

# Reception Baseline Assessment and ‘small acts’ of micro-resistance

Guy Roberts-Holmes  | Diana Sousa  | Siew Fung Lee

UCL Institute of Education, London, UK

## Correspondence

Guy Roberts-Holmes, UCL Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, UK.

Email: [g.roberts-holmes@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:g.roberts-holmes@ucl.ac.uk)

## Abstract

In September 2021, following the global COVID-19 pandemic, the Department for Education introduced a national standardised digital Reception Baseline Assessment (RBA) for all English 4-year-old children. We analyse RBA and its associated Quality Monitoring Visits, as a further intensification of the new public management of early years education to produce ‘school-ready’ human capital. This paper reports on professionals’ and children’s responses to RBA by analysing the mixed-methods data from a nationwide survey of early years professionals ( $n = 1032$ ) and six in-depth case study Reception classes with teacher interviews ( $n = 14$ ) and researcher observations ( $n = 12$ ). An adult thematic analysis of the responses suggests that some children and their teachers used their agency in creative ‘small acts’ of micro-resistance. These ‘small acts’ of resistance and refusal are theorised as micro-political contestations of a policy that is antithetical to early education’s socio-cultural approach. More research is needed to further understand the politics of young children’s rights, agency, micro-resistance and refusal.

## KEYWORDS

accountability, children’s rights, early years, policy, resistance

## RECEPTION BASELINE ASSESSMENT: AN EARLY YEARS ‘QUALITY’ PROGRESS MEASURE

Since 2000, English early childhood quality has gradually become synonymous with supposedly ideologically free and objective ‘bench marking’, ‘standards’, ‘profiles’, ‘checks’

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Authors. *British Educational Research Journal* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of British Educational Research Association.

## Key insights

### What is the main issue that the paper addresses?

This paper focuses on children's and teachers' responses to the new English early years accountability policy of Reception Baseline Assessment, as interpreted and understood through classroom observations and analysis of teacher narratives.

### What are the main insights that the paper provides?

The paper attempts to make 'visible' young children's 'small acts' of subversion to Reception Baseline Assessment and calls for the further theorisation of children's rights and agency in policy making.

and school readiness tests. These include the Curriculum Guidance for the Foundation Stage (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1997), the Early Years Foundation Stage (Department for Children, Schools and Families (England), 2008), the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (Department for Children, Schools and Families (England), 2008), Development Matters (Early Education, 2012) and the Phonics Screening Check (2016, 2021), and most recently the national standardised test called Reception Baseline Assessment (RBA) (Standards and Testing Agency, 2012), which is the focus of this paper. Ofsted's and the Department for Education's (DfE's) interpretation of 'quality' has been increasingly constructed as digital profiles, grids, checklists, progression charts and performance tracking, leading to the datafication of children and early childhood. Hence it is no surprise that the latest standardised national 'quality' performance measurement is the digital online RBA to be 'administered' to all English 4-year-olds in the first 6 weeks of their starting school. The English DfE states that the RBA's purpose is not to support young children's learning, but to hold schools accountable for their literacy and numeracy progress between Reception class through to their Year 6, Key Stage Two Standard Attainment Tasks (KS2 SATs) at the age of 11. Over time, it is likely that RBA and its digital progress measures may lead to the regular publication of visualised and comparable results, thereby providing parent consumers with yet more comparable 'quality' performance datasets to make calculations and choices in the competitive schools market.

RBA is set within an instrumental, calculative and economic market-based rationality that has tended to reduce and negate the complexity and contextualisation of 'quality' early education to measurable national standards, 'norms' and 'outcomes' that objectify and normalise the child (Moss, 2014; Vandenbroeck, 2020). This positivist scientific paradigm for RBA is exemplified by the National Foundation of Educational Research's (NFER's) Quality Monitoring Visits (QMV's) (Standards and Testing Agency, 2021), carried out by NFER inspectors on behalf of the Standards and Testing Agency. The purpose of QMV's is 'to identify *any significant divergence* from the RBA guidance' (Standards and Testing Agency, 2021, p. 5); they are an attempt to produce a standardised and controlled environment to enable the comparison of statistical data. The detailed technical instructions for the prescription of a standardised environment for the delivery of RBA state that 'the administrator should use *the wording given* in the instructions for each task; instructions and other *scripted speech* are read aloud clearly and at a pace that allows time for the pupil to process the information and consider their responses; if a pupil changes their answer, the final answer given is accepted. *Instructions are only repeated once*, unless stated otherwise; the assessment

should be carried out in English' (*added emphasis*; Standards and Testing Agency, 2021, p. 6). Such regulatory guidance—that is, monitored by NFER inspectors—is highly prescriptive and contrary to embedded socio-cultural dialogue within meaningful relationships. These detailed technical instructions for the standardised delivery of RBA are a further example of the ever-tightening micro-management and disciplinary surveillance of early years pedagogy. We contend that by negating children's 'rich' potentialities, voices and agency, such prescription is antithetical to early education's socio-cultural approach and acts as 'a complete humiliation for children's ingenuity and potential' (Malaguzzi, cited in Cagliari et al., 2016, pp. 378 and 422).

## PLATFORMING RECEPTION BASELINE ASSESSMENT

Further evidence that RBA may become part of the wider school market comes from the shared sociotechnical vision of platforms held by both the DfE and EdTech businesses. For example, in 2021, £7.5 million was awarded to the EdTech business Digital Hippo to develop a Digital Assessment Platform (DAP). This is significant because RBA is now set to become the '*first primary school* assessment that will be delivered through the platform' (Central Digital and Data Office, 2022; Trendall, 2022). The development of an early years and primary school assessment platform by EdTech business is an example of the DfE acting 'as a market midwife, fostering and forging an infrastructure within which the private sector can flourish' (Peruzzo et al., 2022, p. 6). One of the potential aims of such a national DAP might be to enable government, headteachers and potentially parents to 'reassemble young children's data for surveillance and future prediction of performances to identify young children "at risk" of failure and to automatically intervene to pre-empt deviations from ideal or projected future outcomes' (Gulson et al., 2022, p. 32). Platformed RBA data can be used to identify children and intervene to mitigate against potential future risk of failure in achieving required outcomes. However, platforms' use of 'surveillance capitalism' (Zuboff, 2019) raises ethical and data privacy concerns as young children's valuable 'behavioural surplus' data is potentially sold to a multitude of different companies and third parties without children's, parents' and settings' consent (Kurian, 2023).

The data was collected in September 2019, just months before the global COVID-19 pandemic closed all Reception classes in March 2020. The pandemic provided the DfE with an unparalleled 'opportunity' to justify the statutory imposition of the algorithmically driven digital RBA test in 2021. This is because the pandemic acted as a powerful catalyst for a dramatic shift to online education, experimentation with algorithms and 'technological solutionism': 'COVID-19 has been treated as an experimental opportunity to scale up the use of algorithmic technologies... while presenting a model vision for the future of the education sector itself' (Williamson, 2021, p. 10). Imposing RBA within the COVID-19 context suggests that the DfE did not let the pandemic crisis 'go to waste' (Mirowski, 2014).

Post-pandemic there has been a considerable rise in child poverty and the development of a mental health and well-being crisis, particularly among poorer families and children (Meade, 2021; Sutton Trust, 2021). To respond to the increased number of young children with poor socialisation skills and high emotional needs, early years educators have called for more play and time for the development of young children's socialisation (Alwani et al., 2024). However, rather than choosing to alleviate child poverty and listen to professional calls for play and a 'slow pedagogy' (Clark, 2023), the English government has politically chosen 'catch up' and accelerated learning outcomes by using a plethora of digital technical interventions and 'solutions' such as RBA. This catch-up digital solutionist approach has resulted in an intensification of inappropriate stress within some young children's daily lives and is failing to close the attainment gap. Post-COVID, a growing body of critical literature argues

that inappropriate techno-solutions, such as RBA, need to be reframed as problems rather than solutions. This problematisation of education technology suggests that a radical rethinking of technology is required because of its tendency to *widen* inequalities, entrench the privatisation of public education and care, exacerbate competitive market rationalities, amplify children's techno-stress and create ecological harms (Selwyn, 2023).

## MACRO AND MICRO-POLITICAL RESISTANCES AND THE RECEPTION BASELINE ASSESSMENT

The government first attempted to introduce RBA in September 1997 with a pilot of the National Framework of Baseline Assessment (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1997), in which all primary schools had to choose from one of 90 local baseline assessments; it was made statutory in September 1998. However, it failed as a comparable performance measure and was withdrawn in 2002. In September 2015 the DfE made a second attempt to introduce RBA. The early childhood education community responded with nationally coordinated boycotts and marches attended by thousands of teachers, parents and children (Goldstein et al., 2018; TACTYC, 2019). These national professional boycotts and protests, combined with a failure of the various assessment instruments to provide a comparable performance measure between schools, resulted in the DfE withdrawing RBA as a statutory assessment in April 2016 (Standards and Testing Agency, 2016). Undaunted, the DfE reintroduced a pilot digital version in the autumn term of 2019. Once again there were national professional protests against RBA, including a 'march of the four-year-olds', and over 7000 primary schools boycotted the digital pilot RBA (Weale, 2019). Given the scale of this professional resistance to RBA, the DfE's eventual statutory imposition in 2021 may be described as 'authoritarian' (Ellis et al., 2021).

Within the context of the research reported in this paper, it is important to note that resistance is not always head on, large-scale or high profile; it may instead take the form of 'minor engagements... [which] are cautious, modest, pragmatic, experimental, stuttering, tentative... the everyday and not the transcendental' (Rose, 1999). Here, resistance is understood as the everyday, localised and micro-political acts situated within ordinary classroom spaces, routines and relationships. We analysed our data on teachers' and children's covert responses to RBA using this theorisation of resistance as being minor and mundane political small acts (Archer, 2022; Millei & Kallio, 2018). These small acts 'struggle against mundane, quotidian forms of neoliberalization' (Ball & Olmedo, 2013, p. 85) such as RBA. It is here, within the classroom space itself, that early childhood micro-resistance to RBA is perhaps now to be found and 'whilst not formally co-ordinated, is united in its challenge to the status quo' (Albin-Clark & Archer, 2023, p. 6). Moss (2017, p. 20) notes an early childhood resistance movement that 'occupies many different spaces finding expression in many different forums'. At the same time, the amount of space for subversion and micro-political resistance will vary locally and be dependent on a variety of grounded conditions, such as the autonomy allowed to individual teachers, their self-confidence and the intrusiveness and rigidity of the school managerial context. However, even when the conditions appear to be least favourable, resistance in some form or other is possible. It is hoped that by making young children's and teachers' micro-resistances to RBA visible within ordinary classrooms, this study may in some small way contribute to the conceptualisation of children's and teachers' agency and micro-resistance narratives. In this we wish 'to work with them in the small spaces of resistance that always occur even with the most dominant of discourses. Better, surely, to keep on the margins, to sustain refuges where alternative stories can be told to the likeminded, to focus on building networks of mutually supportive resisters? Better micro-politics than macro-politics' (Moss, 2017, p. 27). We are hopeful that our sharing of

post-structuralist stories of early childhood minor resistances, troubles and 'fractures' highlights RBA's inappropriate techno-solutionist approach. However, it is possible that such resistance might have become marginalised because of the ubiquity of early years platforms following COVID-19, which has normalised techno-solutionism amongst both adults and children.

## METHODOLOGY

Our intention for this paper was to understand children's responses to RBA. A systematic and careful analysis of a nationwide survey ( $n = 1032$ ), six in-depth case study Reception classes with teacher interviews ( $n = 14$ ) and researcher observations ( $n = 12$ ), enabled an adult interpretation of children's responses to RBA. Given our child-centred politics and socio-cultural approach, we readily acknowledge our subject position as being critical of national standardised tests such as RBA. Whilst embracing this political position, we acknowledge that it also leads us to interpret and understand RBA with a similar critical perspective. The data was carefully and systematically cross read between the three researchers for codes and themes using a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021). We also acknowledge that more research is needed to gather further children's perspectives and understandings of RBA using the imaginative and creative Mosaic approach (Clark & Moss, 2017).

The research was done in the first 6 weeks of the autumn term in September and October 2019. The six case study primary schools were located within London and the South Coast, and all had 'Good' or 'Outstanding' Ofsted gradings. Two schools were maintained by the Local Authority, two were Academy schools and two were Church of England schools; all six schools had a wide socioeconomic range, as indicated by the free school meals (FSM) claimed. The data reported in this paper was collected from 14 teacher semi-structured interviews and six 1-h classroom observations of teachers conducting RBA with individual children. We interviewed the following early years staff: two Early Years Foundation Stage Co-ordinators (EYC); nine Reception Teachers (RT); two Nursery Teachers (NT); one Teaching Assistant (TA) for their views of the impact of RBA on children's experiences of the 'settling in' period. The teacher interviews lasted between 25 and 50 min and were recorded and transcribed professionally. The researcher observations were based on close observation of the teacher conducting the online test with individual children. The observations focused on teachers' and children's relationships, interactions, dialogue and responses. In particular, close attention was paid to children's facial and bodily expressions to understand their emotional responses to the test.

In addition to the above, an online survey was distributed via the National Education Union (NEU) email database using the Opinio web-based survey tool and was available for a period of 3 months. The data was exported from Opinio and analysed using SPSS. The survey consisted of 19 questions about staff perceptions and experiences of RBA. Respondents were also given opportunities to supplement their choice by adding written comments to each answer. 1285 Reception and primary teachers answered a minimum of four questions and 1032 completed the survey in full. Data used from the questionnaire responses in this paper is referred to with a 'W' (as teachers' written responses).

The research was conducted within the ethical guidelines provided by the British Educational Research Association (2018). Care has been taken to ensure the anonymity of all respondents and the security of data. Schools were recompensed with funding for either a half day or full day of teaching cover (depending on the number of interviews).



## CHILDREN'S SMALL ACTS OF RESISTANCE

The tightly prescribed scripted format excluded children's social context of learning—how learning and knowledge relate to the world and to the capacity, or agency, of young children to use knowledge to shape it. Teachers reported that the scripted test tended to displace meaningful dialogue and relationship building with young children.

*I am dictating the script, I am not having a meaningful dialogue about anything.*  
(RT2, School D) P. 40

*It's as if reception children are a commodity to be scanned by staff trained only in scanning items.*

(W) P. 40

*The children wanted to chat to me during the assessments and tell me other things that linked to their lives and showed me their knowledge but the assessments were too narrow to take account of this.*

(W) P. 40

*Some of the questions could be more open. They're very closed questions and the nature of Early Years is such that we don't tend to ask closed questions. We tend to ask open questions, to see what the child is able to volunteer so I have a problem with that.*

(RT2, School D) P. 40

Despite the NFER's authoritarian guidance to respond to children's answers with a rigid scientific and objective neutrality, we observed children's and teachers' dialogue, play and interactions together. Teachers' comments above and researcher observations below suggest a moral and political commitment to care responsively and professionally (Morris, 2021), even when such acts contravened the RBA's prescribed regulations.

*Kai points to the park picture clues and excitedly tells the teacher that he fed ducks with his sister and he saw a dog jump into the water and the ducks flew away. The teacher, noting Kai's excitement, asked him more about this.*

(Researcher 3, School C, Field Notes)

*A group of children are focused on playing together in the 'home corner'. The teacher asks Jerrell to come with her to 'play a game' in a separate room. Jerrell doesn't respond and carries on playing. The teacher calls his name again and with a clearly unhappy face, Jerrell stops what he is doing to follow the teacher and they go into a small cubicle room. In the room there is a tall 'adult-size' chair and desk with a computer and a small 'children's-size' chair and a round hard cushion that serves as a table for the child. Against the wall and tucked in a box next to his chair, Jerrell found some Lego and begins to play with it. The teacher starts the RBA literacy test and Jerrell plays and talks with the Lego.*

(Researcher 2, School D, Field Notes)

Kai's, Jerrell's and their teachers' micro-subversive actions trouble and unsettle the image of the passive neoliberal policy subject who can be normalised and governed. Their creative small acts query and contest their subject positioning as compliant, silent and passive objects of policy.

## NO TIME FOR MEANINGFUL PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

The first few weeks of Reception class is known as the 'settling in' period and is usually viewed as a crucial time for young children's early school experiences: it is children's first experience of formal education in a primary school setting. Making time to build positive relationships between teachers, support staff, children and their parents is key for a successful start in school life. The 'settling in' period requires early years teachers' careful, slow and reflective tuning into children's interests and experiences. The 'settling in' period requires listening to children's perspectives and demands considerable time, reflection and dialogue (Clark, 2023), none of which can be found in RBA, with its tightly prescribed time limits to answer questions. Our research found that administering the test meant that teachers were not able to spend as much time getting to know their children, building meaningful relationships or establishing routines in this crucial time period—a problem reflected in the following teachers' comments:

*I was taking time away, and me being away from the group would have an emotional effect on them. Why am I administering a test, when actually I need to be with the children?*

(EYC1, School A)

*It means the teacher is not able to spend time building relationships with the class and finding out about their interests, which could help them settle in.*

(W)

*It takes you away from bonding and forming relationships, which meant that building those initial relationships took longer. This affected some children's settling time, which affected their learning.*

(W)

*My relationship/early attachment with the children wasn't as strong as I spent most of my time completing baseline assessments rather than interacting and engaging with groups of children.*

(W)

*The baseline assessment takes reception teachers away from their class during those crucial first few weeks when building relationships and modelling routines and rules are very important.*

(W)

*It takes time to develop the relationships in the early years by supporting and developing play in a child centred way not with pre-set questions which many young children will find threatening and stressful.*

(W)

Our observations found that teachers were rushing through the test so they could be present with the children in meaningful ways. In contrast to 'slow pedagogy, knowledge and the unhurried child' (Clark, 2023), online RBA efficiently and rapidly calculates children's abilities in a very narrow range of prescribed phonics and numeracy. One RT angrily stated that RBA's accelerated content expected 4-year-old children to 'come into Reception hitting the ground running' (RT, School A). This notion of 'hitting the ground running' negates

meaningful pedagogical relationships that afford complexities, nuances and subtleties. Meaningful relationships are dependent upon early years teachers' time and careful in-depth observation, dialogue and tuning into young children's views and experiences, all of which are core early years values and principles and absent in the prescribed 'scientific' RBA test.

## A SCHOOL READINESS TEST

Teachers reported that RBA's accelerated and intensified content had the effect of steering pedagogy away from creative playful relationships towards school-based numeracy and literacy (particularly phonics). Such an intensification of childhood does not allow sufficient time for young children's 'basic emotional and cognitive needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness, and the opportunity to develop their metacognitive and self-regulation skills to be met' (Whitebread & Bingham, 2011, p. 4). The teachers' comments and observations suggested that children were aware that they were being tested in school-based early literacy and numeracy and some experienced a sense of test failure, anxiety and stress. This was something that teachers felt could potentially lead to the unintended consequence of some 4-year-olds labelling themselves as 'good' or 'bad' learners.

*Children saying, 'I can't read' 'I don't know' 'I can't do it' 'What does that mean' 'Can I go yet?' 'When can I go?' 'Can I play yet?'*

(W) P. 26

*I'm just angry because, why should I be made to make a child fail? I'm put in a position where I'm almost encouraged to make a child fail, make a child feel bad about themselves. That's not why I'm a teacher. I have to make thirty children feel bad about themselves.*

(NT1, School B)

*Children who don't reach the required standard are left feeling like they are not good enough.*

(W) P. 28

*Some were intimidated and scared. They knew they were being assessed whether they were aware of it or it was subconscious. Many were scared of 'getting it wrong'. They are 4 YEARS OLD!*

(W) P. 27

*Lots of children noticed if I was clicking no, or giving them a X on my list and got upset they had got it wrong. They were very aware they were being 'tested'.*

(W) P. 24

*I am sure that from looking at children's downward glance, for example when they are unsure, their face slightly drops when I know and when they know that they are not getting something correct.*

(EYC1, School A)

Goldstein (2018, p. 16) has noted the detrimental effects of school accountability on children's well-being: 'The problem is at the moment the accountability component dominates everything else and it distorts the curriculum, it distorts learning, it distorts children's behaviour. There is lots of evidence now about the stress that children go under. Assessments



should not be doing that to children. Assessments should be encouraging children to learn'. His comments matched those of several teachers in the case study schools, who commented on how RBA appeared to build in expectations of particular social behaviours for young pupils with which they should be equipped when they come to school. These processes change what it means to be a new Reception pupil, which now involves arriving at school equipped with new 'readiness' for testing (Georgeson et al., 2022).

Early years teachers felt conflicted and anxious in attempting to meet the formal school-based testing demands of RBA, and at the same time trying to settle and develop caring relationships through play, dialogue and meaningful activities with the children. This reconfiguring of Reception teachers, away from their caring pedagogic values of observing and listening to young children and towards a screen-based scripted standardised test, led to professional unease, frustration and stress.

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

As with other national standardised tests, our research suggests that RBA 'elicited a range of often, unhealthy emotions – fear, anxiety, envy, despair, humiliation. Our emotions are linked to the economy through our anxieties and pleasures and our concomitant efforts of self-management and self-improvement' (Roberts-Holmes & Moss, 2021, p. xvi). Here, RBA may be productive in governing young children towards the desire for self-improvement in formal literacy and numeracy 'school readiness'. Four-year-olds become 'children of the market' (Keddie, 2016, p. 109) as their earliest educational experiences are forged in RBA's individualised competition to get the right answers. Within this critical frame, RBA can be understood as the latest technical 'fix' for the rapid development of early years human capital. RBA may catalyse early childhood education to further increase young children's human and educational capital (Campbell-Barr & Nygård, 2014) by 'activating all the resources they have at their disposal – at school and at home' (Grimaldi & Ball, 2021, p. 12). Under RBA's reductionist and functional numerical scoring system, early childhood education is alerted to neoliberalism's harsh political philosophy that any notion of 'equality gives way to ubiquitously competitive worlds of winners and losers' (Brown, 2016, p. 3). RBA's redefinition of early education's principles of holistic care and well-being as measuring attainment in prescribed, narrow, school readiness goals 'robbed meaning from individual histories' (Malaguzzi, cited in Cagliari et al., 2016, pp. 378 and 422) of children's complex lives.

Our critique of RBA should not be misconstrued as an argument against assessment, evaluation and accountability. Rather, we understand socio-cultural evaluation practices, such as pedagogical documentation (PD), as potentially broadening rather than narrowing the curriculum and as democratic, because PD listens and responds to children's voices and welcomes complexity, imagination, creativity, uncertainty and unpredictability, all of which are absent in national standardised testing. Pedagogical documentation with children demands the slowing down of time for 'slow' pedagogical relationships (Clark, 2023) based on trust, complexity, meaning and context. Such a slow pedagogy enables educators to appreciate that 'all children whatever their culture, whatever their lives are rich, better equipped, more talented, stronger and more intelligent than we can suppose' (Cagliari et al., 2016, p. 397). However, adopting such a slow pedagogical approach is problematic given the DfE's post-COVID emphasis on an accelerated and intensified 'catch-up'.

Our research has attempted to highlight some instances of children's and teachers' small subversive acts, minor resistances and 'mundane politics' (Millei & Kallio, 2018, p. 44). We interpret this to suggest that some teachers refuse subjectification as administrators and technicians and the young child as a passive receiver of measurable skills and competencies. Their 'small acts' of resistance may be interpreted as minor political struggles with

reductionist neoliberal images saturated with performativity, that is, a subjectivity dominated by the necessity to perform well through achieving externally imposed standards and targets. Or, putting it more simply, refusing what seems to be expected of them, and working instead on creating a different subjectivity. Subjectivity here becomes 'a key site of political struggle'; that is, 'a struggle over and against what it is we have become, what it is that we do not want to be' (Ball, 2016, p. 1143). This refusal is important because neoliberalism's impoverished view of young children and their teachers has stifled any signs of a democratic politics of education (Sousa & Moss, 2023).

In response to the imposition of RBA, Dame Alison Peacock states that 'as teachers we have the opportunity (and responsibility) to make a difference for those within our own learning sphere today. *We can make the decision to listen, to trust, to work collaboratively and most importantly, to believe that there is another way*' (Peacock, 2016, p. 132; *original emphasis*). This alternative would involve teachers and families taking democratic responsibility for the assessment of children's learning rather than relying on 'outside experts' with their supposedly objective indicators and standardised performance measures. More widely, we argue that a radical rethinking in the design, regulation and purposes of digital technology is required if the ethical needs, interests and experiences of children and other marginalised groups are to be met (Kurian, 2023). 'Digital degrowth', 'slow pedagogy' and a 'deimplementation' away from techno-solutionist interventions for prescribed early childhood outcomes are needed for an equitable, public, democratic and ecologically sustainable early childhood education.

## FUNDING INFORMATION

National Education Union, Hamilton House Mabledon Place London WC1H 9BD <https://neu.org.uk/about/contact-us> £20,000. The report was independently written and sent to NEU.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

There are no conflicts of interest with this paper.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The complete 2019 report and data is available at [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339500079\\_Reception](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339500079_Reception).

## ETHICS APPROVAL

BERA ethics were followed and the UCL Ethics Committee gave improvement in 2019.

## ORCID

Guy Roberts-Holmes  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8122-0499>

Diana Sousa  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0631-2235>

## REFERENCES

- Albin-Clark, J., & Archer, N. (2023). Playing social justice: How do early childhood teachers enact the right to play through resistance and subversion? *Prism: Casting New Light on Learning, Theory and Practice*, 5(2), 47–66. <https://doi.org/10.24377/prism.article714>
- Alwani, S., Day, N., & Kulkarni, K. (2024). Making space for play in the global post-COVID landscape. *International Journal of Play*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21594937.2024.2323411>
- Archer, N. (2022). 'I have this subversive curriculum underneath': Narratives of micro resistance in early childhood education. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 20(3), 431–445.
- Ball, S. (2016). Subjectivity as a site of struggle: Refusing neoliberalism? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(8), 1129–1146.
- Ball, S., & Olmedo, A. (2013). Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(1), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2013.740678>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis a practical guide*. Sage.
- British Educational Research Association. (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research* (4th ed.). British Educational Research Association. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethicalguidelines-for-educational-research-2018>
- Brown, W. (2016). Sacrificial citizenship: Neoliberalism, human capital and austerity politics. *Constellations*, 23(1), 3–14.
- Cagliari, P., Castagnetti, M., Giudici, C., Rinaldi, C., Vecchi, V., & Moss, P. (2016). *Loris Malaguzzi and the schools of Reggio Emilia: Selected writings and speeches 1945–1993*. Routledge.
- Campbell-Barr, V., & Nygård, M. (2014). Losing sight of the child? Human capital theory and its role for early childhood education and care policies in Finland and England since the mid-1990s. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 15(4), 346–359.
- Central Digital and Data Office. (2022). Digital assessment service platform. <https://www.gov.uk/service-standards-reports/digital-assessment-service-platform#what-the-team-needs-to-explore-1>
- Clark, A. (2023). *Slow knowledge and the unhurried child: Time for slow pedagogies in early childhood education*. Routledge.
- Clark, A., & Moss, P. (2017). *Listening to young children: The mosaic approach* (3rd ed.). National Children's Bureau. Department for Children, Schools and Families (England). (2008). Statutory framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage. [https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6413/7/statutory-framework\\_Redacted.pdf](https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6413/7/statutory-framework_Redacted.pdf)
- Early Education. (2012). Development matters in the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). [www.foundationyears.org.uk/files/2012/03/Development-Matters-FINAL-PRINT-AMENDED.pdf](http://www.foundationyears.org.uk/files/2012/03/Development-Matters-FINAL-PRINT-AMENDED.pdf)
- Ellis, V., Mansell, W., & Steadman, S. (2021). A new political economy of teacher development: England's teaching and leadership innovation fund. *Journal of Education Policy*, 36(5), 605–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1717001>
- Georgeson, J., Roberts-Holmes, G., Campbell-Barr, V., Archer, N., Lee, S. F., Gulliver, K., Street, M., Walsh, G., & Waters-Davies, J. (2022). Competing discourses in early childhood education and care: Tensions, impacts and democratic alternatives across the UK's four nations. *British Educational Research Association*. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/competing-discourses-in-early-childhood-education-and-care>
- Goldstein, H., Moss, G., Sammons, P., Sinnott, G., & Stobart, G. (2018). *A baseline without basis: The validity and utility of the proposed reception baseline assessment in England*. British Educational Research Association. [www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/a-baseline-without-basis](http://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/a-baseline-without-basis)
- Grimaldi, E., & Ball, S. (2021). The blended learner: Digitalisation and regulated freedom – neoliberalism in the classroom. *Journal of Education Policy*, 36(3), 393–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1704066>
- Gulson, K., Sellar, S., & Webb, P. T. (2022). *Algorithms of education: How datafication and artificial intelligence shape policy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Keddie, A. (2016). Children of the market: Performativity, neoliberal responsibilisation and the construction of student identities. *Oxford Review of Education*, 42(1), 108–122.
- Kurian, N. (2023). AI's empathy gap: The risks of conversational artificial intelligence for young children's well-being and key ethical considerations for early childhood education and care. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491231206004>
- Meade, J. (2021). Mental health effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on children and adolescents: A review of the current research. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 68(5), 945–959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2021.05.003>
- Millei, Z., & Kallio, K. (2018). Recognizing politics in the nursery: Early childhood education institutions as sites of mundane politics. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 19(1), 31–47.
- Mirowski, P. (2014). *Never let a serious crisis go to waste: How neoliberalism survived the financial meltdown*. Verso.
- Morris, L. (2021). Love as an act of resistance: Ethical subversion in early childhood professional practice in England. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 22(2), 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949120932297>
- Moss, P. (2014). *Transformative change and real utopias in early childhood education: A story of democracy, experimentation and potentiality*. Routledge.
- Moss, P. (2017). Power and resistance in early childhood education: From dominant discourse to democratic experimentalism. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 8(1), 11–32.
- Peacock, A. (2016). *Assessment for learning without limits*. Open University Press.
- Peruzzo, F., Ball, S. J., & Grimaldi, E. (2022). Peopling the crowded education state: Heterarchical spaces, EdTech markets and new modes of governing during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 114, 102006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102006>
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (1997). The national framework for baseline assessment: Criteria and procedures for the accreditation of baseline assessment schemes.
- Roberts-Holmes, G., & Moss, P. (2021). *Neoliberalism and early childhood education: Markets, imaginaries and governance*. Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Selwyn, N. (2023). Digital degrowth: Toward radically sustainable education technology. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2159978>

- Sousa, D., & Moss, P. (2023). Towards democratic culture and political practice in early childhood education: The case for transformative change at a time of converging crisis. *ETD – Educação Temática Digital*, 25, e023067.
- Standards and Testing Agency. (2016). Reception baseline comparability study: Results of the 2015 study. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7f4d0c40f0b6230268eab2/Reception\\_baseline\\_comparability\\_study.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7f4d0c40f0b6230268eab2/Reception_baseline_comparability_study.pdf)
- Standards and Testing Agency. (2021). RBA quality monitoring visits guidance. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/995089/RBA\\_quality\\_monitoring\\_visits\\_guidance.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/995089/RBA_quality_monitoring_visits_guidance.pdf)
- Standards and Testing Agency. (2012). Assessment framework for the development of the year 1 phonics screening check. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-framework-for-the-development-of-the-year-1-phonics-screening-check>
- Sutton Trust. (2021). A fair start: Equalising access to early education. <https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/A-Fair-Start-Full-Report.pdf>
- TACTYC. (2019). Young children as guinea pigs: The Reception baseline assessment framework. [https://tactyc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Young-children-as-guinea-pigs-TACTYC\\_.pdf](https://tactyc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Young-children-as-guinea-pigs-TACTYC_.pdf)
- Trendall, S. (2022). Government works on digital tool for assessments of reception pupils. <https://www.publictechnology.net/2022/03/08/education-and-skills/government-works-digital-tool-assessments-reception-pupils/>
- Vandenbroeck, V. (2020). Measuring the young child: On facts, figures and ideologies in early childhood. *Ethics and Education*, 15(4), 413–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2020.1824096>
- Weale, S. (2019). Parents and children march against plans to test four-year-olds. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/apr/25/parents-and-children-march-against-plans-test-four-year-olds>
- Whitebread, D., & Bingham, S. (2011). School readiness; a critical review of perspectives and evidence. <https://tactyc.org.uk/occasionalpapers/>
- Williamson, B. (2021). Education technology seizes a pandemic opening. *Current History*, 120(822), 15–20.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). Surveillance capitalism and the challenge of collective action. *New Labor Forum*, 28(1), 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796018819461>

**How to cite this article:** Roberts-Holmes, G., Sousa, D. & Lee, S. F. (2024). Reception Baseline Assessment and 'small acts' of micro-resistance. *British Educational Research Journal*, 00, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4016>