the way I expected. Vampira immediately assumed a role in which she directed Chinita with similar strategies used by aunties. This could be related to the way learning was understood and performed within this space. She did not want to disrupt the rationale of the classroom whilst also ascribing to a way of performing herself and in relation to others. The interaction between Vampira and Chinita resulted in the iterative repetition of orders, which were recreated and regulated by a peer who became ‘Aunty’. This section could be read as a normative (re)production of a developmentally informed discourse of the Child.

Nonetheless, it is important to ask if Vampira’s subjectivity shifted beyond the Aunty position, even though she was drawing on the same practices used by aunties. Her suggestion to Chinita, to present the end product whilst telling aunties that she had done her own sewing, possibly illustrates that Vampira was aware of how this would be perceived positively by practitioners. The final sewing product and the performance of sewing reflected the successful production of the developing child, as described in the curriculum.

END OF UNTANGLING PART 3
Aunty Bedford asks Roja why she loosened her pigtail, then starts calling for Prima (14:45). Different background noises, mostly conversations, movement of chairs, tables and running.

**Aunty Bedford:** Where is Prima? Prima! Prima! She’s not in the classroom, I’m going to check the bathroom.

**Staff look for Prima, Aunty Bedford notices that she can’t see her. They look for her, she’s hiding under a table. I can see her from where I am. She [Prima] doesn’t come out when she’s called and she knows that she’s being looked for. I want to tell them where she is, I don’t know why but I also want to keep the secret.**

**Prima stays under the table.**

**Aunty Lily:** Did you find her in the bathroom?

**Aunty Bedford:** No.

**Aunty Lily:** Maybe she is in the bathroom, or the closet?

**Aunty Bedford:** No

**Aunty Lily:** Prima [Last name]! Prima [Last name]! Who has seen Prima [Last name]?

Someone points down under a table.

**Aunty Lily:** Aaaah, how funny, huh?

**Aunty Bedford:** Come and finish your work, come on!

Aunty Bedford notices that Prima has her hand tight, like a fist (it could look like she’s hiding something), she remains under the table.

**Aunty Bedford:** What do you have in your hand? Show me! (Prima resists) Look at Prima! She works, and works badly, and she doesn’t want to show me what’s in her hand! Come on, Prima!

Laughter and conversations in the background.

**Aunty Bedford:** She’s got nothing in her hand, but she doesn’t show it upfront!

**Is it because the framing of the classroom, taking care of children and protecting them, assumes that the adults have to have an all-knowing and vigilant position, which they now where each and every child is? And I, as an adult, share or can understand that concern?**

**Figure 121:** AUNTY CELESTE CHECKING BATHROOM, PRIMA IS HIDING UNDER A TABLE.
Aunty Celeste: Prima, come. COOOOME! Do you want me to come and get you?! ... Oh my daughter, come to me!

Aunty Bedford takes hold of both Prima’s arms and lifts her out, placing her in front of her so that she looks upwards toward Aunty Bedford’s gaze.

Aunty Bedford asks Prima to show her template. From where I’m sitting I can see a mess of string and knots. Prima blushes and looks at her feet.

She then goes to Aunty Lily, who tries to disentangle everything and make Prima sew ‘in the right manner’.

Prima is taken to Aunty Lily to finish her sewing template.
Untangling the Episode: Part 4 – Under a Table

In this section, it is unclear if Prima was under the table either out of frustration because she could not do what she was asked to do, or if it was because she did not want to participate. What was clear and disrupted the rationale of the activity, was her hiding under a table and hiding her work. She was not visible, not sitting straight or still, and her template was knotted and entangled, a messy object that she hid from aunties’ regulatory and evaluating gaze.

Aunty Bedford noticed Prima’s disappearance and when she found her, she tried to resort to different strategies and interpellations to make her submit to the order. Prima ignored other aunties’ calls, and was only ‘seen’ after she was pulled from underneath a table. Prima’s resistance towards the sewing activity and rationale interfered with the learning activity procedure.

However, although she disrupted the patterns of teaching-learning to sew by making a mess of her string-template and hiding from the supervisory gaze, she did not trigger changes within the discursive practices of staff. Prima’s actions (her messy sewing and hiding) were negatively and publicly assessed. She seemed embarrassed. She did not follow any of the instructions and therefore had been unsuccessful in producing her template.

Arguably, Prima’s body and subjectivities shifted twice, first while hiding under a table making herself invisible; and second when Aunty Bedford took hold of both Prima’s arms and lifted her out, placing her in front of her so that she looked upwards toward Aunty Bedford’s gaze. Her exposure appeared to serve as a disciplinary example, and her resistance served to reaffirm that there was just one way of sewing. Simultaneously, she also showed herself as a developing child in the ‘wrong’ way, expressed in her messy sewing template that she chose to hide. This discursive position served as the opposite of an ideally developing child, setting up the binary between right and wrong.

END OF UNTANGLING PART 4
Trenzando “Para Abajo!”

This last section braids “trenzando’ (Gonzalez, 2001; Saavedra, 2011) the episode as a whole. The four breaks of the episode enable to identify available discursive positions in the classroom during this variable learning activity, informed by the curricular framework. The table below summarises the main points. In each column, the main arguments for each part are captured. In the final row, I stitched together what kind of discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ were produced in this variable learning activity (sewing a template):

- the developing child – a developing subject who required protection and stimulation (e.g. a plastic colourful needle) to acquire this skill in order to successfully learn at school; and
- the facilitating Aunty – a facilitating subject who arranged the space and resources while overlooking how to satisfy the never-ending needs of her students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 - Initiation</th>
<th>Part 2 – Help!</th>
<th>Part 3 – Chinita and Vampira</th>
<th>Part 4: Under a Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child was an active subject whose attention had to be captured and regulated.</td>
<td>Child was in development, both physical and cognitive, had to use appropriate materials to develop skills. Therefore required (female) practitioner support and assembled around her/them.</td>
<td>My intention to promote collaborative learning between Chinita and Vampira led to the reproduction of reiterative behaviourist practices that were already implemented by staff.</td>
<td>Prima’s resistance to be visible (hiding under a table), and also sewed her template not as expected (entangled with knots), exposed the opposite ideal of what was expected from her: to be obedient, still, autonomous and a fast learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Achievements (&quot;Logros de Aprendizaje&quot;) established sewing as mastering a given set of skills, relevant competence for writing.</td>
<td>Activity drew on Tylerian rationale, a reiterative and cumulative process: water dripping upon a stone wears it away. Learning had to be repeated and shaped according to a standard. This lead to shaping the learner as well.</td>
<td>Assumptions of co-constructed learning may also have a particular power relationship amongst learner and teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible link with school readiness expectations. Developed in a logical instructional sequence.</td>
<td>Type of material was adapted to physical ‘conditions’ (e.g. size) and its appearance depended on the characteristic ‘interests’ and ‘tastes’ of children at this age (e.g. colours, shapes)</td>
<td>However, Vampira finished Chinita’s work and told her to state that it was hers. This may reflect Vampira’s awareness on how the perfect production of the sewing template also implied that the individual sewing had done her-self adequately. By suggesting to Chinita to call the template her own, she also provided Chinita the possibility of being acknowledged by staff. It also reinforced the idea that a child’s learning had be to acknowledged by an adult in order to be ‘learning’.</td>
<td>This conflict triggered different practices of aunties, that assumed that they should be ‘easily resolved’, ‘managed’ and/or ‘treated’ (Grieshaber, 2004): first by having her ‘under the radar’, second by forcing her out from underneath the table, third by exposing her sewing template and making her sew as expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first part presented the setting, where the discursive positions of ‘the facilitating Aunty’ and ‘the developing child’ were established as the expected subjectivities to be produced. Discourses of ‘the vulnerable child’ overlapped with ‘the developing child’, which produced a particular relationship with ‘the Aunty’. She facilitated development in a pre-established sequence and simultaneously ensured that every child was protected and performed practices that denoted that they were learning.

Regarding ‘the Aunty’, the second part of the episode disentangled her subjective position. Her facilitating role became more evident when child subjects engaged in a relationship of dependence by explicitly demanding practitioner’s help. Their bodies were used to move, bend and kneel down to (child-sized) tables, to check how each child was sewing her template. The instructions-feedback did not provide information for children on how to solve autonomously the task. Rather, it re-enforced pastoral power (Foucault, 1982) through a relation of dependence between learner – teacher and ‘in need’ – caretaker. Under a notion of support-help, ‘the Aunty’ was expected to supervise children’s micro actions and regulate these according to the ideal ‘developing child’. Her protection ensured children’s success.

Children were acknowledged as ‘doing’ the activity: achieving the goal, passing to a next level, as well as ‘doing’ what young children had to ‘do’ and therefore ‘be’ within their developmental stage. A binary was established between the ‘ideal’ (autonomous, fast and obedient) and the ‘lacking’ (slow, disobedient and in need of support) child learner. Behaviourist practices were employed on whoever deviated from the pattern (informed by a - Tylerian rationale), in which repetition throughout time shaped the subject at the end.

As a female adult and former practitioner, I also became interpellated accordingly. My reflective records serve to illustrate tensions between help versus facilitation. My experience could illustrate how female adults may be pulled into ‘the Aunty’ discursive position when engaging within ECE settings, where female adults’ narratives were pre-defined according to maternal(istic) demands. Contradictions on how to ‘help’ Chinita illustrated this last point, as I felt ethically and pedagogically compelled to help her resolve the task. I drew upon pedagogic narratives of facilitation (collaborative help among knowledgeable peers) in order to resolve the tension I was confronted with.

In the third part, I named Vampira into a facilitator role. Her subjectivity shifted and she became an ‘Aunty’ by drawing on similar practices: oral instructions (‘Downwards’ ‘Chinita, don’t!’),
disappointed body expression, and examining gaze. Consequently, Vampira also perpetuated the discourses of ‘the developing child’ and ‘the facilitating Aunty’.

However, Vampira was knowledgeable about the meaning and effects of practitioner’s approval of the sewn template. As long as Chinita said that she had sewn the template correctly, she would pass the task and would not require further adult attention. This practice could be interpreted as a ‘secondary adjustment’ (Goffman, appropriated by Corsaro, 1990), i.e. finding ways to break the rules while seemingly adhering to these. The concept comes from research in prisons and Corsaro (1990) adapted it to his work on children’s ‘underworld’ cultures. However, Corsaro’s reading produced the classroom as a structure that could not change and defined subjects’ practices within a dichotomist rationale, either following or not the rules. On the contrary, Vampira’s help was not an ‘underground’ practice, but visible and out there for everyone to see and hear, within a space that provided the illusion of surveillance.

Vampira also made evident how the iterative practice of sewing a template implied the iterative production of the developing child who acquired relevant skills. She unveiled how this child was actually an illusion, encouraging Chinita to reclaim herself as a subject by taking advantage of the rationale of the learning activity that aimed to produce them as the ‘developing child’. Vampira’s advice ‘Tell her that you did it’, rather than underground resistance, may illustrate how she acknowledged the setting, and queered up the rules through complicity and ethical empathy.

The third and fourth parts illustrated the difference between the ideal developing child (i.e. achieving the task successfully with a certain degree of autonomy) and the Child subject who fell out of the developmental trajectory, who did not have a fluid progression and escaped the supervisory gaze. For a period, Prima and her template were invisible. Perhaps she understood how her knots –both in her developmental trajectory and her linear sewing- were a problem and attempted to hide them. But her hiding was read as a deliberate resistance to the learning setting, the developmental gaze, and dependant relationship to aunties; having unforeseen effects. She was yanked and publicly exposed; her subjectivity was abjected and used to illustrate how her narrative was ‘wrong’.

Un-doing Prima was powerfully productive, because it perpetuated the discursive position of ‘the facilitating Aunty’ as an omnipresent and all-knowing subject; and the ideal ‘developing child’ seeking help while obediently following the pre-established path of learning. The production of
the disruptive-non-learner/obedient-learning child was bound to a facilitating Aunty, who either helped~facilitated~modelled, or closely regulated each movement.

The cardboard template is a metaphor for the production of ‘the developing child’ in the ECE classroom. This activity allowed me to unpick the structure and practices in which discourses of ‘the developing child’ were produced, resisted and/or transformed. Subjects became correctly developing ‘children’ if they followed a pre-defined linear trajectory by repeating particular practices, arranged as an iteration that enforced such a pre-defined trajectory with disciplinary~pedagogical instructions implemented by a facilitating Aunty.
CHAPTER NINE:  
KAI-KAI FIGURES OF THE DEVELOPING CHILD THAT PLAYS

In this chapter, three episodes of variable learning activities will be unpicked. All of these were planned by practitioners drawing on the CFECE and were proposed as ‘play’, that practitioners modelled and facilitated, but their ending and outcome differed. However, before presenting the episodes, it is necessary to analyse how the nursery’s planned curriculum, influenced by the CFECE (MINEDUC, 2001a) outlined children’s play.

I (Children’s) ‘Play’ in Curricular Documentation – Entanglement of Social and Developmental Purposes

In the Curricular-pedagogical dimension of the PEI, the ‘Pichintún’ nursery defines the principle of play for their institution:

‘Principle of Play:

Childhood is a key period to guarantee an active and conscious lifestyle, in which intrinsic values of joy and participation have to be emphasised. In children, play is spontaneous and fundamental, because through it, they learn to share, respect others, to tolerate, it motivates their imagination, creativity and teamwork.

Play is also necessary for promoting children’s personal development, strengthening their self-esteem, autonomy, self-control, expression of affection and interaction amongst peers.’

(Extract from ‘Pichintún’ PEI, 2013)
This definition suggests an ontological necessity and space for play in ECE (Ailwood, 2003) assuming that ‘play’ is an intrinsic feature (‘spontaneous and fundamental’) of children, and a universal activity of the social category of childhood (Jones et al., 2010). Children’s play or play in the phase of childhood is assumed to provide joy by essence (Bishop and Curtis, 2001; Burman, 2008a) and to have creative and imaginative qualities. However, it omits the possibility that other practices could take place, such as exclusion (Rosen, 2015; Taylor, 2008).

Co-existence

Pedagogical Orientations – First Cycle

- The gradual progress within their relationships with other children will enable them to move from play with one or two friends, to play in small groups. Later, and to the extent that they include norms and simple rules, they can participate in collective and cooperative play and in larger groups. Corner play, role play or fiction play lead to simple group dramatisations, and are instances that facilitate interpersonal relationships because you need others to play.

(Mineduc, 2001a, p. 53)

The quote states that play is also a socialising activity (‘learn to share’, ‘respect others’, ‘tolerance’) and considers it a vehicle for developing other social skills, enabling children to establish interactions with peers. However, it could also suggest that until this point children could not collaborate with others. Similarly, EC researchers have emphasised the socialising aspects of play for ‘meaning-making’ and creating ‘communicative meetings’ (Löfdahl, 2005).

The pedagogical principle of play of the nursery echoes the pedagogical orientations from the CFECE (MINEDUC, 2001a, box to the right). These emphasise children’s play as a medium and condition for gradual socialisation. The development of autonomy and self-control through play are highlighted. This decision could be linked to the age group of the first cycle (0-3 years), because it does not emerge again in older age groups. This may be related to a Piagetian understanding of play, as the relevance of play activities decreases while the child acquires the intellectual competencies to understand her reality (Piaget, 1972).

The CFECE’s pedagogical orientation on play also emphasises children's capacity to effectively regulate one’s own and others’ behaviour, introducing a link between the CFECE and cognitive theory. For instance, Piaget's symbolic play emerges between two and five years, is centred in children’s environment, representing objects, actions or scenes (Piaget, 1972). Through these instances, children are able to become sociable, because they resolve internal conflicts, contributing to a positive acceptance of themselves. Similarly, this perspective on play emphasises
the subject’s responsibility to develop an entrepreneurial capacity for self-control that resonates with the notion of ‘technologies of the self’ (Foucault and Rabinow, 1991).

Within the Butterfly classroom ACP, ‘Teaching and Learning Practices’ were defined as: ‘playful situations that enable the individual construction of learning, based upon experience and significant learning’. The concept of ‘significant learning’ (Rogers, 1959) coming from humanist theory was coupled to Piagetian cognitivist informed pedagogy. For Piaget, play contributes to establishing new mental structures through a process of assimilation, enabling the child to adapt to reality (Piaget, 1972). Therefore, through play, the child re-shapes reality to benefit her internal organization, and to consolidate motor schemes and their coordination when these are acquired. Significant learning experiences and playful situations are linked to staff’s practices of ‘initiation’ (to capture children’s attention with histrionic actions) at the start of variable learning activities, which may also explain why the places and topics chosen for play drew from ‘common knowledge’ and experience.

These curricular statements place play as a pre-existing, universal quality of human beings, characteristic of a particular social group and phase (childhood), which is promoted for the acquisition of socialising skills. The theoretical influences stem both from western psychology and sociology (Sellers and Chancellor, 2013). For instance, cognitivist psychological notions of play suggest that children assimilate and comprehend their social world(s) through repetition (Piaget and Cook, 1952). Similarly, sociological understandings of childhood as a social category, suggest that ‘children’ incorporate rules and appropriate the social world through play (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998).

Both the CFECE and the nursery’s curricular plan explicitly focused on ‘the Child’ and its intrinsic need to play for learning, which explains why it was systematically included in the timetable of regular learning activities in the Butterfly classroom. However, the adult female practitioner and her position within play were not available, possibly suggesting the idea of play as an exclusive activity and feature of children and their learning.

How play and the playing child was produced in the Butterfly classroom will be explored through three planned play episodes, as variable learning activities. I was a participant observer in these instances, following the instructions practitioners gave to children. The first episode is role play in public transportation: ‘la Micro’ (Chilean bus) and an airplane. The second episode imaginary play about the beach, directed by Aunty Lily. The third episode is corner play, in which the Beauty
Parlour was played by aunties and female children. These episodes illustrate how the entanglement between romanticised discourses of ‘play’, children’s play (for learning), and development, (re)produced imaginaries – of the curricula and practitioners - of learning through play.

II Playing on la Micro (bus) and later on an Airplane

Playing ‘la Micro’ was a common during the first semester (March-July 2013). Most children participated, sometimes changing turns if they were called out by other practitioners for hygiene habits (see Chapter Five). The classroom and furniture were arranged in a similar way for any play instances set on public transport: two rows of chairs and an aisle in the middle.

![Figure 123: ARRANGEMENT OF THE CHAIRS TO PLAY “MICRO” (FIELDNOTES EXTRACT, 15/05/2013) THE DRIVER’S SEAT IS THE SINGLE CHAIR AT THE FAR LEFT](image)

After arranging chairs, we stood ‘at the entrance’ (next to the driver’s seat) and either volunteered for or waited to be chosen by practitioners for a role (driver/pilot, ticket inspector, salespeople, entertainment, and regular passengers). Passengers sat still and could purchase things (tickets, food), tip and assess entertainment. Children could only get up if they were called out (outside of play) by other practitioners (to the bathroom or for another activity). Also, some female passengers insisted on travelling with their children (baby dolls or daughters) who sat next to them.

Driver(s) sat at the front and moved their imaginary steering wheel with grand gestures from one side to the other, if told to do so by staff, or moderately if they did it by themselves. Other characters did not use any props, although sometimes some musicians brought a toy guitar with them, and were called on cue by practitioners. They could sometimes join in as passengers afterwards, but this varied.
There was a week in between playing la Micro and playing the Airplane, which followed a similar routine. It is worth mentioning that most of the players had never flown on an airplane before and therefore possibly relied more on the practitioner’s instructions about what to do. Both episodes, described in the extracts below, illustrate the dynamic and conflicts that emerged during play.

They were both fluid and rigid at the same time. The emulation of ‘real’ closed spaces with pre-defined narratives entangled with the fluid re-shaping of the space, a classroom and a transport medium at the same time, and the constant entry/exit of players and aunties.
Playing Micro (early morning break)

‘Aunty Celeste organises the space. Chairs are moved. She asks who’s going to be driver, salesman, clown and singer. She chooses one person for each role [they all stand next to the rows, waiting to get on to the micro]. We get on the micro and each sits on one chair. Aunty Celeste tells us to remember that micros move [we have to move in our seats, from side to side].

A mother with a baby doll in her arms gets on the micro. Aunty Celeste says out loud: “The lady with the baby still has to pay!” Some girls run to the shelf to get dolls and sit down again. Chinita is told that she has to charge for each ticket. She walks down the micro’s aisle, and passes by every child asking for ticket money.

Camilo is the salesman and he walks through the aisle and shouts: “Ice cream! Ice cream!” Some passengers tell him: “Camilo I want ice cream” I ask which flavour he has, he says vanilla. I pay for two and he ‘gives’ me two of his fingers (emulating two popsicles).

Aunty Celeste gets on the micro to sing, she sings Gloria Trevi’s “Voy a traer el Pelo suelto”. She then asks each of us for money, everybody pays her. Eloisa says that she hasn’t got any money. Aunty Celeste replies: ‘then get off!’ We all look at each other, Eloisa remains seated.

Throughout the game, Aunty Violeta calls out passengers to the bathroom. They get off while the micro is still moving.

Mate is a clown. He stands in front of the aisle, stares back at us and starts sucking and biting on his apron. Aunty Celeste starts shouting at him: ‘To the lions! To the lions!’ Some passengers (2-3 children) join in, catching the rhythm and start repeating it in a chant.

Then Aunty Celeste tells us that we have to get off to go back to the nursery.’

Playing Airplane (midmorning break)

‘Aunty Violeta asks who will do the different roles: pilot, co-pilot and two stewardesses. We sit in a row and Aunty Violeta tells Roja [one of the stewardesses] that she has to ask the passengers what they want to have. She stands still and doesn’t reply. Aunty Violeta asks Estefani [the second stewardess] to do it instead.

Abeja decides that he’s going to sing although he was not an official singer. He stands on a chair in the back of the aisle which is the back of the airplane, plays guitar and sings. Aunty Lily comes in and says loudly “A passenger [Abeja] is going to fall out of the window, so you have to call security!” Abeja gets off the chair and sits. Aunty Violeta asks who’s going to be Security. She chooses Camilo and Mickey.

Aunty Violeta tells Vijejne that the pilot [he] is not driving the airplane, which is “so inappropriate!” Vijejne starts driving exaggeratedly, moving an imaginary steering wheel from one side to the other.

Aunty Violeta decides that someone has to sing. Vijejne volunteers. She tells Chinita that she has to introduce the show. Chinita doesn’t know what to say. She seems embarrassed. Vijejne comes forward (in front of the aisle of the airplane) and says that he doesn’t want to sing anymore. He refuses to move and keeps his lips tightly closed.


Chinita is surrounded by approx. 5 passengers (they got up to shout “boring”); aunts seat them or take them off the airplane. Chinita plays a guitar, and then gets off stage. Francesco gets on it and Chinita introduces him: “And now...” – Aunty Violeta tells her: “LOUDER!” – “... and now, Francesco’s going to sing!” I’m the only one who shouts “Bravo!” and claps.

Francesco plays and Chinita introduces him again. We are then told to put back the chairs because the game is over’
II.I Practitioners' role in play

In both cases, practitioners performed a mixed role, participating, directing and regulating the narrative. Aunty Violeta’s and Lily’s version of ‘children’s play’ was tightly aligned with modelling idealised ‘real’ places in society, and the available subjective positions linked to them. The relationships established between child players and adult practitioners illustrated how notions of ‘play’ invested power in aunties, responsible for providing a ‘stimulating learning environment’ (PEI, 2013) for children. Through repetition of particular rules in play, practitioners attempted to enable children to learn about their social environment, by adapting these new rules to schemes they already accommodated. According to the curricula, aunties were accountable for teaching basic social rules about children’s closer social environment, as well as how to play with others. For that reason, practitioners regulated and intervened when play narratives were disrupted.

For instance, when Vijenje and Chinita refuse to execute their entertainment role in the airplane, aunties begin chanting ‘boring!’ to correct their behaviour. But when the chant gets out of aunties’ control, with fellow child passengers surrounding Chinita, some children were excluded from the play instance by aunties, and others resumed their passenger role. In this play instance, a type of relational power was established where aunties defined roles and acceptable behaviours for children, and engaged in a way in which they could direct it.

In contrast, Aunty Celeste had the opportunity to move beyond the pre-established play narrative in la Micro. She performed a pop song which was outside of ‘children’s (nursery) music’ and challenged stereotypes about EC practitioners. However, she did not explore this further. Her performance served to comply with the role of the musician on la Micro and also for reinforcing commercial practices, because everybody had to pay for entertainment on the micro, even if they had babies in their arms. Consequently, this highlights a different type of relational power amongst subjects, of a commercial nature. Tickets had to be paid for, there had to be a salesperson that had to be paid and the performer had to be paid for her music. In all of these cases, not paying meant getting off the micro, being excluded from the play instance.

The dynamics of in/exclusion based on player’s rule-abiding behaviour or financial solvency could be representative of broader, national socio-economic conditions, related to the neo-liberal rationale naturalised in social interactions in Chilean society. For instance, while la Micro is an

---

30 Gloria Trevi’s song ‘Pelo suelto’ (1991) re-emerged on the same date in the afternoon hygiene routine, where two children sang it.
affordable means of public transport, flying in airplanes is expensive and could be considered as a class privilege; however, both play episodes positioned children in similar roles with similar rules of interaction. Consequently, through the discursive production of ‘children’ and ‘children’s play’, access and transactional relationships were established amongst subjects, allegedly mirroring Chilean society.

II.II Reproduction and Resistance

Conflicts emerged when any of the participants ceased to follow the realist narrative. For example, our performance as micro-passengers or the airplane pilot, were deemed insufficient by practitioners. Through their language, they ‘made’ the play experience more accurate. Aunty Celeste drew on an omnipresent third person to describe the micro’s sway (a fact), expecting us to infer that we had to move/bounce on our seats. Aunty Violeta’s statement in direct imperative, ‘Vijenje is told that he is not driving the airplane’, could be read as a social pressure strategy, but moreover was the observation that in this case, the plane would crash without a pilot. Interestingly, we all knew what to do and how to do it in order to respond adequately. Our movements, e.g. swaying on our seats, and Vijenje’s exaggerated piloting, were exaggerations that made what we played, and who we were playing readable and conformed to understandings of play and children’s play.

Conversely, the stewardess, the presenter and singer on the airplane and the clown on the micro were roles that were not laid out by/for the players. It is unclear if their initial lack of response to the interpellation was because they did not know that they were being called out or if they were resisting physically (standing in silence) to perform the role. In the case of the airplane, Roja’s refusal to perform stewardess created a conflict for Aunty Violeta, who replaced her with Estefani.

Similarly, Mate was chosen to play clown on the micro, and he was visibly uncomfortable with it (biting on and sucking his apron), and Vijenje, who volunteered to play singer on the airplane, stood in front of the same aisle Mate did. Their silence was possibly interpreted as resistance, and it may have originated by them waiting for staff to tell them what to do, or because they simply did not want to play these roles anymore. Nonetheless, in both cases aunties’ response was ordering Mate to be thrown ‘to the lions’ and defining Vijenje’s act as ‘boring’. These expressions became rhythmical chants, where the ritualistic effect of signals echoed, and in which everybody was encouraged to join.
Child subjects who resisted taking on the roles—subjectivities ascribed to them hindered their fluid iteration, and exposed the artificial rationale of ‘real’ play. By not assimilating the reality through a playful repetition of facts of the environment, children deviated from the aim of this type of play. Interestingly, in these episodes, only a small number of participants engaged in shaming practices. The remaining children abstained through their silence and stillness, still enabling the practice to take place. As with the players who stood speechless, seemingly resisting their cue, their refusal to participate did not challenge the play rationale, narrative, roles (and underpinning power relations) or the setting itself.

II.III Changing the rationale – singing at the back of an airplane

Abeja, the self-nominated airplane singer, decided to twist the rules of play and of the place they were supposed to be playing in. He created the performance of a singer on an airplane, used a chair to break the rationale of its use (not sitting on it), changed his body (making himself taller and more visible), and stood on the opposite side of the airplane. Instead of standing in front of the passengers—audience, or going through the aisle, he started singing from the back, without being called on to do so. His attempts to go beyond the play narrative—of what flying on an airplane was, on how to play airplane, on being a singer—queered the rationale and exposed the artificiality of the setting and its intentions. By shifting into another discursive position, he became a different subject who was more active and had a broader range of action than the passive passengers he was initially categorised as.

Abejas’ actions exposed how this play was particular to child-centred imaginaries, in which aunties foreclosed the threshold of narratives and other subjectivities for children and themselves: Aunty Lily’s intervention (she was outside the airplane and play), cut into his performance. Her observation - ‘A passenger is going to fall out of the window’ - is an interesting image and can be read in multiple ways. First, Abeja could fall out of the window because he was standing on a chair, which was only possible if she acknowledged the artificialness of an imaginary directed play. Second, by expressing the warning in third person, she made everybody else aware that this could happen to anyone. In either case, his disruption demanded ‘security’, creating with policing peers an environment that would enable Abeja and the other passengers, to assimilate the real conditions of flying on an airplane.
Similar to play on public transportation, in the Beach practitioners directed an artificial narrative in which descriptive statements and exaggerated gestures produced ‘imaginary play’. Although it seemed at the beginning that this directed imaginary play would follow the same rationale as other instances, the episode described below had an unexpected turn beyond the type of relationships and practices observed in previous ones.

‘2:44. We put away all the toys and almost everybody runs around the classroom. When everything is tidied up, Aunty Lily tells us to sit down at the centre of the classroom. She says that we’re going to use our imagination to travel. We want to go to the beach and we can play that we’re going there.

Aunty Lily asks me to hand out one newspaper spread per person and then the trip starts. We have to get on a micro, pay, then arrive at the beach. We do not use any props, we rely on her oral descriptions - ‘Now we’re getting on the Micro”, “We arrived at the beach!” - to follow her around the classroom and imitate the different mimes (for instance getting on the bus, walking towards the sea). We put on our bathing suits, bathe in the sea, dry off (with the newspaper-towel) and play with the sand

While we’re making sand castles, Aunty Lily tells us to make a ball out of the towel.

Suddenly, she starts throwing newspaper balls at us, and chases us all over the classroom. We run, throw our balls and the ones we can find on the floor.

Aunty Lily runs, she laughs, throws and picks up any ball with short sneaky steps.

In the meantime, Abeja, Wanderino, Vijenje and Francesco (all male children) run around half naked.

They laugh and show each other their torsos. Then they stand in front of several peers, Aunty Lily and me, and straighten up so that it seems to me that they’re blowing up their chests’ (Fieldnotes Extract, 20/11/2013)
III.1  (Aunty) Lily at the Beach

The beach and its playful qualities emerged in Aunty Lily’s engagement with it, as the performative and playful creation of the setting – through swimming, building sandcastles, and so on – opened up a fault line and enabled her to go beyond existing narratives.

Still situated as the ‘facilitating Aunty’, she directed us to change the (imaginary) towel’s purpose and make the towel into a (newspaper) ball. The recovery of the newspaper’s properties (now a crumpled towel) was Aunty Lily’s last instruction. She surprised us with her ball throwing, and, instead of stopping us, invited to throw them back at her. Suddenly, relationships between child subjects and Aunty subjects, informed by discourses of protection, care, development and respect, were suspended. Just as we ran across the space, subjectivities were crossed and enmeshed. Everyone participated in getting hit and throwing at others, we enjoyed ourselves and laughed.

Aunty Lily did not stand on the outside observing or instructing. Her body (Figure 126) looked diametrically different to other learning experiences (overlooking, with a hump, with child subjects around her or on her, see Figures 126, 127 and 128). Her body did not resonate with actions of surveillance, service or attending.

Figure 126: AUNTY LILY PLAYING AT THE BEACH (20/11/2013)
On the contrary, her running and playful sneaking were different from what practitioners would perform during the initiation of a learning activity, illustrating or modelling what children were expected to do.

Aunty Lily’s disruption reshaped the play narrative making subject positions hybrid, and foremost enabled her to go beyond the subjectivity she (re)produced for others and her-self as an Aunty. The laughter resonated with the effects jokes and humour can have on questioning the norm and on how we can seriously start laughing at the assumptions that provide us the illusion of an identity (Aswell Doll, 1998). Humour opened up a place for pleasure (Tobin, 1997) in the ECE classroom, where a threshold of other subject positions became available.

IV Corner Play

Corner play aspires to develop symbolic play (Piaget, 1972), which requires adults to assume a facilitator role, adding to the production of practitioners’ subjectivity in play. In this type of play, the facilitating Aunty has to ensure that the classroom space is well arranged and materials are classified into themed corners, to enhance children’s development and learning through play. The child chooses in which corner to play/develop her learning according to her interests, interacting with other players.

During my stay in the nursery, I observed two variations of corner play. Separate corners (two tables per corner) would be arranged in different areas of the classroom. In these corners, aunties would sit and direct play (e.g. construction, cooking – with ‘real food’ or plastic toys –, hairdressing, colouring) and children could join in according to their interests. In the second
variation, children would be distributed in tables of six. Aunties handed each group a box of materials (e.g. toys of different varieties, didactic materials, books) and children played ‘freely’.

In the timetable of regular activities of the Butterfly Classroom (see table below), corner play was planned every day after lunch and before other planned variable learning activities. Play corners aimed to develop and promote socialisation skills whilst collaboratively ‘adventuring’ and ‘imagining’, two concepts frequently linked to ‘children’s play’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE CHILD</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES OF THE ADULT</th>
<th>SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:15</td>
<td>Personal and Social Formation</td>
<td>Co-existence</td>
<td>Choose a corner</td>
<td>Invite boys and girls to participate in the corners.</td>
<td>Share with other children, playing, investigating, imagining, constructing and adventuring with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share toys</td>
<td>Invite them to keep the toys in order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tidy up the material after using it</td>
<td>Participate in the play corners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest challenging activities in the play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Extracted of the Timetable of regular activities, Butterfly Classroom, 2013)

Relationships amongst children were only based on ‘sharing’, and adults related to children through overseeing the adequate implementation of play-corners: participation, tidy space and resources; and by suggesting ‘challenging activities’; their activities served two purposes: order and child-centred pedagogy. References on how to favour children’s relations between themselves were not available, suggesting adult direction/leading (orchestration) of play instances. In this context, discourses of ‘play’ seemed exclusive to child subjects, creating a generational distance between children and adults (Ailwood, 2003). Adult practitioners distanced themselves from this activity, only intervening for pedagogical purposes. As mentioned earlier, a developmental argument could underpin this situation and, as a consequence, adults and practitioners could not play as children in this classroom.
Practitioners intervened and supervised play corners for other reasons, as well. In the Diagnose of the Pedagogic-Curricular Dimension of the Butterfly Classroom (ACP 2013), the following group characteristic was observed by staff:

boys and girls get whatever they want from their parents through crying and tantrums, hence they have difficulties abiding by established norms. Aggressiveness in their play is another important factor to take into consideration, because they do not respect their peers. They have difficulties in requesting others toys or materials, they snatch these from their hands and create conflicts among each other’

(Extract from ACP 2013, p. 8)

It is relevant to analyse the language used to describe children’s behaviour. First, children had to abide by the classroom’s norms, which differed greatly from their families’ rules, and therefore they – children and, incidentally, their families – needed to be educated on the matter (Fendler, 2001). The statement suggested that they were ‘spoilt’ (‘get whatever they want (…) through crying and tantrums’), uncivilised (norm-less), and consequently were not capable of socialising with peers. Second, because children were not sociable, they did not know how to share and snatched objects from others. Both verbs – abide and snatch – were negatively linked to devious behaviours, and echoed the historical aim of social control assigned to ECE in Chile. Interestingly, the learning objective in the timetable of regular activities also linked ‘play’ with children’s imagination, construction and adventure; which also suggested a romanticised perspective on play.

The following section interweaves extracts from a ‘corner play’ episode. As in previous chapters, I attempt to re-construct this episode with different extracts of ‘data’ (fieldnotes, my reflections on them, and some audio extracts). This corner play lasted approximately 40 minutes. Aunty Violeta was in charge of getting most of the resources (from food, to car lanes and make up), and one Aunty sat in each corner to direct play.

IV.I The Beauty Salon corner (25/06/2013)

After lunch, the space is divided into three spaces: car lanes, cooks making salad and hair salon. Staff invites me to join in whatever I like/am interested in.

I opt to go to the beauty parlour, though it would not be my first option. It seems to be the ‘freer’ space to play (cooking was completely directed by the staff and cars don’t look attractive).
Practitioners arranged the space and decided in advance what play corners were going to be available for playing. Aunties also decided the number of children who could play in each corner, establishing a maximum of ten. Free choice was only based on what was made available and disciplinary strategies for achieving efficiency interwove. My writing exposed a first slippage: I explained that I sought a corner in which play could be ‘freer’. ‘Free’ could be referred to play directed by aunties and the assumption that children and I would comply completely with it. My understandings of play were, therefore, linked with notions of no intervention from the outside, and possibly romanticised understandings of ‘children’s play’ and/or play/learning for a ‘developing child’. My implicit assumptions like this one will be further analysed in the final chapter.

The production of particular gendered children is also present in this excerpt. Boys did not access this play corner until the very end, when resources where put back and tables where tidied up. Aunty Bedford was the gatekeeper and stated publicly who could (not) access and play in this corner - ‘Only girls put on make-up’, thus established heteronormative play and what practices (applying make-up) corresponded to girls. This has been widely discussed in literature on gender and ECE (Blaise, 2005b; Blaise, 2014; Madrid, 2013; Renold, 2006). Also, according to the arrangement, play corners could show what kind of ideal adulthood practices should be (re)produced (Robinson and Taylor, 2009). It is important to mention that simultaneous to our beauty salon play, Monster High and Hombre Araña played ‘doctor’. They arranged a bed with some chairs, and Monster High checked Hombre Araña, first his heart, then lungs.

**IV.II  Aunties playing ‘Women’**

Initially, in order to produce the reality of a beauty salon, practitioners had to ‘play’ the production of the ideal adult woman. This play involved the iteration of discursive practices (particular female subjects apply appropriate makeup on corresponding areas of their bodies) which shaped players’ bodies according to an ideal of adult female beauty. As ‘facilitating aunties’, Aunties Bedford and Celeste modelled the ‘adult woman’ and reminded female child players, through oral disciplinary actions, who could (not) ‘play’ to become one. This also happened in other moments, where Aunty Celeste and Aunty Bedford let players know that there were particular ways of applying make-up:
‘Aunty Celeste: “This is for lips, look... What are you using to paint my eyes? With this? Noooo, this is for cheeks! This is for the eyes... this is for cheeks and this is for eyes!”

‘Aunty Bedford: ‘Ok, put on make-up now... You have to look into the mirror, Prima! [To other children] You have to do it like Prima is doing it, you have to look into the mirror to put on make-up. Roja, now paint your lips.

Aunty Bedford observes Prima’s make-up and says: “Oh, Prima, how preetty... The little cat lady” (adult laughter in reply)”

(Audio Extracts)

Aunty Celeste instructed and repeated rules and procedures to teach her female co-player what specific makeup aimed to highlight particular areas of her face. She never named each item (lip gloss, blush, and eye shadow) but taught her co-player by indicating and repeating a body part, e.g. ‘This is for the eyes’, echoing a Tylerian rationale (Kliebard, 1975; Tyler, 1971). By resisting getting her make-up done in the wrong way and facilitating the female child player how a product was exclusive to one body part, Aunty Celeste established how her—the female adult body could be re-presented in a different manner. The use of the mirror not only served to visually reflect the final product, but also to ensure that the correct sequence for applying makeup was being followed. Aunty Bedford drew on a step-by-step rationale to instruct other co-players.

In the second quote, when Prima did not correspond to Aunty Bedford’s assumptions of appropriateness and beauty, Aunty Bedford implied that Prima did not look pretty and even suggested that her make-up was ‘over the top’, and sexualised (‘cat lady’). Aunty Bedford may have implied that Prima’s use of make-up was inappropriate and/or did not correspond to her age. Aunty Bedford’s judgment (which was supported by other female adults) allegedly had performative effects both on her and Prima’s gender, regulated according to Chilean heteronormative and androcentric definitions of femaleness. It is unclear how Prima respond to this constitution, but Aunty Bedford re-produced this subjectivity for herself throughout the episode.

Although I (on a conscious level) reject(ed) these types of practices and wanted to resist them, my understanding of a (female exclusive) beauty salon framed my play practices.
Some girls apply make-up on me and my hair is combed. I also comb others and we paint each other’s nails. I try on several occasions to ‘play’ hairdressers. I call them ‘señorita’ (lady), and ask them if they want manicures. I’m completely ignored.

(Fieldnotes Extract)

My ‘rigid’ transposition of discourses of femaleness and beauty services led me to attempt playing my classed gendered understanding of a beauty salon: a female manicurist providing manicure services to ladies who can afford these. Interestingly, none of the ‘ladies’ took this invitation up. They did not engage with it at all; children followed aunties’ comments, but ignored mine. This resonates with Butler’s (1997) notion of interpellation, which she illustrates as turning around when you think a person with a particular authority is naming you, not because they simply called you.

I became an instrument upon/through which female children explored different practices, which did not necessarily correspond to my understandings of what happened amongst women in beauty salons, nor aunties’ step-by-step instructions. The exaggerated application of make-up went beyond an exploration (how to you apply make-up? What for? And what are the boundaries when you make-up your - self?), but perhaps exposed the artificialness of practitioners’ expectations on how to facilitate learning of female children through play with make-up to become women, and how female beauty (with make-up) looked like.
IV.III “You look beautiful, like battered Housewives!”

Aunty Celeste: So how do I look? How do I look?
Anonymous Child: pretty.
Aunty Celeste: Pretty?
Anonymous Child: pretty!
Aunty Celeste: Do you think I might be surprised if I look at myself into the mirror?
Anonymous Child: Yeah.
Aunty Bedford: I’m already beautiful.
Aunty Celeste: Not enough, we have to apply make-up on Bedford!

Aunty Celeste: How do I look?
Aunty Bedford: Who battered you, Celeste?

Aunty Celeste: ‘We’re the top models’ [joking tone]
Aunty Nicole: The most make-uped! (Aunties’ laughter)

Aunty Bedford: (in a loud volume) You [talking to girls and me] look like battered women. (Laughs from other Aunties)

Aunty Lagos comes in and wants to get her make up done too.
Aunty Lagos: (to a girl) Are you applying make-up on me?
Anonymous 1: Yes.
Aunty Bedford: Ok, here Lagos, come and get your make uuuuuup! I’m going to do it!
Anonymous 1: No, it was me!
Aunty Lily: You look soooo pretty! [to everyone who has had her make-up done, in a mocking tone]

(Audio Extracts)

When Aunty Celeste emphasised how beauty is enhanced through makeup (‘Not enough, we have to apply makeup on Bedford!’) contradictions of female beauty vs ‘natural’ beauty clashed and entangled with other pedagogical assumptions. Similar to the protocol for practitioner’s appearance (JUNJI, 2007b), particular features of their bodies had to be ‘enhanced’ to favour their efficient performance; whilst developing pedagogic practices (and therefore also their selves) that stay close to nature and their maternal essence (Cannella, 1997).

The ‘top-model’ was added to the female stereotypical sexist figures of the ‘cat lady’ and ‘battered housewife’. Each female figure suffered some sort of (sexual, physical) violence. In particular, the top-model had a superior status of beauty and maintenance was iterated systematically by practitioners. It suggests that the expression ‘suffering in the name of (female) beauty’ was produced in these playful interactions. These discursive positions were tied to shaping the ‘female’ body according to chauvinistic androcentric societal standards, harming it. This may explain why children’s responses of them looking ‘pretty’ were received with disbelief and sarcasm.
The extracts possibly show how female practitioners used sarcasm to ‘make-up’ physical and symbolic violence towards themselves, each other and the female children that were playing there. They may have been perpetuating other discourses of the beauty salon: a ‘safe space’ where ‘women’ could lightly talk about structural oppression and unjust conditions, without particularly having an impact on them because they were still aligning to ‘female’ beauty standards. Triggered by children’s exploration with makeup and the underpinning understanding of (adult) femaleness and beauty, aunties brought these discourses into play.

Interestingly, Aunty Bedford first interpellated other aunties as battered women, but at the end she returned this name to us. She told everyone who was playing in the corner that that’s who we could become. Along with their appearance, the embodiment of the Aunty-pedagogy and (maternal) care - may be just as oppressive and limiting as the previously identified female stereotypes (cat lady, battered housewife, and top-model).

In the child-centred classroom, aunties’ sarcastic jokes could disrupt the discourse of ‘the Aunty’, another female figure entangled in the ‘beauty salon’. What happened next extended the controversial female beauty issue, in this case, towards Vampira.

**Aunty Bedford**: It’s because she’s all black…!
Vampira, you look beauuuutiful!
(Audio Extract)

Among the make-up palettes, there was a black eye shadow that Vampira applied abundantly on her nose. She spent a long time doing this, and seemed to enjoy her black nose.

Aunty Bedford noticed it and started laughing at her. Vampira noticed it and attempted to turn her head somewhere else. Aunty Bedford continued laughing, started pointing Vampira out to other staff. Then she took a picture. Vampira looked upset. (Fieldnotes extract)

Female children’s exaggerated application of makeup went beyond an exploration and exposed the artificialness of staff’s expectations on how female children play with make-up to become women, and how female beauty (with makeup) looked. While resisting normative discourses of ‘the facilitating Aunty’, Aunty Bedford still drew upon familiar discourses of female beauty and correct enhancement of it through makeup. The unexpected effects of this tension came at the cost of Vampira, who became an object of mockery. Her playful self-exploration with makeup was not aligned and triggered an unexpected reaction from Aunty Bedford, whose actions seemed disapproving.
However, it is important to look closer into these practices, which may have been unintentional. In order to map the knowledge that underpinned Aunty Bedford’s actions, we have to look at the way she related with Vampira. Possibly, Aunty Bedford assumed that Vampira did not know how to apply makeup adequately and therefore her look was absurd or ridiculous. It also assumed that Vampira would not understand or realise that she was making fun of her and would pose for a photograph willingly. Vampira was interpellated as an ignorant and innocent female child, who could become an object of derision and had to be captured for others’ amusement. Under this reading, Aunty Bedford was not necessarily aware of the knowledge underpinning her practices, nor could she know the unforeseen effects for Vampira.

But I suggest that Vampira did understand very well that she was being observed and subjected to judgment. She hid her face, resisted and being stared at. When I asked her about the situation a week later, she first did not want to talk about it. When I asked her to recall and comment on what happened when she painted her nose black, she replied that she ‘didn’t like it’. Perhaps Vampira was struggling to understand what was so funny about applying black eye shadow on her nose. But she understood that Aunty Bedford was able to observe and regulate, and then expose her make-up with an index finger and a picture. And although she resisted having her photograph taken, her ‘innocent child’ subjectivity perpetuated the power relation with ‘the Aunty’.

Thus, within the corner play of the beauty salon, overlapping discourses of femaleness and femininity (curricular, pedagogical, social) may have operated through aunties by transforming them into technologies of these and producing them(selves) as ‘aunties’ ‘playing’ female adult women. Interestingly, play in this particular episode could be reflecting aunties’ understandings of how to facilitate children’s play, e.g. how the play was framed, its rules and the resources that were made available, but also how they understood female adulthood.

V Concluding Thoughts

In this chapter, understandings of children’s play and how the discourse of ‘the developing child’ was produced in planned learning activities were problematised. The examples illustrate how

---

31 I requested her authorisation to write about what happened and she consented (verbally and with gestures) (adapted from Fieldnotes, 03/07/2013)
planned variable activities of play within the Butterfly classroom aimed to favour development through play, while introducing children into various social spaces and practices.

Following a Piagetian rationale of development/learning through play, there was an important effort into making the promoted symbolic play as real as possible. It could also be argued that this simultaneously exposed their artificiality how a subjectivity of the developing child at play was produced. Each play episode seemed to carry a pre-defined narrative which provided glimpses into broader narratives of Chilean society, as well as to micro-practices of subjectification of ‘the facilitating Aunty’ and ‘the developing child’ in the classroom. Given the developmental and child-centred framing of these episodes, aunties were expected to facilitate the conditions for narratives and pre-established subjectivities towards the ideal discursive production of ‘the developing child’ in play.

Similar to Wood’s (2014) findings, ‘children [we]re caught between different subjectivities; pleasing the teacher through “approved” play choices and contesting classroom discipline, rules and routines’ (p. 153). Arguably, examples showed how players followed the narrative, but also resisted (e.g. standing still and in silence) and transformed the rules of the ‘play’ space. Referring to the latter, in the three episodes, players sought alternatives to transform the subjectivities they had been assigned to, like re-shaping their bodies or appropriating new roles.

Romanticised notions of ‘play’ were used to foster other uses of ‘play’ which were linked to developmental notions of the Child. For instance, some authors point out a socialising aim, related to the notion of ‘rescuing’ deviated children (Bloch and Popkewitz, 2005) who gradually acquired understandings of the ‘social contract’ through sharing. Other authors (Rogers and Lapping, 2012; Wood, 2014) discuss how ‘play’ is currently used in ECE policy, curricula and pedagogies to promote other discourses (Ailwood, 2002). In addition, (innocent) children’s ‘play’ and ‘playful pedagogy’ become technologies through which humanist values are promoted and which perpetuate normative (middle-class) developmental conventions of ‘children’ and ‘child’s play’ (Taylor and Richardson, 2005).

In the three episodes, however, both children and adult female practitioners engaged with different subjectivities that either did or did not fit into the play discourse. In la Micro and the Airplane, efforts to play ‘the real’ world aimed to gradually integrate children into societal practices and culture. Although it set out the play setting for children to ‘perform’ their pre-assigned roles, it assumed children as ignorant of their culture, prompting practitioners to
intervene in its narration and outcome. ‘At the beach’, although initially starting with a similar framing, Aunty Lily’s transgressive move – to play at the beach - opened participants to the possibility of exploring other discursive positions than the ones assigned by the pre-arranged narrative. Finally, in ‘the Beauty Salon’ practitioners engaged with the narratives of the play-corner, but also brought into play broader issues about Chilean femaleness. This playful engagement foregrounded other discourses that affected all female players.

Overall, female practitioners remained invisible in the curricular planning, suggesting an ‘omnipresence’ that required that they made the play narrative ‘work’ as facilitators, standing on the margins of play. Discourses of ‘play’ in this ECE context emphasised its exclusivity to ‘children’, while adult’s participation only had a pedagogical purpose. Drawing on Ailwood’s (2003) analyses on ‘play’ in ECE settings as a technology of governmentality, this discourse managed the available discursive positions in the classroom, and delimited practitioner’s participation in it. In play, practitioners directed and reinforced rules of the ‘real’ world outside the classroom, for instance reminding passengers that they could fall out of transportation; or that adult women have to look beautiful with makeup. However, in instances when practitioners entered the play narrative, such as playing beach or beauty salon, the subjectivity of the Aunty was suspended and female adults came to the foreground with other subject positions.

In response to both social and pedagogical demands echoed through the play corner, as the working conditions in the classroom, e.g. lack of resources, extended work hours and responsibilities, low wages (Tokman, 2010), clashed with discourses of vocation, social and moral responsibility towards ‘children’ and their ‘vulnerable’ background. Whether through pedagogical facilitation, maternal teaching, or care, ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ were bound through pastoral power (Foucault, 1982). Complementary to this, the Chilean female catholic figure also may be particularly relevant, as her matriarchy is based on the sole responsibility and care of her children (Montecinos, 1990, 1997, 2010). In addition, the vocational aspect of female practitioners, initially catholic (Orellana Rivera and Araya Oñate, 2016) and currently still present in practitioner’s discourses (Viviani, 2016), position the female carer and facilitator as a subject investing her complete female self for children’s wellbeing and moral (catholic) growth.
CHAPTER TEN:
RE-TRENZANDO KAI-KAI FIGURES OF THE CHILD AND THE AUNTY

Butler’s (1999) early work on gender as performative led me to explore how discourses of ‘the Child’ were performatively produced in a Chilean ECE classroom. Practices within this space were linked to the national curricular framework (MINEDUC, 2001a) and its implementation through practitioner’s planning. These curricular documents and the pedagogies put forward configured the classroom and its rationale, establishing – through the type of power/knowledge to be transmitted/acquired – what subjectivities to be (re)produced (Popkewitz, 1997). Pedagogies are practices of ‘the social administration of the individual’ (Popkewitz, 1998, p. 536) that articulate philosophy, curriculum, psychological theories and didactics. They are performative because through their enactment subjectivities (learner and teacher) are produced. As shown in previous chapters, discourses of ‘the Child’ were (re)produced by~through ‘the Aunty’, and a binary rationale constituted their relationships within the classroom; i.e. one could not exist without the other.

In this chapter I will draw on the analysis developed through the different Kai-Kai figures of discourses of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ present in the Butterfly classroom. These figures will be articulated with broader narratives of Chilean ECE. The overlapping Kai-Kai of the ‘vulnerable child’ and of the ‘developing child’ produced a subject that is school ready (Chapter Six), but also work-ready. This has been discussed in other literature (Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2007; Fendler, 2001; Hultqvist and Dahlberg, 2001), suggesting that neoliberal rationales framing ECE contexts permeate pedagogies and relationships within the classroom. This also had effects on female practitioners who were entangled and torn between the fulfilment of the production of ‘the Aunty’ and ‘the Child’. Despite the pressure of accountability and its impact in shaping practitioners into aunties, they sought other alternative discursive positions through which they could resist. Practitioner’s subjectivities and practices, i.e. ‘the Aunty’, based on protecting and facilitating, can be linked to Montecino’s (2010) conception of ‘Marian allegory’: an immaculate mother in a masculine imaginary.
I. Kai-Kai Figures of ‘the young Chilean Child’

The ECE institution is a ‘site where what it means to be’ a child ‘is produced within a range of discursive practices so as to fabricate or construct a “regulatory ideal”’ (Butler, 1993, p. 1). The discursive practices of the Butterfly classroom, in this case, where framed by the Chilean ECE curricular framework, its socio-historical context and other competing discourses such as the economy (Ailwood, 2004). According to the curricular framework and the Butterfly classroom’s planning, any experience was considered as a learning experience. This promoted aunties as responsible and accountable for children’s care, protection, learning, and consequently the production of the subject of ‘the Child’. The production of ‘the Child’ was bound with the production of ‘the Aunty’, a professional adult female who promoted regimes of truth about her student, the Child subject, through pedagogy(ies). Drawing on Haraway’s analogy of Cat’s cradle (1994), I created three Kai-Kai figures of discourses of the Child produced in the Butterfly classroom.

The first Kai-Kai presented the story of a child that was produced through routine activities which were renamed as ‘habits’, because they involved the satisfaction of everyday basic needs. Routine activities had a curricular framing which emphasised the training and gradual acquisition of self-sufficiency. This training was directed by female practitioners who became Aunty if they maintained certain practices: panoptic, assessing gaze, disciplinary actions. It emulated Fordist approaches, in which efficiency and speed were central. Children’s wellbeing was represented through being well-fed and clean.

The second Kai-Kai presented a pre-defined narrative of a child in development that required learning through practical experience, and a step-by-step facilitation after an Aunty carefully set out the environment for discovery. This resonates with Viviani’s (2016) study about Chilean ECE stakeholder’s understandings of ‘the good educator’. Practitioners are reconceived as technicians, who promote learning by ‘designing, implementing and evaluating learning processes’ (p. 4). Activity based learning was entangled with planned play, informed by psychological and sociological understandings of ‘the Child’. Playfulness and the inherent ‘need’ of learning through playful activities was an aspect of the developmental narrative that emerged.

The final Kai-Kai was created through three episodes, in which play was planned and directed by Aunties. Additionally, my understandings and production of the Child were entangled and challenged. Narratives of care and protection, particularly coming from parents, and specifically
mothers, were present throughout. This notion of female (maternal) care may be showing something about broader Chilean culture, about the purpose of the female adult’s role with young children and, by extension, how this relationship has to work out in a professional environment.

I.I The ‘developing child’ is school- and work-ready

The three Kai-Kai figures presented how a school-ready child was produced. Specifically, the first Kai-Kai showed that the vulnerable child subject needed to be civilised through the repetitive acquisition of self-care rituals. Habit’s like eating or hygiene practices were underpinned by assumptions of an ignorant, savage child subject who required an Aunty’s care, protection and supervision. These rituals set up a ‘template’ upon which the second Kai-Kai was based.

Physical care and protection became entangled with pedagogies in which tending to ‘the Child’ was central. This type of care was imbued by notions of children’s learning through experimentation. Consequently, learning activities considered the acquisition of skills (e.g. sewing) as favourable for school-readiness. Likewise, children’s ‘inherent playfulness’ was used to capture their attention through ‘Initiation’ (e.g. motivation) strategies, or to achieve other goals related to acquiring skills and greater autonomy. The third Kai-Kai builds on the discourse of developing child, but adds a layer of planned play.

Sellers and Chancellor (2013) discuss how play within child-centred discourses is restricted and operates according to the institutional rules. Similarly, Wood (2014) differentiated between ‘three modes of understanding the play-pedagogy interface’ which influences how play is constructed in ECE contexts and make relations ‘between policy, theory and practice’ (p. 145) evident. Although in the Butterfly classroom different play(ful) approaches were planned, these were ‘technicist versions’ which complied with specific ways of developmental learning and the curricular goals that represented broader socio-political trajectories.

Both skill acquisition and (developmental) technicist play responded to school-readiness narratives in which ‘the Child’ had to become independent, through aunties’ facilitation, for self-care purposes. The illusion of ‘free choice’ and ‘access’ to resources at hand, promoted through space arrangement and corner play, created subjects who on the long term could take responsibility for their own learning and themselves. Following globalised trends, children would be ready to successfully adapt to the school and, on the long term, the global market economy as an
entrepreneur (Ailwood, 2004; 2008). Similarly, Dahlberg et al. (2007) state that, following globalised labour market trends, young children as conceived as ‘a labour market supply factor which must be addressed to ensure an adequate labour supply and the efficient use of human resources’ (p. 47).

Additionally, self-regulation was developed through the internalisation of classroom rules and the discursive positions made available by and through these rules. Efficiency discourses of the ECE profession (Bloch and Popkewitz, 2005; Fendler, 2001) could be related to technologies of the self (Foucault and Rabinow, 1991), in order to effectively regulate one’s own and others’ behaviour. Walkerdine (1992) warned us about these effects, especially for female practitioners implementing progressive pedagogy. Notice the links with Ailwood’s (2004) work on genealogies of governmentality in Australian ECE. Her analyses explore ‘the gendered ways in which subjects are governed’ (p. 28), and displays how changes on childhood discourses also impact for instance on discourses of the female worker/citizen and motherhood.

I.II Accountability Demands of the Female Practitioner

Practitioner’s accountability, regulated through supervision, inventory of materials; and attendance (of children and staff), were additional elements of their production as aunties. For example, the following extracts belong to the nursery’s PEI and show specifications on the professional role (what to do) and profile (who to be(come)) of practitioners (both educators and assistants).

---

32 Parts of this section were published as an article: “Caballito blanco, ¡vuelve pa’ tu pueblo!”: Troubling and reclaiming the historical foundations of Chilean early childhood education’, Global Studies of Childhood, Vol 7, Issue 2, 2017.
33 According to regulations for state-subsidised nurseries, children who miss more than three (3) days are taken out of the list and new children have to enter. In addition, practitioners have to follow up and check why families are not engaging (JUNJI, 2007c)
Functions of the Pedagogical Educator [and Assistant]

(...) Keep a warm attitude, is motivating and respectful, and propitiates a favourable environment for the children of her group.

(Extract of the Organisational Dimension of PEI, 2013)

Profile of the Pedagogical Educator [and Assistant]

(...) Likewise, the professional has to demonstrate vocation whilst confronting different situations in the nursery. She has to project a proactive, motivating and dynamic attitude, both in her pedagogical practice, as in team work, creating a harmonious working climate.

Within this context, it is primordial to have and maintain a social conscience referring to the people she [the professional] interacts with. This social position [in the nursery] demands of her to especially show empathy, and solidarity, deliver values and evidence features of her commitment towards families.

(Extract of the Organisational Dimension of PEI, 2013)

Both statements, written in imperative tense, in a third, omnipresent person, emphasised active and productive behaviours and attitudes. Values of care, empathy and solidarity permeated practitioner’s practices because of their social role of the institution (‘social conscience’) and their total positive commitment. These descriptions assumed a strong vocation for service and care for others, as well as a high level of involvement and enjoyment. Similarly, in Viviani’s study (2016), Chilean practitioners working in vulnerable contexts also considered their role as compensatory, and emphasised the importance of empathy and giving love to peers, children and families.

Likewise, one of the most important dimensions that constitute the Chilean female practitioner was based on developing a maternal role, tightly linked with practices of protection and care (Muñoz, 2014). Female practitioners were expected to have a strong vocation, always be joyful and love their children (Viviani, 2016). Since its creation, Chilean ECE and its curriculum has been deeply rooted in Froebel’s philosophy (Peralta, 2012), in which female practitioners’ ‘essence’ was assumed to be closer to nature and therefore also to ‘children’, and thus deeply shaped female practitioner’s appearance.
Furthermore, female practitioners of the Butterfly classroom were assessed and held accountable for the fulfilment of JUNJI’s regulations. Their professionalism was linked both to practices of care and progressive pedagogies, as well as the production of a pre-defined feminine, conservative appearance. Short or pulled up hair not only had hygienic advantages, but also enabled modelling a type of professional female adulthood that had to be aspired to.

The ‘Protocol Manual for Security and Care of Children’ (JUNJI, 2007a) established for practitioners (educators and technical assistants) that, as the visible faces of the institution, they had to follow and enforce the hygiene norms. The first protocol (‘Institutional Image’), suggested a particular female professional appearance.

![PROTOCOL NO 1: IMAGEN INSTITUCIONAL](image)

Figure 130: “PROTOCOL NO 1: INSTITUTIONAL IMAGE” (JUNJI, 2007a, P. 2)

The depicted subject is white and anonymous, suggesting a universalised - but at the same time local and particular to the Chilean ECE context - discourse of the female ECE professional. Personal appearance was linked to the apron, which had to be clean and tidy. Additionally, practitioners had to keep their personal hygiene in ‘optimal conditions’: short and clean nails without any polish, no rings, dangling earrings nor short necklaces. Even shoes (comfortable flats or low heels with a round tip) were pre-defined – suggesting a way of moving their body, standing and being able to shape it according to children’s needs.

The emphasis on a gendered appearance may be one of the unforeseen effects of humanist pedagogies that emphasised the idea of a practitioner as a role model, an idea promoted in the CFECE regarding the ‘EC educator’ (MINEDUC, 2001a). The portrayal of women in ECE is deeply rooted in Froebelian tradition and is seen as crucial to the establishment of a caring role that is implicitly maternal (Aslanian, 2015). However, several authors (Ailwood, 2007; Cannella, 1997)

---

34 In the Chilean ECE system, practitioners have to use aprons. Their colours signal the degree the practitioner has attained: green – professional educator, university graduate; blue – technical assistant, either graduated from a professional technical college (two years) or a vocational secondary school (two years of general secondary education, plus two years of vocational training). Although some institutions may use other colours, these distinctions are always made evident.
have critiqued that this maternal role has been mis-used to the detriment of female practitioners. This example also displays a gendered level of the government of the self.

Nonetheless, Aunties found different ways to create ‘secondary adjustments’ (Corsaro, 1990) with their bodies, aligning to the rules while also transgressing them. For instance, Aunty Celeste and Aunty Bedford had several small tattoos that could be hidden under the uniform, if necessary. The tattoos ranged from the names of their children in their wrists or lower arms, to fantastical female figures of fairies or symbols of goddesses. Neither colleagues nor the headteacher showed concerns about exposing these; and parents even complimented them for their beauty when they saw them. Although their tattoos went against regulations that stipulated how ‘the Aunty’ should behave and look like, this example may be illustrating how practitioners could resist such control over their bodies for accountability purposes. Through these, practitioners reshaped their bodies according to their own standards of beauty and professionalism.

‘Marian Allegory’ and ‘the Aunty’

In Latin-American culture, Virgin Mary conciliates differences and tensions by bringing these together, as she mediates and sublimes difference. Similarities can be established with ‘the Aunty’, a discourse in which ideas like maternalism and femininity entangle. Within the ECE classroom, ‘the Aunty’ becomes the (Marian) advocate of ‘the Child’s’ wellbeing, shelter and development, through pastoral power and the dedication~sacrifice of herself. However, as such, the Marian figure is also an archetype of order and tradition, which she can promote through loving discipline, work, protection and care.

Foucault’s explanation of ‘pastoral power’ (1982) considers how gradually the state has taken upon the role/position the church had over individuals. In chapter two, I established similarities with the Chilean case, specifying the operation of the state as a carer through educational ‘services’. Following this rationale, and perhaps as an extension of the state action, ‘the Aunty’ offers care, while cradling young children and rescuing the vulnerable in a loving manner. The evidence presented in previous chapters show that the Aunty conciliates the overlapping and contradicting social and educational policies operating through ECE, working with a deprived population in large-sized classes with limited resources, planning and implementing hygiene and mealtime rituals, developmentally-appropriate variable activities; with a vocation, love, dedication and joy.
This analysis does not aspire to invalidate practitioner’s vocation, or assume that their dedication does not represent a deep personal commitment. On the contrary, I have learned as a former practitioner and participant observer in the Butterfly classroom, that practitioners engaged with the production of ‘the Aunty’ because they believed that children’s and their families’ lives could be improved through their work in ECE. Still, the different tensions that ‘the Aunty’ reconciles in her everyday practices make her accountable to several institutions, and it is a necessary element to consider when analysing her role in the production of ‘the Child’.

Foucault argues that ‘quantifiable surveillance within a culture of coercive accountability allows for centralised control over the local through largely self-monitoring responses or ‘disciplinary technologies of the self’ (Foucault, 1983). This process fashions education/teaching in such a way that governments and their instrumentalities can lay claim to measures of ‘quality’ to present to the ‘market’ to guide ‘choice’ (Ball, 2003). The consequence is that self-regulating professionals, under the panoptic gaze, are deemed consummately capable of achieving a narrowly defined version of ‘quality’ by virtue of dual accountability – to the self in first instance, but ultimately to ‘society’ (children, families, government, the nation state)’ (Osgood, 2012, p. 128).

Interestingly, Montecino (1997) suggests that, within syncretism, the ‘marian allegory’ goes beyond the religious congregation as it also has impacted on women’s identity constitution. Possibly, this could shed some light on how female EC educators’ subjectivities can go beyond the accountability demands. For instance, the following example from an EC classroom could illustrate how a syncretic effect is produced to reclaim a traditional song that enables female practitioners and children to shift from the dominant rationale:

‘We’re sitting in the morning circle, singing different songs. Some children want to sing the song of the fireman and the cook.

**Aunties and some children:** The fireman sold his hose, so he could marry the [female] cook / The [female] cook sold her apron, so she could marry the [male] general / The [male] general sold his sword, so he could marry the beautiful Lady / The beautiful Lady sold her fan, so she could marry Don Federico/ Don Federico said no, the beautiful Lady fainted...

**Aunty Lily:** *(interrupting)* wait, wait, we changed the ending!

**Aunty Bedford:** Yes, we did!
Aunty Lily: How was it? ... Ah yes! Don Federico said yes, the beautiful Lady doesn’t care!’

Children, Aunties and Ximena: HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! (laughing all together)

(Fieldnotes Extract, 05/12/2013)

At first glance, aunties complied with the imaginaries that the traditional children’s song brought along, because they sang at least once a day at children’s request. But on closer examination, alternative interpretations could emerge. For instance, practitioners may have decided to subvert the ‘Aunty’ narrative by, instead of singing in choir making exaggerated gestures to capture children’s attention, stopping the song at the end and prompting everyone to change the lyrics. Additionally, practitioner’s change of lyrics and laughter could be interpreted as a way of resisting gendered and classed discourses often promoted in ECE contexts. By drawing on humor, practitioners also created ‘secondary adjustments’, as they arguably did with their tattoos.

Another possible reading could be that practitioners simply had reproduced the traditional lyrics because, until the day of the episode, these had not been unpacked regarding their colonial origin, or the sexist and classist issues that the song portrayed. Practitioners may have shown their disagreement with the normative discourses related to femaleness of the Aunty by changing the lyrics from:

‘Don Federico said yes,’

‘the beautiful Lady peed herself!’ to ‘the beautiful Lady doesn’t care!’

The phrase in Chilean Spanish that the practitioners decided to sing, instead of the original lyrics – La bella dama no está ni ahí! – can be literally translated as ‘the beautiful lady isn’t there!’. Insinuations about the beautiful lady’s hysterical reaction to male rejection were overlooked and became the source of contagious giggles. Thus, it could be argued that in this episode, practitioners playfully articulated through colloquialisms, a distance between them and traditional sexist figures of the Chilean woman. As I analysed in Chapter Nine, practitioners often engaged with figures of the Chilean woman, which they had to promote in the classroom. Allegedly, in this episode, they successfully refuted the gendered dependence implied in the lyrics, creating an emancipatory position in which they invited children to participate. It is also relevant to note that practitioners engaged with taboo topics through humour, distancing themselves from dominant discourses of ‘the Aunty’ and ‘the Child’.
II Concluding Thoughts: (un)doing the Child and the Aunty

Within Chilean ECE, two (binary/antagonistic) figures have been established: the Child (learner) and the Aunty (teacher). These subjectivities were suggested by the curriculum but also by the philosophical traditions embedded within it. Both emphasised the relevance of activity, play and women - and their ‘inherent’ (maternal) femininity - as essential to teaching young children’s learning and development (Cannella, 1997).

Within Chilean ECE, female practitioner’s professionalism is linked to curricular, pedagogical and social understandings of female gender and maternalism, deeply rooted in Chile’s colonial promotion of Eurocentric progressive pedagogies. Different scholars (Ailwood, 2007; Cannella, 1997; Walkerdine, 1992) have discussed how child-centred practices not only create normative conditions for children, but also for practitioners. In this study, it is possible to argue that the subjectivity of ‘the Aunty’ is carries the influence of both Catholicism and neoliberalism.

On one hand, the female adult figure, whether as a mother or as a practitioner, was linked to the Child figure as a caretaker and protector, in response to a Marian allegory. This was relevant for the constitution of the discourse of ‘the Aunty’. First, because it reaffirmed how a child (in need, vulnerable, innocent) was (illusory) inherently linked with her. Second, it assumed that the female ‘nature’ of this adult subject was inherently available for caring and helping. Third, it assumed that she enjoyed this role and her (universal) caring nature was expressed through her body.

The production of the Child subject led to the transformation of the female practitioner into a technology, through which discourses of the Child operated. From the perspective of the society and the state, ‘the Aunty’ was the figure that was in charge of protecting and caring for its children. ‘The Aunty’ represented the paradox of being a universal, neutral, asexual, and hyper gendered female mother. The hegemonic discourse of care of children through ECE and its practitioners was consistent with globalised trajectories of ECEC (Galdames, 2011).

Burman (2008b; 2010; 2012) has several examples in which discourses of a developing child(hood) and stimulating parent/mother(hood) are promoted commercially as normalised truths. Mothers, who are accountable for promoting their children’s development, are expected to gradually favour more self-regulated, subjects who fit into school preparation-readiness. But her analyses also show how these truths serve to produce a child that is school ready is also useful for a particular economy.
On the other hand, the Chilean state draws on globalised trajectories of knowledge, in reference to EC care and protection measures (Hopkins and Sriprakash, 2015), to position ‘the Aunty’ in charge of producing (child) subjects who will be able to be self-sufficient and serve the economy (Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2007; Galdames Castillo and Poblete, 2014). This school-ready (and ideally work-ready) child also contributes to reach economic development goals, complying with trends of ‘comprehensive’ education of a larger number of the (poor) population, instigating the notion education is a catalyst of social mobility in a neoliberal economy. It also facilitates female integration into the workforce, both for mothers and practitioners. In the Chilean ECE context, child and Aunty subjects are produced for promoting policies that serve neoliberal – and also neo-colonial – policies.

Foucault (Chomsky and Foucault, 2006) explains that for the state to operate, it requires specific relationships of domination between (female) adult and child that have their own configuration and maintain themselves autonomously. Consequently, ‘the Child’ is a (neo)colonial discourse that has been amalgamated, whitened and classed in the ECE context, while ‘the Aunty’ is a technology to produce the subjectivity of ‘the Child’, her own subjectivity being the product of a syncretic effect that entangles neoliberalism and Catholicism.
CHAPTER ELEVEN:
REFLECTING ON POWER AND PRIVILEGE IN RESEARCH

This chapter aspires to sum up and analyse the research process, specifically issues of power and privilege that emerged throughout the study, which became central to the process of re-writing this thesis. In the first version of the thesis, I assumed that by considering power issues with children and making an important effort to develop with them a respectful approach in which assent and consent was achieved, ethical concerns were taken into account. However, regarding these issues, I considered practitioners only in a superficial manner, which may have resulted in an inaccurate and unintended representation of their work, lives and selves. I believe this was due to my role as a former practitioner and researcher, thus, in this chapter, I critically address how issues of privilege over participant practitioners were embedded in the study, and how this may have resulted in unequal power relations, which may have perpetuated unjust structural conditions I initially aimed to question.

In the first section, I analyse how my unseen privilege affected the study (including its written aspect) and therefore may have invisibilised practitioners’ voices and affected their wellbeing. In the second section, the analysis of my privilege will be used to reflect how it impacted on the study, the social relations with practitioners, and how my actions may have perpetuated unjust structures. With this reflection, I aspire to acknowledge that, as a female researcher-practitioner-human being, I am accountable for the shape of the structure of social relations in research, and that power issues with practitioners should have been considered in depth.

Making invisible privilege visible

In the first version of this manuscript, the issue of privilege was left unquestioned and it was challenged by the examiners of the thesis. Their suggestion to examine reflectively my ethical standpoint and power in relation to practitioners was more difficult than expected. The poststructuralist understanding of power that I drew upon for the first version of this thesis was insufficient for this purpose, as it did not enable me to unpack how different variables operate in creating oppressive relationships between the researched (specifically, practitioners) and
researcher (me). Furthermore, the comments from examiners opened a series of questions around my privilege as a female practitioner-researcher that I had ignored until it was questioned. Consequently, I sought for other theoretical and ethical tools to ‘make unseen privilege visible’ (Bartell and Johnson, 2013, p. 35).

According to Allies for Change (NA), privilege ‘operate[s] on personal, cultural and institutional levels, and gives advantages, favours, and benefits members of non-target social groups at the expense of members of target groups’ (p. 1). People positioned in privileged positions are unaware of their membership within the dominant group, as they have the advantage of seeing themselves as subjects, instead of a particular homogeneous representation. Privileges and benefits are granted to them, ‘regardless of their stated intent’ (Allies for Change, NA, p. 2).

I reflected on this definition and questioned in which ways this could be applied to the study and myself, and whether a continuous effort to respect and consider the participants had been made. I realised that I had considered exclusively children as participants, and practitioner’s’ consent and participation was only superficially included. This led to creating an oppressive representation of female practitioners, positioning them in a structuralist framing within which they were understood as subjects who were part of the nursery ‘machinery’, overseeing child subjects, and who were able to (at best) temporarily resist this discursive position. I unintentionally omitted deeper analysis of episodes in which practitioners were vulnerable: they cried, were sick, tired or happy. Although I stated having emancipatory intentions, in my analyses I failed to check my blind spots and ignored how I positioned myself in a privileged position. The initial research question focused on the performance of discourses of ‘the Child’, as this had not been explored, and assumptions about how adults/practitioners had inherently more power over children, was embedded in it.

McIntosh (1988) emphasises that ‘the pressure to avoid [facing our privilege] is great, for in facing it I must give up the myth of meritocracy’ (p. 3). Thus, I would like to reflect on the illusion of the ‘merit’ of ‘being’ a researcher, who can enter classrooms and interpret practitioners’ behaviours without acknowledging their own interpretations. Drawing on McIntosh’s (1988) analysis of her privilege as a researcher and practitioner, organised in four areas: personal, professional, institutional affiliation, and education research; I list the privileges that gave me advantages to research practitioners’ professionalism and lives.
1. Personal
   - I can access higher education because I had a good secondary education.
   - I can work in a wide variety of jobs if I want to, because of my qualifications.
   - I can research early years settings without having to work simultaneously, because I have a scholarship.
   - I can study abroad because I speak several languages.
   - I can ask my partner for financial, emotional, and academic support because he also has a postgraduate degree.
   - I can ask some friends for academic support because they also have a postgraduate degree.
   - I can judge other women’s beliefs and opinions because I am educated.

2. Professional
   - I can assess and judge early years assistants because of my degree and the educational level I have achieved.
   - I can assess and judge early years educators because of my postgraduate degree.
   - I can access early years classrooms and assess their work, because of my qualifications as an academic and a professional.

3. Institutional Affiliations
   - I can access educational institutions and classrooms because of my profession and degrees.
   - I can research in early years’ spaces because of the European institution I am studying in.
   - I can be asked for my opinion or evaluation about early years practitioners’ work.

4. Education Research
   - I can enter and exit the classroom whenever I please.
   - I can leave the classroom if I am hungry, sick, or tired.
   - I can dress with clothes I consider comfortable and appropriate.
   - I can observe and write down whatever I esteem relevant.
- I can assess and judge practitioners’ beliefs, behaviours and opinions.
- I do not need to confirm information with practitioners, because my observation is enough.
- I can avoid assuming responsibility for children and their behaviour in the classroom, because I am not part of nursery staff.
- I can have playful and horizontal relationships with children because I am not part of the nursery staff.

Until listing my privileges, I was not aware that these provided the possibility of doing this study and writing about ECE, children, and practitioners. Although I have never intended to use any type of privilege as an advantage over others, I did not use it to support them, to show their stories or how the discourses that emerged from the Kai-Kai figures in previous chapters were just as harsh on their lives and selves, as they were for children.

In this re-written version of the thesis, I have tried to convey and be clear about the ways I reproduced unequal structural conditions for practitioners during research, as a reflection of their everyday struggles to perform ‘the Aunty’. Their voices, experiences, thoughts and bodies were not protected, but silenced because I did not foresee that their subjectivities and positions would be relevant in this study. For this reason, in the next section I revisit and reflect on some research episodes that illustrate instances where power issues arose in relation to practitioners.

**Reflecting on power issues in research**

As I mentioned before, the focus of the study was mainly children’s practices and interactions in the nursery, and less so on practitioners. Ethical considerations, analysis on power relations, among other things, were almost entirely centred on children. Furthermore, my background as a practitioner labelled my researcher ‘self’ as part of the main culture, entering the classroom with an ‘insider perspective’. This enabled me to observe, criticise, challenge and unpick any kind of evidence with a freedom that is not available to any researcher. Questioning these acts is the first step to reflect on and check power issues in research, but it is not enough to change them, as it does not end the problematic consequences involved in unseen dynamics of researcher privilege. To transform social systems, the unseen dimensions surrounding privilege have to be
acknowledged, in the hope of enabling other researchers in the field to keep thinking about and to reaffirm the political dimension of research in ECE.

Eder and Corsaro (1999) highlight that one of the most important privileges, particularly for an ethnographic research approach, is the chance to enter and observe the daily lives of the people they study. In my case, I did not have the inherent right to be in the Butterfly classroom, but had the privilege to access it. The ethnographic-informed approach I employed aimed to resist perpetuating the colonising narratives of ethnography which instrumentalise individuals and their culture. I took this into account when performing participant observation with children, respecting their personal accounts, drawings, and play conversations and topics. My observation and participation in children’s play considered how I affected their interactions and worlds, but ignored the need of doing this for practitioners.

In this sense, my participant observation in the classroom possibly impacted on practitioners’ work and (professional, personal) lives. This could range from creating distractions for children and them, to affecting their wellbeing because of concerns relating to my examination and judgement of their practices (and the possible negative consequences related to that), or to my transgression of (unspoken) rules: how to behave in the classroom, how to behave as a female adult, how to behave as a colleague, among others. These issues should be taken into account before and during the study’s implementation, as they raise ethical concerns by placing practitioners in a disadvantaged and/or powerless position. In the following paragraphs, different examples in which practitioners may have felt constrained by the study and myself, the researcher, will be examined.

**Limitations of the ‘least adult’ role**

In the first stages of the study, I worked to develop a positive and friendly relationship with practitioners. However, my main efforts were placed on children, and I attempted to detach from the adult role of authority (Eder & Corsaro, 1999), aiming to reduce the power imbalance between myself and children, an idea that I sought to infuse in my methodology. Thus, I designed the study to follow Eder and Corsaro’s (1999) understanding of adult participation, in which the researcher’s status as an adult is acknowledged, but she is conceived as *atypical*.

Christensen and Prout (2002) suggest that relationships between adults in researching children, and the effects these can have between researchers and child participants, has to be carefully examined to develop ‘ethical symmetry’. This involves taking into consideration how these
relationships can affect children’s ‘data’, the behaviours of the participants, what contexts are researched, and text and image production (Randall 2012).

After analysing the methodological approach of the study, and the examiner’s comments on it, I realised that my status shifted towards a ‘least adult’ role, which may have been productive when working with children. Mandell (1988) suggests that the least adult role was not only achievable, but also desirable when researching with children. However, I was not aware of how my relationship with children impacted my way of relating to practitioners’ lives. By positioning myself in a ‘least adult’ role, I may have excluded practitioners from actively participating and constructing shared meanings, as I gave less emphasis to their understandings when developing fieldnotes or other records.

**Everyday practices and fieldnotes**

During the study, I observed and participated in practitioner-directed activities, however at the time I did not consider how my privileged position towards practitioners affected these occasions. For instance, my privileged positioning as a researcher enabled me to enter and facilitate children’s access to restricted spaces, such as the bathroom. Although I made a constant effort not to transgress the rules of the classroom, given that I subjected myself to practitioners’ regulations just as any child, I did not take into account the consequences of my actions in everyday mealtime and hygiene rituals, or the collective use of my notebook.

By observing and participating in hygiene rituals, or facilitating children access to the bathroom, I possibly created a problem for practitioners to solve. They may have had to take further actions to prevent accidents, or feel obligated to double efforts to promote the expected norms and behaviours in such space. Likewise, I did not help practitioners to resolve the consequences of my privileged actions by opening the bathroom door for children who needed to use it, but not accompanying them there.

During mealtime rituals, my participation (and possibly the contents of my lunch box) created unnecessary distractions for children while practitioners attempted to go about this ritual as planned. Social demands related to guaranteeing children’s protection and promotion of physical wellbeing, positioned practitioners as responsible and accountable for children’s eating habits. Throwing away too many leftovers is negatively assessed by the subsidising institution (JUNJI) and
the external company providing services (food and its preparation). Also, as a former practitioner and based on informal conversations with other practitioners, I am aware that some children attending state-subsidised nurseries often do not have other meals besides the ones provided in the nursery. Therefore, when children left their lunches to examine mine, or refused to continue eating because they wanted what I was having, practitioners had to double their efforts to enforce mealtime habits.

Additionally, in the mealtime episode in which I giggled because Eloisa burped (Chapter Seven), my behaviour may have possibly impacted in a negative manner on Aunty Lily’s effort to teach ‘vulnerable’ children manners that were considered relevant for their future, either in school or life in general. Furthermore, by apparently siding with Eloisa’s behaviour, as an adult I delegitimised practitioners’ rules. This problematic emerged because, in the ‘least adult’ role (Mandell, 1988), I got drawn into children’s activities, including me in activities that they did not develop in front of practitioners, leading me to assume that my researcher status positioned me as an *atypical adult* (Eder and Corsaro, 1999). However, Eder and Corsaro’s understanding of the atypical adult status considers that the researcher is not a complete participant, because she is still an adult.

Another instance where I may have imposed my researcher privilege on practitioners was while registering my fieldnotes. Recording in the notebook may have seemed vague to practitioners, or they may have feared being captured raising their voices or talking about things that would be considered inappropriate for an ECE practitioner. For instance, in one free play instance, I was with a group of children and we had the audio recorder on. Aunty Celeste stumbled with a toy and said a swearword at a low sound volume, which she immediately seemed to regret and blushed. She then came to me and asked if I could delete that audio recording. I answered of course, left the group and got my computer. I downloaded the audio recording, we identified the snippet where her voice appeared, and she personally clicked on *Delete*. Her face lit up, and she explained: ‘*Thanks, you know that we aunties cannot say or be heard saying something like that.*’ (Fieldnotes extract, 08/11/2013).

Events like these led me to interpret that my status had been accepted by children and practitioners, and that I was not perceived as a threat and was being ethically consistent with an ‘atypical adult’ role (Eder and Corsaro, 1999). I perceived the practitioners’ initial sensitivity to my presence as an expected reaction, but I assumed they were put at ease when they saw how
children accepted me, my constant presence and my commitment to experience the classroom life from children’s perspective:

‘Ximena: So, what do you think I have been doing in this research?  
Aunty Celeste: At the beginning, I thought you would just be there, but then I saw you becoming part of the children’s group, almost like a child.  
Aunty Bedford: Yeah, because you are part of everything we do, you sing in the morning with us, you do whatever children are doing. [you] get into the sandpit and play there.  
Ximena: Is there something I could change for the next period?  
Aunty Lily: No, I don’t think so. Just don’t make any problems. (Everybody laughs)’

(Audio extract from Feedback conversation with staff after first stage of study, July 2013)

The reflective diary, informed by an autoethnographic approach, assumed that through my observation and participation, I impacted in the production of ‘the Child’ and ‘the Aunty’ discourses. This changed my status from an ‘atypical adult’ to a ‘least adult’ role, where I had certain privileges over children, and in turn, practitioners could not access my interactions with them.

Limitations when observing and participating in play

The design of the study assumed that practitioners would actively engage in play instances developed by children. However, practitioners’ roles and professional obligations within the nursery -linked to the implementation of policies in the ECE context- were not fully taken into consideration. Consequently, practitioners may have felt obliged to supervise play and prevent accidents in the playground, or to make explicit the pedagogical intention when they participated in play instances I was observing and recording. The first practice, supervising play, would respond to social demands of ‘the Aunty’ protecting children’s physical wellbeing. The second, making the pedagogical intention of play explicit, may be related to several aspects of the professional role of ‘the Aunty’.

‘Aunty Celeste: I would also like to play with children in the sand, or just sit with them with the toys. But I can’t, I have to do so many other things! I just can’t, although I want to.’

(Audio extract, final feedback meeting, 06/12/2013)
According to the CFECE, any practice in the classroom has to have a pedagogical intention, i.e. if any other activity emerges practitioners have to engage in it pedagogically, and have to plan it later in retrospective. In addition, the CFECE’s definition of play as children’s inherent activity, foreclosed adults’ chances to play non-pedagogically. However, in the beach play and play corner episodes in Chapter Nine, practitioners playfully engaged with children. They did not necessarily produce the ‘facilitating Aunty’ or ‘protective Aunty’ discourse, but rather shared a facet of their selves, as individuals who are not exclusively dependent on the setting and the demands it places on them. Allegedly, these could be examples of how they resisted and attempted to reshape their subjectivity in the classroom. Both play episodes had an explicit pedagogical purpose, which possibly helped practitioners to feel entitled to play.

For my part, changes could have been considered during the initial exploratory phase or during the in-depth immersion in order to explore with practitioners, for instance, how to create moments~spaces in which they could feel protected while also being active participants. In the episodes where adults participated, I could have returned to them and asked about the reasons behind their decisions and actions, as well as checking my own interpretations. The relevance of such practice relies on participants having the right to know what had been recorded and to explain their actions. It also helps to avoid over-interpretation or putting personal meanings into the analysis. As with other participative approaches, participant observation of play instances opened questions about my ethical responsibility as researcher, the limits of informed consent, the relevance of assent, and halting unexpected narratives when these put participants at risk.

Finally, it is important to revisit how, by engaging in the ‘least adult’ role during play instances, I unconsciously brought other narratives into play that were problematic. For example, in the play corner episode (Chapter Nine), I assumed that my participation was reduced to following the narratives aunties set out for us. However, when I revisited my reflective diary, I realised that I also was perpetuating discourses of ‘the Aunty’. Moreover, when I attempted to give children a manicure, I actively participated in reproducing heteronormative and androcentric discourses, adding a class element which was not taken up by other players.

Possible ways of keeping my privileges in check

The examples in this chapter show instances where my position as a privileged female practitioner~researcher was operating over practitioners, despite my intention to establish a
horizontal relationship with them. For instance, after the study I had two meetings in which, preliminary findings were discussed with practitioners, and they expressed agreement to what I was writing and thinking, this practice could have continued throughout the analysis process, consistent with my appropriation of Frank’s (2011) ‘pockets of participation’. Regarding this issue, Milner (2007) emphasises:

> ‘Engaged reflection and representation suggest that it is the researcher’s responsibility to listen to the voices and perspectives of those under study (in this case, for the teacher to talk through a researcher’s observation) to provide compelling, fair evidence. In situations where the researcher and participant disagree, it is critical for the researcher to report both the narrative (in this case, the researcher’s interpretation of a classroom interaction) and the counter-narrative (the teacher’s explanation) or vice versa’ (p. 396)

My analytical process could have benefited greatly from a continuous conversation with practitioners. Take for example the finding of how ‘the Child’ discourse is tightly linked to ‘the Aunty’ discourse, which emerged after the ‘data’ construction process while I was back in the UK in 2015, where a critical analysis about practitioners’ tensions and challenges in the performative production of ‘the Aunty’ should have been developed and included in the first version of the thesis.

Another way of approaching this problem would have been incorporating interviews with staff. Throughout the ‘data’ construction period, practitioners chose to review the evidence only on four occasions. Their argument - ‘they trusted my judgment’ – could have been unpicked for unseen power tensions created by my privileged position. Among other things, concerns about ‘transgressing limits’ between researcher-researched by reading the notebook and identifying what ‘data’ should be deleted could expose them to further examination and use of that same ‘data’ against them. Consequently, and given that practitioners had limited time, short interviews in which they would give meaning to their behaviours, could have been a practical and consistent alternative.

These ways of keeping my privileged position in check, could have opened up a richer, deeper and more complex reading of practitioners’ lives and practices in the classroom. My writing omitted that they could have conflicting opinions, thoughts, and discourses, just as I did. These questions, framed under an understanding of collective meaning-making, would have respected their lives and experiences, as well as significantly contributing to the construction of ‘data’ of this study.
Final thoughts

McIntosh (1988) offers an insightful critique of unseen privilege. People who are positioned in privileged circumstances are not necessarily aware of it, or about the disadvantages it can create for others. The ethics of this study should have been explored to unpick the corollary aspects that put me as the researcher at an advantage. This researcher privilege is an invisible framing of unearned assets that this study carries every day, and about which I remained oblivious. Consequently, even though this study was not intended to be oppressive, it could have justly been perceived so by the participants.

I may not have predicted that my ethical considerations were not enough for the participant adults, however this reflection could have enabled working with unforeseen dangers that my unseen privilege brought into the study. Privilege needs to be reviewed regularly, as people (irrespective of their age, gender, identity) and communities have to be represented in ways such that the study honours them and maintains their integrity (Milner, 2007).

It is my hope that this chapter, the critical analyses and potential solutions I outlined, are useful for future studies in the ECE field. As a female practitioner and researcher, my intentions have always been informed by social justice values, particularly with the disadvantaged ECE realities I have actively worked in. I have learned that practitioners make an unacknowledged effort to create protected spaces for young children, and this study provides confirmation that it is not an easy task. Practitioners seek to offer young children opportunities to reap the knowledge and experiences that may prove useful for the latter becoming active members of their communities and society in general. This is a particularly important issue for children from vulnerable families.

From an ethical perspective, I aspired to showcase and put children’s voices and experiences at the front of the study, which is an important research gap in the Latin-American context. However, I was not as successful in portraying the interplay and entanglement with practitioners’ voices and experiences, despite this being closely linked with those of children. I hope that my reflections and critiques are understood as an honest attempt to transform invisible privileges that carry unforeseen assumptions and practices, and that this effort can impact positively on the ECE field and the people living within it.
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## APPENDIXES

### 1. Gantt Chart 1: Preliminary Arrangements and Exploratory Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>2013 (Starting Month January)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Arrangements</td>
<td>Online meetings with Headteacher</td>
<td>Inform about study. Request suggestions and apply changes.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online meeting with Education Head of Municipality</td>
<td>Inform about study.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting in nursery with Headteacher and Team of practitioners</td>
<td>Inform about study. Request suggestions and apply changes.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Phase</td>
<td>Meeting in Municipality with Education Head</td>
<td>Inform about study.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop with Practitioners.</td>
<td>Inform about study. Request suggestions and apply necessary changes.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation to Families, workshop</td>
<td>Explain study. Request consent.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in Classroom</td>
<td>Immersion into the daily life of the classroom.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autoethnography</td>
<td>Critical episodes, deconstruction</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop with Children</td>
<td>Explain study. Invite to participate. Request consent and assent.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piloting Play as Participatory Research Method</td>
<td>Explore how many children, what times, moments, leitmotifs, spaces work best.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting/constructing data with children</td>
<td>Explore how many children, what times, moments, leitmotifs, spaces work best. Explore ways of recording (audio, visual, etc.)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Analysis</td>
<td>Explore with children how it could be analysed.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting back to Participants</td>
<td>Explain what has been done and achieved. Collaboratively assess what could be the next steps. Request suggestions about what I could bring back to the participants and/or institution.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Table 1: Phases of the Research Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Main Aim</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Week 1 – 6 (March to second week of April)</td>
<td>Presentation and Immersion</td>
<td>Participation, receiving consent and assent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Week 7 – 14 (Third week of April to last week of May)</td>
<td>Exploratory, Developing Pockets of Participation</td>
<td>Immersion into the daily life of the classroom, piloting participatory methods, initial collaborative data construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Week 15 - 19 (First week of June to last week of July)</td>
<td>Developing Strategies, Data Co-construction</td>
<td>Immersion into the daily life of the classroom collaborative data construction, Possible collaborative data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth Data Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Week 20- 21 (First to second week of November)</td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Immersion into the daily life of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Week 22-24 (Third week of November to first week of December)</td>
<td>Data Co-construction</td>
<td>Collaborative data construction, Possible collaborative data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Data analysis and writing up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gantt Chart 2: Outline for Research and PhD Thesis completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>YEAR 1 2012</th>
<th>YEAR 2 2013</th>
<th>YEAR 3 2014</th>
<th>YEAR 4 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration and definition of topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Literature Review and Methodology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring approaches to data construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting Participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing participants and collecting their assent/consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Exploratory Study and Adaptation of method to research design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary data analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: In-depth Data co-construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting back to the participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Courses and Modules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Childhood: We are doing it. Exploring with young Chilean children the performativity of childhood

Ximena Galdames C.
MPhil/PhD student, Institute of Education (IOE), University of London

1. Introduction

During the last 30 years, within the field of Early Childhood Education, ‘reconceptualists’ (Cannella, 2005; Soto and Swadener, 2002; Taguchi, 2006; Taylor, 2011; Tobin, 1995) have discussed the need to deconstruct and analyse dominant ideas about childhood and early childhood education. When these ideas are not discussed, they can lead to the production of ‘power relations (...) that harbour injustice, oppression and regulation (Cannella, 1997, p. 157) of children. Notions of ‘the child’, ‘childhood’, and ‘children’ have formed part of grand narratives, and have structured the field in several ways, producing a specific subject (‘the child’) who must be (re)produced in nursery classrooms.

In a previous study, in which underpinning discourses of the Chilean early childhood education curriculum and its relationship with early childhood educators’ comprehension were analysed, I found that there were diverse discourses of childhood and ‘the child’ that overlapped and contradicted each other (Galdames, 2010). Similarly, in another analysis (Galdames, 2011) linked to this study about the early childhood education curriculum, it was possible to observe how early childhood policy contributed to shape a notion of childhood marked by discourses that represent children as subjects restricted by the structure (lacking of, savage, in development and/or immature) and with little capacity for agency. However, the way children respond to and act upon these restrictions has not been explored yet. This study will explore how the idea of ‘the child’ is developed in the early childhood education classroom.

Although I concur that discourses about ‘the child’ have constituted children as an ‘other’ (Cannella, 1997), it does not imply to be determined to be (Butler, 1999). Thus, I am interested in exploring how children (i.e., they are ‘made’ into a particular subject) (re)produce, change or resist these discourses. Through reconceptualising, ‘the field of childhood studies could work towards breaking the adult/child binary, to acknowledge the concept of the child as a political one’ (Cannella et al., 2000, p. 219), and therefore offer the possibility of a different alternative to work with/for children. My work is based on authors who suggest that postmodern and post structural theoretical frameworks can help unveil, challenge and modify dominant ideologies (Blaise, 2010; Cannella and Viruru, 2004; MacNaughton, 2005).

Summarising, I am interested in studying how (ideal) discourses of the Chilean child is constituted and reproduced by individuals in the early childhood education classroom.
2. **Research questions**

The main question that will guide my study is:

*How is the discourse of ‘the child’ produced by young children?*

This research question is in turn linked to three more specific questions:

- *What is the current notion of childhood in Chilean early childhood education?*
- *How is ‘the child’ constituted and reproduced by adults and young children in the Chilean early childhood education context?*

3. **Objectives**

- To explore the usefulness of the notion of ‘childhood as performative’ in a Chilean early childhood education classroom.
- To develop play as a research method with young children.

4. **Methodology**

This study is framed by a postmodern paradigm (Stronach and Maclure, 1997), considering an exploratory and gradual approach (Lee, 1999). This means that although there is a framework of reference, this framework will adapt to the context of the nursery, the classroom, practitioners and children, and the progress of the study. Before detailing the research methods, I offer a summary that will allow the reader to visualise the design and structure of the study. A four-month exploratory study is expected to be developed during the first semester of 2013.

I will collect data from three sites: first, the general framework of the Chilean early childhood education; second, a selection of curricular and/or pedagogical documents from the nursery; and third, a year group in the nursery.

The first site corresponds to the Chilean early childhood education context, given that this system is a place where different disciplines converge and constitute ‘the child’ as a subject. In my opinion, the document analysis that frame the Chilean early childhood education will allow me to critically inquire what constitutes the current understanding of childhood in the early childhood education field.

The second and third sites where I will collect data will be the nursery and the group. Data will be collected from:

- **A)** The analysis of curricular and/or pedagogical documents produced by the nursery; and
- **B)** The group, young children and staff working in the classroom.

During this time, I will join the year group one day a week, for the entire school day (8:30 -16:30). Regarding the collection and analysis of documents produced by the nursery, this exercise can provide information in relation to discourses that have been emphasised to constitute ‘the child’ in this particular nursery. The documents elaborated in the nursery (and more specifically, for the year group) such as daily, weekly, monthly and annual planning will allow me to critically comprehend the idealised subjectivation of ‘the child’ in the nursery. During this exploratory phase, I expect to identify and collect the main documents to subsequently analyse them.
The approach will be gradual to evaluate the exploratory design and chosen research methods, and thus be able to modify and adapt the study format. It is worth mentioning that children’s participation is a central element, which requires of detailed exploration and evaluation given that in the Chilean context there have not been any studies that considered young children as participants and/or researchers.

The exploratory study is divided in three phases, where activities and their depth will be expanded according to the increase of familiarity with the context and participants. The first phase starts with establishing a bond of trust with the context (practitioners, education community, families and children) and obtaining the proper authorisation and consent to participate of the study. After reaching an understanding of how the classroom dynamic and the roles that participants are established every day, I will explore how to research with children, through play as a research method, how we make ‘the child’ in the classroom. Such instances will be called ‘participatory spaces’. After all of the necessary conditions have been met, I will seek to pilot with children different alternatives to play and how to record it (for instance, through audio, photo or other). According to the data collected, this exploratory experience will be analysed to refine the study method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Week 1 – 6 (March to second week of April)</td>
<td>Introduction and immersion</td>
<td>Participation, seeking consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Week 7 – 14 (third week of April to fourth week of May)</td>
<td>Exploratory; participatory spaces</td>
<td>Immersion in classroom daily life; identification of curricular-pedagogical documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Week 15 - 19 (first week of June to fourth week of July)</td>
<td>Develop strategies; data collection</td>
<td>Immersion in classroom daily life; pilot of collaborative data collection; Potential collaborative analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the circumstances allow it and the exploratory phase turns out successful, I plan to return in the following semester or school year for a number of weeks to do the formal data collection with the same group of participants.

Regarding the data collection methods, the study aims to articulate four different sources: document analysis, auto ethnography (Roth, 2005a), a postmodern approach to ethnography (Britzman, 1995; Tamboukou and Ball, 2003) and play as a research method. The following table briefly explains what these sources consist of, what kind of information they collect, and how they will be applied in the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Key Aspects</th>
<th>Document Analysis</th>
<th>Auto ethnography</th>
<th>Postmodern approach to Ethnography</th>
<th>Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General description</td>
<td>Review of curricular and pedagogical documents used in the nursery and year group.</td>
<td>Recording and analysis of critical episodes, comments/observations from children about my role as an adult in the classroom. Critical analysis of my role and its influence on how the notions of childhood/adulthood are (re)produced.</td>
<td>Immersion in daily activities of the classroom to achieve a deep understanding of the context.</td>
<td>Pilot the possibility of developing some kind of play instance with children that would allow, through their participation (play), to manifest issues of their interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection procedure</td>
<td>Identification of key documents where elements that make reference to or illustrate notions of childhood can be found.</td>
<td>Recording and analysis in a field journal.</td>
<td>Participation in classroom activities as part of the group.</td>
<td>Participation in corner or free play, preferentially when it is led by children (for instance, dramatic or role play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of data collected</td>
<td>Pedagogical and/or curricular documents produced in the nursery (for instance, annual planning, classroom pedagogical project)</td>
<td>Personal commentary, critical episodes, children’s observations or comments</td>
<td>Recording of objects and activities (for instance, routine or regular activities). Field notes of some of these instances.</td>
<td>Recording of play instances, participants and their roles, how it is developed, what is said, how participants use their bodies to manifest their impressions, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related activities in the classroom</td>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td>Notes in a journal.</td>
<td>Notes in a journal.</td>
<td>Notes and drawings in a journal, and possibly photos and video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My role in the classroom</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal, but neither as a practitioner nor a child</td>
<td>Internal, as another non-adult participant in play.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth mentioning that my role as researcher does not intend to disturb the routine activities of the nursery, and specifically of the year group in the classroom. Therefore, my role will not be a teaching one, nor will I play a child role. Although I will integrate as a participant in the classroom and nursery, I do not expect to have the authority and attributions of staff. This implies that I will not be able to support pedagogical activities, nor take responsibility for the year group as an early childhood educator where I am developing the study.

5. Ethics

This study is framed within the ethical guidelines established by the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011). According to these guidelines, respect and protection of people involved
in the study is a fundamental issue that orientates the research practice. Classroom staff will be informed and their consent will be sought in order to observe and register some routine activities.

Permission and consent will be sought from parents and guardians of the year group as well, after explaining the study to them, making sure they understand clearly what it entails. Consent will also be sought from children, both at the beginning and throughout the study. Any participant can withdraw from the study (or their child) freely and without any consequences.

None of the information provided by the participants will be passed on to other people or institutions, in order to ensure confidentiality and protect participants’ anonymity. If any information is requested, a summarising report could be provided at the end of the semester, however, it will consist of a brief synthesis that will safeguard participants’ confidentiality and anonymity. Only if sensitive information that entails harm to children’s wellbeing emerges, this will be passed on through formal channels of communication. All of these conditions will be informed to participants prior to seeking their consent. The following table summarises the main issues related to participation in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants involved</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
<th>Parents/guardians</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>Information letter with summary of the study, which my role and the role of those who agree to participate.</td>
<td>Information letter with summary of the study, which my role and the role of those who agree to participate.</td>
<td>Worksheets where different situations that will happen during the study are identified, and for which their permission will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative activity</strong></td>
<td>Workshop or presentation where the study will be explained, consent will be sought, and alternative arrangements will be negotiated if necessary.</td>
<td>Presentation in Parents’ Meeting where the study will be explained, consent will be sought, and alternative arrangements will be negotiated if necessary.</td>
<td>Planned activity where the study will be summarised, my role will be explained and their role will be described if they agree to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permission and consent</strong></td>
<td>Informed consent, which will be signed by both parties (can be withdrawn at any time).</td>
<td>Informed consent, which will be signed by both parties (can be withdrawn at any time).</td>
<td>Informed consent, before and throughout the study. The aim is to offer young children a written consent form that will not require them to be able to read but still will reflect that they understand what is involved in their participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collected</strong></td>
<td>Routine or regular pedagogical experiences and routine conversations. Practitioners’ performance will not be assessed, and judgements will not be made. Rather, common elements that have been</td>
<td>Routine or regular pedagogical experiences and routine conversations. Free or semi-directed play instances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Benefits**

Finally, in this last section the potential benefits of participating in the study are briefly introduced in order to motivate participants and the nursery to join. It is important to note that this is a tentative list of benefits, and they can change according to suggestions and requirements from the nursery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioners – Nursery</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In exchange for access to the classroom, I can offer CPD instances for staff, according to the needs expressed by the nursery.</td>
<td>Although it is still not very clear to me what can be offered in exchange for children’s participation, the pilot study could provide information to consider potential benefits for this group of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the pilot study is successful, and the nursery provides access to develop the formal study later in 2013/2014, alternative benefits can be discussed and arranged to support the nursery and its staff.

---

**Information throughout the study**

- All written material can be requested (for instance, fieldnotes), some records can be revised, removed or supplemented when there are issues that were not considered.

**Devolution**

- A summary report can be requested. All information provided will be made anonymous.

- Informative activity will be arranged where the development of the study will be addressed. Feedback about the study will be sought in this activity. All information provided will be made anonymous.
5. Information Sheet about the Study for Parents

Title of the Study: Exploring with Young Chilean children the performativity of childhood in a Chilean early childhood classroom

My name is Ximena Galdames, I am an early childhood practitioner and I’m currently developing my studies in London. I am writing to you because I want to develop a study at the nursery your child is attending, and I would like to have your consent for your child’s participation.

This study is a doctoral research framed in the Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment; and the Doctoral School of the IOE (in London, UK).

I. Details of the Study:

I want to invite your son/daughter to become part of a study where the aim is to explore how we remember to which social group we belong to (children or adults), in order to behave accordingly. In order to be able to develop this idea, I want to become part of the nursery: participate in class, write up questions and comments children make to me. Later, I want to try to develop research with them. I will ask them how we could study this topic, how to record what we discover and if possible, create a moment during the day were we would play (in groups, smaller and/or bigger ones). To achieve this, I will spend from March until July, at least three days a week at the nursery, in order to know how it works and get to know everybody better. I am not going to teach, or take care of the children in the classroom. My role will be of a researcher.

II. Protection and Risks:

a) Information: I will protect your child’s opinions and views. Hence, I will not be able to share with you what they tell me in privacy, unless they want me to or it involves their welfare. This is out of respect to your child’s confidentiality. If you are interested, at the end of this pilot stage I can share with you a summary of what we did and achieved.

b) Anonymity: You and your child’s identity will be protected, names and places will be changed. Nobody else, besides myself, is going to access the information I will collect at the nursery.

c) Benefits: This study has no direct benefits for you. However, this study could benefit your child, because he/she will have the opportunity to show how he/she sees how children are treated. It is relevant for the field of early childhood because it provides information to understand and critically change and improve how we see and treat children, and what we teach them. Hence, it would be also relevant for other children because these changes could have a positive impact in their lives. For Chile it is relevant because there has been no Chilean study seeking to integrate children as researchers, so it could mean an improvement.
d) **Costs associated:** This research has no costs for you, it is free from charge.

e) **Voluntarity:** You are not obliged to authorise your child’s participation. I want to respect any of your decisions fully, so if you get to a point you feel uncomfortable with your child’s participation, you can withdraw and hopefully share with me what has led to your decision. Any information you or your child would have shared until then, will not be used. In order to achieve this, you should notify no later than 3 months after your child’s participation, so I can remove the data immediately. It is important to highlight that your son/daughter has the right to withdraw from the study at any moment, if he/she asks for it orally or through gesture.

f) **Risks:** The study does not present any risks for you or your child.

I, the researcher in charge of the study, will keep a form of consent where you will state that you authorise your child’s participation in this research. You will also have a copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions or need more information, please don’t hesitate in contacting me. I will be available the days I am in the nursery (after 16:30), by phone or email. Please discuss the information provided in this letter with other persons if you wish to do so, or ask me if there is any topic that is not clear enough, or that requires more information.

I hope to count with your support. Thank you for your time. Best wishes,

Ximena Galdames C.
Early Childhood Educator, PUCV
MPhil/PhD Student, Institute of Education, University of London

All your data will be collected and saved, protecting your privacy and anonymity according to the Chilean Law of Protection of Private Life (Law N° 19.628, 1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998), and the Ethical Code of Conduct in Educational Research (2011).
6. Informed Consent Form about the Research for Parents

Please, complete this form once you have read the Information Letter and/or listened to the information about this study.

**Title of the Study:** Exploring with Young Chilean children the performativity of childhood in a Chilean early childhood classroom

Thank you for your interest in being part of this study. Before you authorise your son/daughter to participate, the researcher must have explained you the details of the project.

If you have any questions referring to the information letter, or the explanation that has been given to you, please ask the researcher before deciding your child’s participation.
You will receive a copy of this informed consent form, so you can save it and refer to it whenever necessary.

**Parent’s Consent:**

I, 

______________________________________________________________________________

(Name of the parent)

- Have read and listened to the notes at the beginning of this form and the information letter, and understand what is this study about.
- I understand that I can decide in any moment that I do not want to be part of this study. To fulfil this decision, I have to inform the researcher latest within three months after the study was developed, in order to have my son’s/daughter’s data deleted immediately.
- I declare that my child’s participation 

______________________________________________________________________________

(Name of the Child)

- Has not been forced by the researcher or others.
- I understand that I will not be charged, nor that I will be paid for my child’s participation in this study.
- I authorise that the activities my child participates on, will be processed to achieve the aims of the study.
- I understand that my child’s information will be treated in a strictly confidential manner, and will be used according to the protection provided by the Chilean Law No. 19.628 for the protection of the private life (1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998) and the Ethical Code of Practice of the British Education Research Association (Bera, 2011).

**Consent of the Researcher:**


I, Ximena Galdames Castillo

- Have provided the parent the information letter, and have allowed him/her to request help if he/she cannot read it, and have answered all his/her questions about the study.
- I consider that the parent has understood the information that has been provided, including risks, benefits and rights related to their child’s participation.
- I have provided enough information to allow the parent to make an informed decision about their child’s participation in this study.
- I declare that I have not forced or influenced the parent’s decision in any way.
- I declare that this is an academic study, and that it has not been commissioned by any company, private or public enterprise, or the Municipality.
- I will not charge or pay the parent for his/her child’s collaboration in this study.
- I declare that all the personal information will be treated in a strictly confidential manner, and will be used according to the alignments of the Chilean Law No. 19.628 for the protection of the private life (1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998) and the Ethical Code of Practice of the British Education Research Association (Bera, 2011).

Signature of the Researcher

Date
Title of the Study: Childhood: We’re doing it. Exploring with Young Chilean children the performativity of childhood in a Chilean early childhood classroom

My name is Ximena Galdames, I am an early childhood practitioner and I’m currently developing my studies in London. I’m writing to you because I want to research within your classroom and I want to request your consent.

This study is a doctoral research framed in the Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment; and the Doctoral School of the IOE (in London, UK).

I. Details of the Study:

I want to invite the children of the classroom you work in, to take part in a study that aims to explore how we remember to which social group we belong to (children, adults), in order to behave accordingly. I also want to invite you to take part in it, as an indirect participant. Although the focus of the study will be to investigate with children, I will record activities, experiences and routines which you are involved with. I will not evaluate or judge your performance, your work, opinions and/or knowledge. Moreover, I’m interested in exploring how traditions of the Early Childhood Education field are reproduced in the classroom in daily activities, through oral and physical interactions; and how these impact in the way notions of childhood are (re)created.

In order to be able to develop these ideas, I want to become part of the nursery: participate in class, take notes of some activities, write down questions and comments children make to me. I will spend from March to July, at least three days a week in the nursery. In this way I will be able to understand how the nursery works and get to know everyone better. Later in the future, I will try to develop the study with the children. I will require your support for creating spaces (for example framed within a learning experience) in which I will ask them how we could investigate this topic and how to record what we have discovered, so to create a moment during the day in which we would do some role-play (in small or large groups). Your support would be very important, given that I will have to use space and will have to develop these moments in groups, according to the interested in participating.

Referring to my role in the classroom, I will not supervise your work and performance. I also will not teach or take care of the children in the classroom. My role would be of a researcher, i.e. I will participate in the daily activities, will take notes of some experiences, and would play with the children.
II. Protection and Risks:

a) **Information:** I will protect children’s opinions, so I will not be able to share with you the things they share with me in private, unless they request it or it involves their wellbeing. This is because I want to respect each child’s confidentiality. If you are interested, after finishing the study, I can share with you a summary about what we did and achieved. You will also have access to the notes I take of learning experiences where you are involved. You can request eliminating certain aspects and/or incorporate others that I may have ignored.

b) **Anonymity:** Your and children’s identities will be protected, names and places will be modified. You can choose your pseudonym. No other person besides myself will have access to the data collected in the nursery. The collected information that involves you in some way, will not be facilitated to third parties (directorate, Municipality and others). Only in case that the security and/or wellbeing of the children is involved, I will make an exception.

c) **Benefits:** This study has no direct benefits for you. However, this study could benefit your child, because he/she will have the opportunity to show how he/she sees how children are treated. It is relevant for the field of early childhood because it provides information to understand and critically change and improve how we see and treat children, and what we teach them. Hence, it would be also relevant for other children because these changes could have a positive impact in their lives. For Chile it is relevant because there has been no Chilean study seeking to integrate children as researchers, so it could mean an improvement. In exchange for your support and collaboration in this study, I will offer my knowledge and training to the learning community, offering for example teacher training.

d) **Costs associated:** This research has no costs for you, it is free from charge.

e) **Voluntarity:** You are not obliged to consent. I want to respect any of your decisions fully, so if you get to a point you feel uncomfortable with your participation, you can withdraw and hopefully share with me what has led to your decision. Any information you would have shared until then, will not be used. In order to achieve this, you should notify no later than 3 months after your participation, so I can remove the data immediately. It is important to highlight that the children have the right to withdraw from the study at any moment, if they asks for it orally or through gesture.

f) **Risks:** The study does not present any risks for you or the children.

I, the researcher in charge of the study, will keep a form of consent where you will state that you consent your participation in this research. You will also have a copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions or need more information, please don’t hesitate in contacting me. I will be available the days I am in the nursery (after 16:30), by phone or email. Please discuss the information provided in this letter with other persons if you wish to do so, or ask me if there is any topic that is not clear enough, or that requires more information.
I hope to count with your support. Thank you for your time. Best wishes,

Ximena Galdames C.
Early Childhood Educator, PUCV
MPhil/PhD Student, Institute of Education, University of London

All your data will be collected and saved, protecting your privacy and anonymity according to the Chilean Law of Protection of Private Life (Law N° 19.628, 1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998), and the Ethical Code of Conduct in Educational Research (2011).
8. Informed Consent Form about the Study for Practitioners

Please, complete this form once you have read the Information Letter and/or listened to the information about this study.

Title of the Study: Exploring with Young Chilean children the performativity of childhood in a Chilean early childhood classroom

Thank you for your interest in being part of this study. Before you give your consent, the researcher must have explained you the details of the project.

If you have any questions referring to the information letter, or the explanation that has been given to you, please ask the researcher before deciding on your consent. You will receive a copy of this informed consent form, so you can save it and refer to it whenever necessary.

Consent of the Practitioner:

I,

______________________________
(Name)

- Have read and listened to the notes at the beginning of this form and the information letter, and understand what is this study about.
- I understand that I can decide in any moment that I do not want to be part of this study. To fulfil this decision, I have to inform the researcher latest within three months after the study was developed, in order to have my data deleted immediately.
- I declare that my participation has not been forced by the researcher or others.
- I understand that I will not be charged, nor that I will be paid for my participation in this study.
- I authorise that the activities I am involved with, will be processed to achieve the aims of the study.
- I understand that my information will be treated in a strictly confidential manner, and will be used according to the protection provided by the Chilean Law No. 19.628 for the protection of the private life (1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998) and the Ethical Code of Practice of the British Education Research Association (Bera, 2011).
Researcher’s Consent:
I, Ximena Galdames Castillo

- Have provided the practitioner the information letter, and have allowed him/her to request help if he/she cannot read it, and have answered all his/her questions about the study.
- I consider that the practitioner has understood the information that has been provided, including risks, benefits and rights related to their child’s participation.
- I have provided enough information to allow the practitioner to make an informed decision about their participation in this study.
- I declare that I have not forced or influenced the practitioner’s decision in any way.
- I declare that this is an academic study, and that it has not been commissioned by any company, private or public enterprise, or the Municipality.
- I will not charge or pay the practitioner for his/her collaboration in this study.
- I declare that all the personal information will be treated in a strictly confidential manner, and will be used according to the alignments of the Chilean Law No. 19.628 for the protection of the private life (1999), the British Data Protection Act (1998) and the Ethical Code of Practice of the British Education Research Association (Bera, 2011).

__________________________
Signature of the Researcher

__________________________
Date
9. First Informed Consent for Children\textsuperscript{35}

Name: ______________________________________________________________________

Please show with your thumb, what actions Ximena can do when she is researching close to or with you.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image1} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image2} \\
\hline
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image3} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image4} \\
\hline
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image5} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image6} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{35} The original layout of this and the following form was horizontal. The format was changed to adapt to the Thesis format.
I, Ximena, commit to the following:
Date: ______________________________

Signature Participant: ___________________________

Signature Researcher: ___________________________
Name: _______________________________________________________

Please show with your thumb, what actions Ximena can do when she is researching close to or with you. In the case of play, can Ximena record:
I, Ximena, commit to the following:

Date: ______________________________

Signature Participant: ___________________________

Signature Researcher: ___________________________
**First Activity with Children (Slides and Script)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide/Image</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who am I?</strong></td>
<td>I am Ximena. I used to be a child, just like you are. And I also used to go to the nursery, just like you do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>I became an early childhood practitioner. I like working with children, exploring new things and having fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>I also like studying, so I went to a different place to learn more about the things I am interested in. Now I live in London and study in this place. Do you want to know what I am interested in studying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>I want to see in the nursery how we are reminded to behave and act like children and adults. I think that our bodies are very important in how people know who we are.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

36 Slides include scripts for talking through topics and images for two reasons: some children may not be able to read yet; and I wanted to work towards developing a shared understanding of what we are observing and talking about.
But I’m not sure about it and I want to find out more about this. Would you like to help me?

You don’t have to, this is just for people who want to, I will not force you.
If you want to participate, you can always say you don’t want to in a specific moment, or you can say that you want to stop for good.
If you want to help me, that’s fantastic, but I want you to know that I want to get to know you.
To get to know you better, I will come to the nursery one day a week for some time.
I will do different things in the classroom. I want to show you what I may do and you can tell me if you are ok with me being doing these things.

I could sit down with you in the activities.

I will write down the things you say and do.

I will write down questions you ask to me, and what I think about your questions.
I will also try to talk with you in recess or moments of play.

I am not going to teach.

I am not going to take care of you or help the other teachers in it.

I will not be a child either.

I will not tell anybody, besides my teacher in London, what you tell me. Unless it involves your safety or wellbeing.
Do you all understand what things I will be doing?
Show me with your hand.
We will use these hands to say YES or NO.

I don’t want you to feel obliged to have me close. You can tell me to go away, or not to write down what you are saying or doing. You can also tell me to cross out some things I have written down. So you can tell me now, but because I have a really bad memory, I will give you some worksheets where all these images we saw will be there for you to tell me if you are ok with me doing it with you.

Present the worksheet and guide the collective reading of it:
- This is how the worksheet looks like. What do we see? (photos and hands that are divided in two columns)
- What kind of text is this? (a table, it allows us to read with images and decide if we agree with it or not)
- How is it composed? (it has two columns and four rows. The first column is for showing what I might do and the second column has hands for you to mark if you want that or not. So in each row you have a picture and a pair of hands, you have to say for every picture if you agree or not)
- How do we read it? (from left to right, which image is first, second, etc)
- What happens in the first box? Who do we see? What are doing? (participating in activities)
- What happens in the second box? Who do we see? What are they doing? (take notes of what you say and do)
- What happens in the third box? Who do we see? What are they doing? (take notes of their comments and questions)
- What happens in the last box? Who do we see? What are they doing? (participate in play)
You have to mark the hand according to what is ok or not.
In this way I will know what each of you think and want, and I can respect it.
After you marked all, I can give you a copy if you want, and we both can sign it with our thumb print. In that way, we both will remember that we have agreed on this.
If any of you has difficulty in marking the hands, they can ask a friend for help, a teacher or me.

In a few weeks, after I know all of you better, I will talk to you about how you could help me more.
Thank you!
Today I want to tell you a story that will help me explain why I visit your classroom every week. I will use different images to read with you story, are you interested?

Here we will try to read the comic together, using the following questions to guide the collective reading:
- What do we see? (a story, a comic strip)
- What kind of text is this? (a comic strip, it allows us to read with images and words)
- How is it composed? (it has four boxes and in each, different things are happening)
- How do we read it? (from left to right, which image is first, second, etc. Look at the image and also trying to know what the words could mean)
Would you like to read it with my help? We will read box by box.

- What happens in the first box?
- Who do we see?
- What are they using/wearing?
- Are they the same height?
- Can they see each other in the same level?
- What might they be talking about? (read out loud the text, and agree in what the character is doing)

- What happens in the second box?
- Who do we see?
- What might they be talking about? (read out loud the text, and agree in what the character is doing)
- What does it mean that the salesman wants to speak to someone ‘mayor’ (=older and/or bigger)

- What happens in the third box?
- Who do we see? What is he doing? What for?
- What happens in the last box?
- Who do we see?
- What are they using/wearing?
- Are they the same height?
- Can they see each other in the same level?
- What might they be talking about? (read out loud the text, and agree in what the character is doing)
- Let’s look at their faces, how are they feeling?

So what do you think is the story about?
Do you want to know why I chose it? I chose it because I think that there are ideas about who children are, what they can and cannot do. Every day, all these ideas make us treat each other differently in the classroom. These ideas also make us think about ourselves, and shape people into children and aunties. But I also think that you (children) take these ideas and transform these according to what you understand and want to do. Like Guille with the salesman in the comic strip. These ideas have brought me to your classroom, because I want to know if this happens and how. This is why I visit you every week. Would you like to know what I’m doing here, in your classroom?
Next week, I’ll bring you more information about it.
Thank you!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide/Image</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Activity with Children</strong>&lt;br&gt;Aim: To invite them to participate as researchers in the study.</td>
<td>Hi Everyone,&lt;br&gt;Today I want to talk with you about what I have been doing in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you help me count up everything I have done here?&lt;br&gt;What I have been doing is called research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People from different areas do research to find more about something they are interested in.&lt;br&gt;Some investigate in science.&lt;br&gt;Others in books.&lt;br&gt;Some like to know other people better.&lt;br&gt;And some like to go to schools and nurseries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you know about research?&lt;br&gt;Does it have a special meaning for you?&lt;br&gt;How do you know when somebody is researching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have been doing some of the things that you say, but I don’t want to do this by myself, I want to ask you for your help.&lt;br&gt;I want to ask you if you want to do research with me, about the things I am interested in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that we know each other better, I want to ask you for help. I want you to help me think how we could investigate in the nursery how we think what children are. I think that what you say, do and play can show me what you think about children.

Remember this story? Can you tell me again what happened here?

I want to investigate with you how we learn in the nursery about who are children, and how these ideas influence what we do, how we look, what we say. The boy in the comic strip doesn’t want to be treated as someone little. Perhaps he thinks that children can help grown-ups, so he makes himself bigger. Maybe there are things like that, which we also do here in the classroom, in play.

I’d like to play more with all of you. I think that play can show us what we know about children, how they have to behave, talk and look. Show me with your thumbs if you’d like to play with me. Show me with your thumbs if you’re ok that I join your play of the house, cooking or other things. I think that what we play can also be research. Would you like to help me research through play? You just showed me that you know a lot about doing research. Let’s think of ways in which we all could record what we think and find out. Remember that they have to help us see, think and understand what we do in our play.

Any ideas? I will write down all your ideas and comments in this sheet where you can tell me what we can record and what not. We will use our thumbs again to say what is ok or not, and you can always say that you don’t want to participate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You don’t have to say yes. This is just for people who want to, I will not force you. If you want to participate, you can always say you don’t want to in a specific moment, or you can say that you want to stop for good. If you want to help me, that’s fantastic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>