University and early childhood setting collaboration in innovative academic and professional development

Ian Barron*, Lisa Taylor^, Jan Nettleton^ & Shabnam Amin^

*Educational and Social Research Institute, Manchester Metropolitan University

^Martenscroft Nursery School and Children's Centre, Manchester

Abstract

This paper focuses on the long-standing relationship between early childhood academics at a university and early years' practitioners in a combined nursery school and children's centre in the North of England. The paper explores its development into an innovative academic and professional development programme, centred on a belief in the importance of research–informed practice and practice–informed research in improving practice and outcomes for children and families. The paper uses Foucauldian notions of power and heterotopia and Gordon's concept of haunting to explore the meeting of academic, practitioner and political worlds. The focus for the paper is a project led by the university concerned with provision for children under two and in particular the experiences and reflections of the academics and practitioners. A key feature is the attention given to the diverse agendas of experienced early years practitioners, early childhood academics, and local and central government policy makers and regulators. The paper highlights the tensions and successes inherent in attending to the competing needs and demands of children, families, local and national government, quality assurance agencies and the academy. We explore the ways in which power, heterotopias and hauntings appear to operate in early childhood practices, what other ways of being and seeing might be opened up and what we have learnt about the processes of joint working required for success in negotiating an ethical path between competing concerns.

Introduction

This paper seeks to explore the long-standing relationship between early childhood academics at a university and early years' practitioners from a combined nursery school and children's centre in the North of England. The particular focus is on a project which began in 2013 (still on-going) and which sought to address opportunities provided by the new 'disadvantaged two-year-olds' agenda (Department for Education (DfE), 2011) and the expectation that early years' practitioners should be specialists in early childhood development (DfE, 2013). The authors of the paper are B, an academic, but not the project lead, at the university and T, N and A, two teachers and a nursery practitioner from the nursery school and children's centre. B and T were involved from the beginning. N and A primarily took part in the development sessions though they also took a significant role in preparing the presentation of the findings for an international conference. B, T and N presented an early version of the paper at the conference. B and T have contributed most directly to this paper. The paper begins with consideration of the project intentions and the project's relationship as an academic and professional development to research. We then provide an outline of the project as it unfolded over the course of a year. At

the heart of the paper are academic and professional development sessions offered at the university. These sessions and the ideas and reflections which emerged from them are analysed drawing upon Foucauldian notions of power (1998; 2002) and heterotopias (1984; 2000; 2002; 2010), and Gordon's (2008, 2011) concept of haunting, to explore the meeting of the worlds of early childhood practice, academia, and government policy. The final part of the paper reflects upon T's experiences of the project and concludes with a consideration of the 'effectiveness' of the project and thoughts about how it might be taken forwards.

The Background to the Project

The paper focuses on the particular partnership outlined above but it was a wider one that included another five early years' settings in the same part of the North of England. This wider group of settings included a range of different types of provision for very young children, including a primary school with a newly established class of two year olds. The project was led by two other academics based at the university though one of the leads left part way through for a post in another institution. The project group, drawn from the university and the settings, sought to design and record theoretically-informed continuing professional development to reflect upon, question and develop existing setting-based practices around child development and young children's behaviour. The programme was intended to enable academics and practitioners to work together in order to respond to the commitment expressed in the Early Years Foundation Stage (DfE, 2014: 5) to give children 'the best possible start in life and the support that enables them to fulfil their potential'. This was seen as raising questions about how these can be determined. The DfE, however, is clear about this and states:

> 'Good parenting and high quality early learning together provide the foundation children
> need to make the most of their abilities and talents as they grow up… the Early Years
> Foundation Stage (EYFS) … promotes teaching and learning to ensure children's 'school
> readiness' and gives children the broad range of knowledge and skills that provide the
> right foundation for good future progress through school and life' (DfE, 2014: 5).

For the project team, this raised questions about notions of foundations and solidity and about the linear notion of learning and development from these supposedly firm foundations, which are seen as contested ideas. Reassurance is offered by the DfE (2014: 7), however, that

> 'the learning and development requirements are informed by the best available evidence
> on how children learn and reflect the broad range of skills, knowledge and attitudes
> children need as foundations for good future progress'.

Expectations of practitioners are made clear with the requirements going on to state that:

> 'practitioners must consider the individual needs, interests, and stage of development of
> each child in their care, and must use this information to plan a challenging and enjoyable
> experience for each child in all of the areas of learning and development' (DfE, 2014: 8).

All of this raised questions for the project team about what we mean by 'best available evidence', 'needs', 'interests', 'stage of development' and 'challenging and enjoyable experience' and in whose eyes. The certainties of the policy documents troubled us and made us determined to ensure that the project 'stops us from thinking that things speak from themselves' (MacLure, 210: 278).

The fixity suggested by the policy position rather bears out Kwon's contention (2002: 6) that 'sequential developmentalism is one of the most influential beliefs in English early years education'. Cannella and Viruru, (2004: 95) argue that the emphasis on particular environments and provision, the significance of adult – child interaction and the importance of children's 'needs', 'creates the illusion of freedom to function and think in a theoretically pre-determined direction'. The project team, like Dachyshyn (2015: 33), were concerned that 'the field needs …..to be awakened to the inequities and injustices of the dominant discourses of developmentalism, heteronormativity, racism, colonialism, classism, and the like' Echoing these concerns, the project was mindful of the way in which Western notions drawn from developmental psychology (e.g. Piaget, 1954, 1975; Vygotsky, 1978) and Romanticism (e.g. Rousseau, 1993) have come to influence beliefs about what is appropriate in early childhood have come to shape notions of how we should work with children. Whilst recent years have seen a growing critique of these grand narratives, Taylor and Richardson (2005: 165) contend that:

> '(Developmentally Appropriate Practice)…remains the dominant paradigm of early childhood education. …. Its cultural partialities are simultaneously obfuscated, generalised and internalised. As a result, the universal applicability of its appropriate childhood 'norms' are widely accepted as self-evident and rarely debated'.

The project team was concerned to debate just these notions and was exercised by the way in which policy initiatives appear to construct and perpetuate the narrative of normative development and notions of '(ab)normal' and '(dis)advantaged' in relation to two-year-old children and their developmentally in/appropriate and ab/normal behaviours, growth rates, progress, attainment, language, socialization and so forth. The project group drew on practice-based experience along with the expertise, reflexivity and knowledge about the broad range of theoretical insights into children's development, learning and behaviours generated by the university teaching and research teams in order to develop a programme of academic and professional development. The initial intention on the part of the academics had been to formulate a relatively traditional programme aimed at furthering and challenging practitioners' existing understandings. Whilst, as Martinovic et al (2012:400) highlight, 'the traditional top-down approach – where the teacher is positioned at the bottom of the 'knowledge funnel', being handed someone else's research-based 'best practices' to implement – is still firmly in place' and was the one that the practitioners had experienced hitherto, the project team became increasingly committed to something altogether less conventional. This is not to say that we were necessarily clear about what this might be at the beginning (or subsequently). In keeping with Henderson (2014: 274), we felt that a programme was needed that conceptualised professional and academic learning as involving 'an exchange … of flows or intensities, which

connect and multiply through processes of intra-action with other flows and intensities, rather than change and transformation in the humanist individualised and bounded subject'.

The project team was mindful of Simpson et al's concern (2015) in relation to early intervention in the lives of young children and their families that certain families are demonised by government as deficient through their own behaviours and ways of being. Simpson et al (2015: 98-99) argue that

> 'the strategy contains a discursive representation and pathologising of those with low household income as 'troubled families' …… because parents choose to be workless ……Increasingly, this pathologising has also been accompanied by a biologisation of poverty which promotes the idea that parents in poverty through their inept parenting practices are also damaging their children's brains and development….the Coalition government's child poverty strategy is about symbolic power and it represents a dominant discourse which seeks to influence both the poor and the ways in which (Early Childhood Education and Care) settings and practitioners work with the poor across England'.

The project was concerned to examine the ways in which these discourses circulate in early childhood and to consider what could be done to challenge them. The dominance of neoliberalism and its application to early childhood as the solution to the perceived economic shortcomings of both parents and children in poverty (Simpson and Envy, 2015) certainly is not limited to England, with its impact being felt in North America, Australia and even Scandinavia, the latter more traditionally associated with democratic notions related to well-being (Franck and Nilsen, 2015; Macfarlane and Lakhani, 2015). Thus the project was concerned with what Delaney (2015: 374) terms the 'borderlands of practice … where varying notions of "best practices" converge, and sometimes conflict, with the professional knowledge and decision-making of teachers' and what this borderland means in terms of thinking about work with young children.

In seeking to highlight and trouble neoliberal discourses and normative notions of child development, the intention was that the academic and professional development programme would enable settings to become places where responses to policy discourses and initiatives concerning teaching and learning would be underpinned by reflection, theory and research. The project team was particularly concerned by the discourses surrounding 'school readiness' and sought to disrupt these with alternative perspectives. School readiness is a dominant concern from United Kingdom government policy makers but, as Brogaard Clausen (2015) notes, the country's early childhood sector is also influenced by rather different perspectives from Scandinavia, concerned with well-being. She contrasts 'schoolification' in the United Kingdom and France with Denmark's traditions of 'self-governed activity and a personal, reflective and relational pedagogy' (Brogaard Clausen, 2015: 359). The

intention of the project was to surface just these sorts of debates and the concern that 'the focus on human capital is forming a particular construction of childhood, one where children are becoming rather than being' (Campbell-Barr & Nygård (2014: 355). If that 'becoming' was in the Deleuzian sense (1990) sense of immanence and rather than a process of moving towards finite 'being', that would be less of a concern but the 'becoming' here is about becoming the pre-determined notion of what an economically and politically contributing citizen needs to be. Whilst neoliberal agendas are not without influence in Scandinavia, as highlighted above (Franck and Nilsen, 2015), Campbell-Barr and Nygård (2014: 356) draw attention to Scandinavia's greater attention to '"here-and-now" well-being' and so it was particularly to Norway, drawing upon the university's links with early childhood theory and practice there, that the project looked to trouble dominant discourses from policymakers and also the particular form of child-centred practice which is common in many early childhood settings. The intention was that this would involve a constant toing and froing between practice, the experiences of development sessions, reflection and theoretical insights. Provocation to practice was seen as an on-going, interwoven and disruptive process rather than as series of development sessions that would then operate as interventions to 'improve' practice.

In order to achieve this, the project involved a constant searching for the ghosts that haunt policy and approaches to practice in early childhood in order to seek to disturb them. Gordon's (2011:3) work is seen as being particularly helpful because haunting in this conceptualization is about surfacing 'what's living and breathing in the place hidden from view: people, places, histories, knowledge, memories, ways of life, ideas'. The concern is to 'show what's there in the blind field, to bring it to life (and not merely to light)' since haunting is understood as a 'contest over the future, over what's to come next or later'. In this sense, haunting involves 'something-to-be-done' and the possibility of acting in ways that reduce discrimination and enable freedom and empowerment. Whilst this might be suggestive of an Enlightenment project concerned to improve and emancipate, the outcomes of the haunting are not predetermined but 'must be approached with an urgency that's autonomous and self-directed towards ends and aims not wholly given and certainly not given permission by the system's logics or crises but rather invented elsewhere and otherwise' (Gordon, 2011:8). All of this was intended to enable us to engage with the way in which 'the trace or remnant introduces a moment of fracture when something unexpected opens up—when insights emerge that may or may not be sayable, when actions emerge that may or may not be actionable' (Yaeger, 2005: 97). Our concern was to open up alternative possibilities that would reduce discrimination and open other ways of thinking, acting and becoming.

From early in the project, there was consideration of the ways in which very young children are understood in government discourses and policy documents. As noted above, there was concern, in particular, about the attention to educational, social and economic disadvantage and its apparent association with, or explanation in terms of, poor parenting, leading to deficit models of young children and their families. The project team and participants largely shared the stance of Bourke and Lidstone (2015: 836) when they argue that 'some discourses dominate, not necessarily because they are more right or truthful, but because they are able to

exercise more strategic relations of power and have political strength'. In seeking to understand the sources and effects of these discourses and how they linger as ghosts, Foucault's work (1998, 2002) on power was considered in order to enable consideration of both the policy context in relation to provision for two year olds and practitioners and the taken for granted assumptions of policy makers, practitioners and academics concerning appropriate provision for young children. Such reflection is important in considering other possibilities in terms of how we might understand and work with children. For Foucault (2002: 340): power 'operates on the field of possibilities in which the behaviour of active subjects is able to inscribe itself. It is a set of actions on possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; it releases or contrives, makes more probable or less; in the extreme, it constrains or forbids absolutely...'. Foucault highlights that the reason why such discourses come to constrain us without us necessarily realising is because they also bring us advantages and success in the eyes of those with power, such as regulators, local authorities and England's Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), if we submit to their will. Thus, according to Foucault (2002: 120): 'What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no; it also traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network that runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression'. This could be seen to raise questions about the extent to which the individual has any space for agency, any opportunity to resist the mechanisms that shape how we understand and act in the world. Foucault (1998) presents a world in which 'power …. questions, monitors, watches, spies, searches out, palpates, brings to light' but one in which, at the same time, the individual seeks to 'evade this power, flee from it, fool it, or travesty it' (1998: 45). This is the space of agency and the academic and professional development sessions were conceived as offering the opportunity to re-examine, think, feel and act differently in work with young children.

The Project and Notions of Research

The relationship between the academic and professional development programme and notions of research is an interesting one worthy of some consideration. The programme could be seen to have some of the characteristics of traditional participative qualitative or even action research (Carr and Kemmis, 1986) in the sense that it involved the participation of both academics and teachers in a project that was aimed at offering provocations to the way that we think about and work with young children and a concern to bring something different about and to study and reflect critically upon the process in so doing. Such a portrayal of the programme, however, might suggest something of an Enlightenment project regarding progress and improvement and that was not at all the conceptualisation here. Following Holmes (2013: 3), the programme was more concerned to 'break with the conventions of linear educational narratives in favour of …… manipulating ideas of the child and of childhood, trying to play with irrational plot sequences to create jarring juxtapositions'. In terms of the project team, whilst some members were involved in most or all of the sessions, others came and went for a variety of reasons. This could be seen rather to challenge the orthodoxies of the way in which much participative research is often

understood, where it is more usual to have a pre-determined group of people involved with a view to researching the effect of a particular educational intervention. Any change to the group of researchers and participants is often seen as making the project vulnerable to methodological challenge. The project, however, had a rather different methodological stance. Following Holmes (2016:11), the project sought to challenge the normative ways in which Enlightenment research has conceptualised understanding and to be 'monstrous …… to have an affinity with dis-order, chaos, mutation, and de-formation in an attempt to work against logic, rationality, normality, purity and science'. Through the eyes of traditional research methodology, the project would indeed seem to display many of these characteristics. We will see shortly what this meant for the academic and professional development sessions but it was also evident in the formation and evolution of the research team where there was an appreciation that the professional development programme, and the research associated with it, were necessarily messy and erratic because that is the nature of how we experience the world.

Very early on, the involvement in the project of B, who has a senior university–based management position, was reduced as a consequence of other demands from this post and attendant workload issues. These management duties included leadership, with the head of the nursery school and children's centre, of an initiative to develop, in partnership, a joint research and practice hub. Whilst B's connection to the project continued as part of the research and practice hub developments and as a result of membership of the setting's advisory board, this involvement was more remote until later in the year when developments related to the research and practice hub led to a need to reflect upon the project and what was emerging from it in the form of a conference presentation and this paper. This has resulted in the paper being shaped in a more linear fashion than the way in which the project itself actually functioned and has posed challenges in presenting the paper in a fashion that is not at odds with the project's conceptualisation of the relationship between practice, the project and engagement with theory and reflection as an interwoven but imperfect patchwork with unhemmed and fraying borders.

With involvement in action research and data collection such a time consuming and therefore costly activity, it is not, in fact, unusual for more senior academics not to be involved directly in all aspects of a project and for their time to be spent on what are often seen as the more prestigious activities of analysis, conference presentation and paper writing. What is unusual is to reveal this. As Tilley (2003) notes, data is often collected by research assistants, or by teacher participants in action research, whose costs are more commensurate with the funding available through research grants. Tilley (2003) points out that not only is the data often collected by someone other than the principal investigators, it is common also for data transcription to be carried out by more junior members of research teams or even contracted out to those with no direct involvement. Middleton and Cons (2014: 284) thus argue that division of research labour 'cannot be divorced from the logics of capital' and Tilley (2003: 771) highlights that 'time is a diminishing resource. Researchers more often than not have to allocate their time to other aspects of conducting research not so easily delegated.' Middleton and Cons (2014: 282) note that 'perhaps the most notable quality of the literature on research assistants is its sparse, episodic, and ad hoc

character. …… More often than not, discussions of research assistants are limited to footnotes'. Significantly they go on to add that 'their presence tends to be conveniently erased in the all-important progressions from fieldwork to published ethnography' (282).

Whilst a decision could have been made to silence these developments, they would have become ghosts lurking behind, alongside, through and amongst the project and the way in which the research was carried out and so we believe it is important to bring these hauntings out of the shadows. B decided, following, Jenkins (2015: 12) that 'we must interrogate the realities of how our knowledge has been produced, who has been involved in its construction, in what ways, how this affects the stories we tell in our writing, and what ethical and methodological implications it might have'. In this way, it is hoped that some small contribution is being made to the sparse literature. In many ways, this was not easy to do and feels like a risk. Jenkins (2015: 23) highlights the way in which there is 'a marked tendency for scholars to write out some of the methodological complexities of their fieldwork for fear of disciplinary criticism.' Cons (2015: 376) warns that the involvement of others and absence of the researcher can invite censure as possibly 'conjur(ing) questions about the (researcher's) own skills, abilities, and qualifications in the field'. Perhaps of more concern still is Cons' (2014: 376) reference to possible concerns about methodological purity and that by admitting that the academic researcher was not the only one present, or was not present at all, there is a risk of suggesting 'that our data is compromised at best, 'polluted' at worst' (Cons, 2014: 376). Despite these dangers, B came to feel that this is an important story to tell, especially given the ever greater financial and time constraints affecting more senior researchers and the necessity of involving others in data collection. The concerns are also refuted as being rooted in positivist notions of the importance of purity and replicability of research methods in pursuit of notions of supposed absolute truth and fact.

A key concern in relation to the research and practice hub was that it should give visibility to the collaboration between the university and the practice setting. We were committed, therefore, to ensuring that our work acknowledged the involvement of all concerned. Hence, early in the project, the current authors decided to work on a paper that would be presented initially at an international early childhood conference by both B, the academic, and the practitioners, T and N, and which would subsequently be published in a journal. Such joint publication is relatively unusual and Holligan (2015: 1263) warns that 'academics routinely tend to pursue joint authorship only with those deemed to be at least as prestigious as themselves in the field' and so erase details of research assistants and research participants. Middleton and Cons (2014: 284) draw attention to the way in which researchers are generally 'in the business of transforming the work of the hired assistant into the cache of intellectual capital and acumen'. Our major concern was to establish what B, as the academic, and T and N, as the practitioners, should bring to the paper. Like Postholm (2009) and Yu (2011) we were not of the view that working across academia and practice necessitated that B as academic had to take on fully the role of practitioner or that T and N, as practitioners, needed to take on all aspects of researcher. In short, we were under no illusion, as Postholm (2009: 561) notes that 'no one in this 'community of development' will become a

full participant in the other's practice'. Thus we decided on a division of labour that was attuned with our expertise and what we were looking to gain from the project. These decisions also meant that a move away from the norms of anonymity was seen as important in order to ensure that the respective contributions are give some visibility and to reduce the dangers, identified by Jenkins (2015: 217) of the views of participants 'being appropriated by the researcher writing up the project'.

The division of labour means that the diary notes of the sessions were written largely by T and N, the practitioners, and the analysis and pulling together largely by B, the academic. The details of the sessions are an amalgamation of notes written contemporaneously but also subsequently by T and N. This is further complicated by the later creation of a more polished narrative by B, who was not present at the majority of the sessions, as part of the writing up process when his direct involvement in the project increased again. Initially the narrative about the sessions and the reflections on them were written largely in the third person, reflecting T's previous experience of research conventions and B's inside / outside position as the university–based author. However, as a joint paper concerned with the importance of engagement, the writing has since moved, for the most part, to the collective 'we' though there are moments where we have struggled to find an appropriate voice. As such, the narrative bears all the challenges of the relationship between events at a particular point in time and later representation inherent in any research. Thus we are mindful of Cons' (2014: 375) call to consider 'the processes of mediation that necessarily occur within this dynamic' and acknowledge the influence of this on 'analysis and theorisation' (375). The analysis of the professional and academic development project and its conceptualization of children and childhood is mainly that of B as the university academic, reflecting Postholm's view (2009: 577) on the importance of an appropriate division of labour and that 'researchers will usually have strength in analysing and interpreting practice through the lenses of theory'.

Whilst use was made of theory from the beginning, the primary focus of the professional and academic development sessions was practice, with an emphasis on movement and sensation. For the most part, the approach reflected Postholm & Skrøvset's insight (2013: 513) that 'the right time to connect theory to practice experiences' is 'after they had become acquainted with their own practice and that of the others'. This focus on movement and sensation also reflected a growing interest in the project team in the ways in which words are not, by themselves, sufficient as a way of understanding and experiencing the world. Following MacLure (2013: 600), there was an interest in the way in which

> 'language is deposed from its god-like centrality in the construction and regulation of wordly affairs, to become one element in a manifold of forces and intensities that are moving, connecting and diverging .... words collide and connect with things on the same ontological level, and therefore language cannot achieve the distance and externality that would allow it to represent – i.e. to stand over, stand for and stand in for – the world'.

Instead, words, language, are seen as just one of the ways, though a dominant one, that are used to categorise and give meaning and significance to what we experience. Thus we were concerned to seek ways of 'reaching for that which escapes and exceeds language' (MacLure, 2010: 279). In order to explore what this might mean, as the project progressed, increasing attention was paid to sensation and to what theory is currently opening up for us in terms of other ways of conceptualising what practice with young children might need to be about if it is to equip them for a world where the power of words to engage with and capture its experiences, sensations and meanings is running out. Instead of the singular emphasis on language, MacLure (2013b: 228) proposes that more attention is needed to sensory experience and wonder 'especially in our engagements with data, as a counterpart to the exercise of reason through interpretation, classification, and representation (Maclure, 2013b: 228). It is important to understand that wonder does not only conjure up some golden childhood glow and MacLure goes on to argue that 'wonder is not necessarily a safe, comforting, or uncomplicatedly positive affect. It shades into curiosity, horror, fascination, disgust, and monstrosity' (Maclure, 2013b: 229). This made us suspect that the academic and professional development sessions needed to offer some wonder but a wonder tinged perhaps with uncomfortable feelings and troubled thoughts.

Outlining the Academic and Professional Development Sessions

The sessions were all based at, and organised by, the university and the first brought together the practitioners from the six different settings (in some cases more than one from each) with half a dozen academics from the university. T summarised this first session as focusing on the significance of context in the provision that is made for two year olds and their families. She notes her observation that all involved were keen to consider what it might mean to be two in a setting and all were eager to participate and look for a way of understanding and reflecting on provision for children and families. T particularly noticed differences between the provision of spaces across the different settings, adult roles with children, types of documentation and the balance of child and adult led planning. This led to reflection on the perceived needs of two year olds, with discussions deconstructing the notion of 'terrible twos' and the negative images that this automatically brings up, such as 'can't concentrate', 'screams', 'bites'.

The subsequent sessions were opened up to a wider range of practitioners from the six settings. The first explored the ways in which practitioners understood two year olds, using a jam jar activity to encapsulate what the two-year-old meant for each participant. T highlights that this led to deep levels of discussion about what the choices, and what participants said about the choices, suggested about the different ways that they viewed two year olds. T recalls that some notions were more abstract and based on metaphor, such as an elastic band to represent the way children reach out but then want to return to safety; some were rather more literal, with a jam jar containing sand, for example, which two year olds were considered to enjoy playing with. She also notes that

some related directly to practice and to children's attempts at making sense of their environment, for example a bulldog clip which a practitioner had observed a child experimenting with that day. This session allowed for a deep level of discussion of apparently throwaway comments such as 'I wouldn't let a two-year-old have this glass jar' being reflected on and what this might suggest about how we view young children and perceive their need for protection from harm. Back at the setting at the heart of this study, this first session led to discussion about expectations of professional development. The staff discussed how the traditional model is very much a body of knowledge from perceived experts that is delivered for practitioners to use. T draws attention to the way in which many were struck by a quotation from Piaget, used as part of the sessions, which questioned whether education should be about 'forming children who are only capable of learning what is already known'. The programme encouraged a move away from such certainties and echoed Henderson's contention (2014: 280) that the 'intensity of being lost is necessary if we are to find our way out of the already known and into new ways of being'. When presented with a different approach, however, some practitioners found it lacking in clarity and prescription, which meant that they sometimes felt they were 'not being developed' since they struggled to understand and enact their professional development through the necessary critical engagement with their existing beliefs and practices..

The next session, which sought to 'find a balance between supporting and pushing' (Postholm, 2009: 562) both thinking and physical activity was led by a visitor from Norway who uses dance and drama with young children and their parents. T records how the participants watched recordings of dancers using objects whilst being observed by children under the age of three. Pieces of tissue paper were then provided and the participants were asked to use their bodies in a number of ways to keep the tissue in the air. We were encouraged by the visiting tutor to discuss what was happening and what we were feeling. Cardboard boxes were then explored by the group in a variety of ways, first being invited to express our friendship for our box, then examining the shape and feel of the box with our eyes closed, then exploring the sounds that the cardboard box could make as it was tapped, rolled, banged and thrown. We were encouraged and provoked to interrupt, view from elsewhere, feel and listen to what we and others said and experienced in relation to these materials. This led to discussions about the ways in which adults would not normally bestow friendship on an inanimate object such as a box and about how practitioners might respond in their settings if children were noisy and overly physical in working with boxes. We then used boxes and fabric to tell a story about the box and moved with or inside the boxes. This prompted discussions about what physical and sensory engagement, as well as language, offered in terms of understanding objects and experiences.

In order to support this provocation to interrupt and to understand differently, Foucault's concept of heterotopias (and the operation of power in heterotopias) was introduced as a way of theorising what happens with young children in early childhood settings. Foucault's articulation of what he means by heterotopias is generally considered to be under-developed in relation to his better known concepts (Wesselman, 2013). Wesselman (2013:25) goes on to argue, however that 'little can be gained by saying that a space *is* (or isn't) a heterotopia;

the concept becomes more productive when looking at how a space (structurally and spatially) *works* as a heterotopia'. There are some strands identified by Foucault (2000) which can be pulled together in considering what heterotopias are and how they operate. Heterotopias are 'real' and involve enactment, practice and 'place' in contrast to 'utopias' which involve 'space' and idealised ways of being but not physical placement, presence, practice or actual being. Whilst having a physical form, heterotopias are not bounded by this and, in another sense, are imaginary and have a meaning beyond the place in terms of discourses about those places. What is said and understood about the places is as important as the places themselves. They involve notions of place and space but also of discourse. Heterotopias are places where the relationship between the physical objects that constitute them and the meanings of these objects are in no way straightforward. Lord (2006:10) highlights that 'the heterotopia ….. undermines the relation between words and things, and maintains the space between them as a space. In other words, heterotopias are spaces of the *difference* of words and things'. Hence Foucault argues that: 'Heterotopias …. dessicate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences' (Foucault, 2002: xix). Part of the disjunction between the object and how it is represented stems from the way in which heterotopias involve the dynamics of how meaning attaches itself to objects and places as they are shaped by the hauntings of time, culture and placeless space.

In seeking to illustrate this, Foucault turns to the mirror to illustrate the way in which heterotopias operate. What we see in the mirror is 'real' but reflections are never the same as what they reflect. Foucault (2000: 179) explains that

> 'it is a heterotopia in that the mirror really exists, in that it has a sort of return effect on the place that I occupy. Due to the mirror, I discover myself absent at the place where I am, since I see myself over there …. The mirror functions as a heterotopia in the sense that it makes this place that I occupy at the moment I look at my myself in the glass both utterly real, connected with the entire space surrounding it, and utterly unreal – since, to be perceived, it is obliged to go by way of the virtual point which is over there'.

Thus for Foucault (2000: 179) a heterotopia is 'a kind of contestation, both mythical and real, of the space in which we live'. The professional development sessions can also be theorised as s form of heterotopia in that they were concerned to help practitioners and academics to look at themselves and their beliefs and practices but by way of activities which created virtual points out of the line of direct reflection and to create 'a space in which the difference between words and things is put on display and made available for public contestation' (Lord, 2006:10).

Thus the academic and professional development sessions were increasingly conceived as heterotopic but early childhood settings and provision for two year olds could also be understood as heterotopias in a number of ways

and we thought it useful to work with both notions in articulation with each other. There are two types of heterotopias according to Hetherington (2011: 466) 'Some of them are concerned with issues of order, regulation, classification and control, others with freedom and transgression'. It is our contention here that the two co-exist in early childhood heterotopias. On the one hand, they could be seen as 'crisis heterotopias' or perhaps 'deviation heterotopias', offering the seduction of escape for those who do not live the favoured notion of reality. Foucault explains (2000: 180)

> 'crisis heterotopias' as '…reserved for individuals who are in a state of crisis with respect to society and the human milieu in which they live …... heterotopias of crisis are …. being replaced …by …. heterotopias of deviation…..These are the … the psychiatric hospitals; they are also, of course prisons, …. old people's homes, which are on the borderline, as it were, between the heterotopia of crisis and the deviation heterotopia since after all old age is a crisis and also a deviation, seeing that in our society, where leisure activity is the rule, idleness forms a kind of deviation'.

Early childhood settings could thus be understood as heterotopias of crisis and / or deviation, a response to the perceived immaturity of young children, particularly where that immaturity is not remedied by experiences of the type that government deems productive of human capital and an economically profitable later life. In Foucault's terms, whilst on the one hand early childhood settings could be seen to act as heterotopias that offer a space of escape from this unfavourable reality, they could also be understood as places of regulation and control and preparation for a more accepted notion of how to be

Early childhood settings and the academic and professional development sessions could also be seen to include the heterotopic notion of heterochronia in as much as access to them is regulated and time does not necessarily behave as we might at first think. Foucault (2000: 183) notes that 'in general, one does not gain entry to a heterotopian emplacement as if to a windmill. Either one is constrained to enter, which is the case with barracks and prisons, or one has to submit to rituals and purifications. One can enter only with a certain permission and after a certain number of gestures have been performed'. Access to the development sessions was controlled and entry allowed only for specified periods. The sessions offered opportunities for freedom and transgression but there was also a sense in which some of the settings chosen to take part had been selected on the basis of crisis and deviation – crisis because of a lack of previous experience of work with two year olds and deviation because of the form that provision took. In this sense, it is important to be mindful of the power being exercised by the university. In the case of early childhood settings, the two year olds are permitted access only for specified periods of time on the basis of crisis and deviance where the belief is that the experiences which they are being offered at home do not equip them with the knowledge and skills which the government has determined are needed.   Following Foucault (2000: 184), the early childhood setting is a heterotopia which creates 'a different space, a different real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well-arranged' as their homes are

considered to be 'disorganised, badly arranged and muddled. This would be the heterotopia not of illusion, but of compensation.' Our concern was to surface and interrupt the operation early childhood institutions as heterotopias concerned with the correction of particular constructs of deviance.

We also wanted to explore the dimension of heterotopias which is concerned with freedom, illusion and transgression, in which the practices of early childhood settings, and particularly play – based practices, could be seen as offering escape from ordinary spaces and ways of understanding. Johnson's translation (2013:798) of the following extract from Foucault (2010: 24) is useful in considering the imaginative and freeing aspect of heterotopias:

> 'it's the bottom of the garden; or even more, it's the Indian tent erected in the middle of the attic; or still, it's Thursday afternoons on their parent's bed. It is on that bed where they discover the ocean, as they can swim between the covers, and the bed is also the sky, or they can bounce on the springs; it's the forest as they can hide there; or still, it's night as they can become ghosts between the sheets.'

In order to be freeing, however, Johnson (2013: 799) maintains that it is important that play heterotopias 'recall the myths of paradise', 'enclose a rupture', that they 'contain multiple meanings', that 'they are both utterly mundane and extraordinary', and that they offer both 'opportunities and dangers' (Johnson, 2013: 799). However, as a key aspect of the functioning of early childhood settings and echoing many romantic and developmental notions of appropriate practice in early childhood, imaginative play has become so regulated, so much a part of the landscape of its places and spaces, that there are dangers that it does not offer freedom or a way of looking differently but a means of regulating children and childhood as Ailwood (2003) argues. There was the danger that academics and practitioners saw the heterotopia of early childhood institutions and their practices as so mundane that they failed to see both the extraordinary and the discriminatory. The heterotopic challenge for the project was to disrupt the space between the places, practices and artefacts of early childhood and the ghosts of the different discourses which are associated with them in order to explore whether other ways of understanding, experiencing and feeling that space enable different sorts of practice with children to come about.

Surfacing the ghosts of the discourses that attach themselves as meanings to early childhood practices was an important part of the academic and professional development programme. In theorising our approach to professional development, Gordon's notion (2008, 2011) of haunting is considered helpful, with its attention to

> 'that moment (of however long duration) when things are not in their assigned places, when the cracks and the rigging are exposed, when the people who are meant to be invisible show up without any sign of leaving, when disturbed feelings won't go away, when easily

living one day and then the next becomes impossible, when the present seamlessly becoming 'the future' gets entirely jammed up'. (Gordon, 2011: 2).

What we argue here, is that whilst power operates to regulate, looking at early childhood spaces differently at the same time may offer escape from or leakage around the same regulation. The possibility of this escape or leakage offers the opening for something more optimistic, if we can think beyond the constraints of the version of escape (into economic capital at the disposal of the state) that we are being offered in neoliberal policy documents.

The subsequent session was focused on den making and was led by a drama tutor from another university. T notes that open ended resources were used such as long rectangular shaped boards, chalks and circles. Participants worked in groups to make something, using the full space of the room. Once the construction had been made, the groups then moved around to look at and make changes to other groups' constructions. This led us to think about and discuss how children must feel when other children or adults come and play with, damage or destroy what they have made. Participants then regrouped and were asked to construct a den using cardboard boxes. One group created a long tunnel type of enclosure which involved crawling through the boxes. Hidden bubble wrap was placed in the boxes so it made popping sounds as people crawled over the textured surface. The end was then closed off and a clear box with fairy lights was placed inside, covered with small white balls. The outside was covered by a white parachute to give different light and dark experiences as you moved from each space. This reflects the ways in which, following Maclure (2013), we were seeking to make room for wonder, in both its golden glow and menacing shadows. Other groups had different resources: one had blinds and bendy tubes and textured wooden square planks and a light shade; a second group had some umbrellas made of clear material and some which lit up; a third had three hoops joined together to make into an igloo type den covered over with parachute material. They also used a very large parasol with lights and white table sized decorative trees. The groups then found ways of joining their dens together. Den making was a common activity in many of the practitioners' settings but the provocation here, following Foucault (2010) was to see what different ways of making, feeling, touching, seeing and understanding might bring about.

Whilst the majority of the activities sought to challenge the way in which professional development is usually conducted and encouraged physical and sensory engagement, the next session was led by a university tutor and was a more traditional theoretically–based one, concerned with two year olds' talk, making use of a Powerpoint presentation and seminar-based approach. This was the only session that was led by an academic not directly involved in the early childhood work. Some felt more at ease, feeling they knew what was expected of them; others found it difficult to relate the academic content to their practice. Postholm & Skrøvset(2013: 516) argue that 'the academically challenging questions have to wait until what we call complementary relations have been developed. Only then is the necessary trust in place and the teachers can deal with such issues without feeling

that their competence is being questioned, which is often taken as a betrayal'. Certainly it was the case that perhaps the greatest success was with staff who would have previously felt 'not clever enough' to engage in theoretical discussions but who, because of the previous sessions, which seemed more of 'a level playing field' between academics and practitioners, felt a greater confidence in engagement since everyone now knew each other better. Staff followed this up by applying the theory to transcripts of conversations and were particularly keen to consider the elements relating to English as an additional language.

The last session was led by another university tutor, though T noted that he was a student, and fused theory and practice with time for discussion. Whilst previous sessions had focused on physical, tactile and linguistic engagement, this session was concerned with the significance of auditory experience in how we seek understand and make sense. It reflected an on-going concern to consider how 'everything said, done, or felt resides in our bodies' (Dachyshyn, 2015: 39). T recalls how the initial discussion focussed on how listening tends to be understood as an act of human communication, in which one individual human being apprehends the meaning being expressed by another, often through vocal sounds. Very often the focus is on sounds as language. As we have seen, the adequacy of language to represent the world has already been contested by MacLure (2011) and Holmes (2016).T recalls how this was then opened up into thinking about other vocal and environmental sounds which resist interpretation and where there is often no obvious meaning. Yet they are an important part of everyday sensory experience, affecting bodies and shaping atmospheres. Discussions were then held focussing on how we encourage children to develop listening skills (a large part of early reading activities) through focus activities and encouragement.

T documents how participants, as part of the session, practised some environmental listening exercises, as part of a listening walk through the city. Built in to the session were opportunities to discuss what we heard, how we had been listening, and how different ways of listening could influence our work with young children. The walk was pre planned, took us through a variety of contrasting environments and was conducted in silence by those taking part to avoid distraction. We were also encouraged to focus exclusively on listening, rather than touching or looking. Initially we went into a lift right to the top of the building. The team closed their eyes and just listened to the sounds inside the university building. A practitioner reported 'I heard voices but couldn't decipher what was being said, echoes of sounds. Most prominent was a humming, it sounded like air conditioning but I couldn't locate it'. We then opened our eyes and went into a very small room. In here the outside sounds stopped. At this stage the experience is a very individual one and it would be very difficult to write about it either collectively or in the third person. For this reason, the next part of the paper is told directly using the words from T's notes:

> I could hear everyone's footsteps coming into the room and it was so silent I could sense my
> own breathing. We went down the steps of the building from the top right down to the
> bottom. I heard every sound on different textures of flooring but also sounds coming from all

around. We carried on walking, crossing a busy road in two batches quickly moving along, car engines revving, a bus screeching, the speed of cars as they drove past, car horns beeping, a sound of an ambulance or a police car - I wasn't sure - I could hear the sirens but couldn't see what they were. We walked past to an underground tunnel. There was a feeling of fear, graffiti sprayed on the walls. I wasn't sure what sort of state the tunnel would be in. I felt fear yet reassurance that I wasn't alone - everyone else was with me. As we walked back, I felt I had learnt a lot about my own fears and emotions, my need to touch, make sense of sounds, distance, above, below, fear, almost mapping trying to think by looking for buildings I'm familiar with.

The walk highlighted how our listening and attention are linked, how we need to understand sound, locate its origin although sometimes we are not able to if we have never experienced it before. This caused a degree of anxiety and fear and struck us as an important point when considering the attempts and feelings of very young children as they seek to make sense of their experiences. Perhaps there are signs again of the light and shade in MacLure's (2013b) notion of wonder.

On returning to the university, T recalls how themes emerged such as the individuality of hearing sounds and how we all experienced the walk differently. Our experience and knowledge of the area affected our listening and how comfortable we felt. Several of the group mentioned how difficult and tiring it was when we simply listened, how we brought our own interests to the walk, wanting to look into accommodation, shop windows etc. We considered how this must feel for individual children when we encouraged them to listen to something that we, rather than they, have decided is important. We discussed how we quickly want to give sounds a label e.g. hearing a crackling and deciding that it must be a plastic bag and the ways in which MacLure (2010, 2013a) argues that words are not sufficient to the task of helping us make sense and understand. We also thought about how children would explore and differentiate sounds on a listening walk. How would they use language to explain what they hear? What type of sounds would be more prominent so they could re-call them after the walk? We discussed how we felt that children needed time to be absorbed without adults imposing explanation. This time for immediate reflection on our experience allowed practitioners to develop thoughts and ideas and has influenced T's recent sound walks with the children, which have focussed more on an immersive approach, encouraging the 'feeling' and experience sound and silence. Once again, the need for labelling and attention to the external is evident with the children, as they find sounds outside of themselves, such as car horns easier to focus on than their own footsteps etc. Again, this has encouraged practitioners and children to experience everyday activities in a slightly different way with a different emphasis.

Reflecting on the Experiences of the Project

In contrast to the discourses of neoliberalism, members of the project were encouraged to re-engage with 'relationships of reciprocity, generosity, kindness … deeply rooted in contextually relevant values, beliefs, and

practices .. relationships of close contact, and quiet, steady, mindful presence' (Dachyshyn, 2015: 39). T reflects that some of the sessions challenged people because of their physical and active nature and others felt a little uncomfortable immersing themselves in the activities. Exploring why this may be the case brought up issues of feeling judged, feeling reluctant to join in. There appeared to be an underlying theme that the staff felt they were not creative, especially where they focused on the end product rather than the process which led to it. This raises interesting questions about how children feel in such situations and about when the feeling of others commenting, perhaps negatively, begins and whether and how this affects children of this age. This in turn raises questions about the way in which this might impact upon developing a reflective and risk taking culture. Discussions back at the practitioners' settings and amongst the university team led to reflection on what conditions could allow practitioners to critique their own contexts and what conditions prevented them from doing so. These are important considerations because of the discourses which operate through regulatory mechanisms and which often seek to define quality early childhood education in very particular kinds of ways. What supporting structures and spaces would allow for this culture and what existing structures need to be challenged? All of this led to us questioning our assumptions and consequently raised issues about how we can be confident, comfortable and productive in questioning, troubling and reflecting on our own practice in working with children and as academics working with practitioners.

Reviewing and Sustaining the Project

In thinking about the project, T identifies some of the questions that suggested themselves about how continue and sustain it. The approach adopted worked better for some than others. Some could readily see how the ideas and activities encountered in the sessions could be a provocation but also thread through into practice. Others, however, enjoyed the experiences and the theoretical challenges but struggled to see how to work with them in everyday practice with children. Physical and sensory experiences were seen as been particularly productive of reflection and change but the approach also raises questions for B about the different ways in which practitioners experienced this and whether the space is too difficult to enter for some or whether the cost may be too great to their own well-being if they do manage entry. If access is problematic for some, this in turn raises questions about whether other ways can be found to enable these practitioners to look at familiar practice in ways which make it unfamiliar and extraordinary without cause emotional harm in the process. Making the connections required the development of a degree of reflexivity but also the ability to enact what this might mean in working with children. This ability was not readily accessible to everyone and consideration is needed of the processes by which this reflexivity and its enactment in practice can be promoted and the conditions that might make this possible or prevent it. The nursery school and children's centre was concerned to use the project as a spur to further innovation. This is challenging since this setting is also responsible for the running of a small number of other settings, where there is a particular need to improve quality. This raises questions about how to extend the project beyond those directly involved, about how what happened in one context with a group of reasonably like-minded practitioners, researchers and academics might translate into practice with other

practitioners and academics who had not necessarily signed up to the learning journey and certainly had not been on it as part of the project group. Making a difference to how we think and practice seemed to require the creation of discomfort, reflexivity and a receptiveness to working with theory. This was difficult enough in the project group and it is important to take note of Postholm's contention (2009: 564) that 'it cannot be emphasized enough that it takes time to develop a researcher's attitude, and the environment or context must also provide a stage on which the teacher can play out this role'. We feel that this is still some way off.

As discussed previously, the project was not a linear one of development sessions with practical activities, followed by academic and practitioner reflection, followed by the application of theory. Practice, reflection and theory were interwoven throughout as we have seen but it is true that more extended consideration of theory happened towards the end of the project, as conference and journal papers were being prepared, and this was led by B. The shortcomings of this approach are acknowledged since it means, as Holmes (2014: 783) highlights, that the experiences of the project are necessarily 'distanced from their observer, severed from their vibrant and intense life forces and embalmed in a textual eternity' which is not adequate to the task (MacLure, 2010, 2013s). There is also the issue of the seemingly taken for granted assumption regarding B as having greater theoretical knowledge. The division of labour was primarily driven by the restrictions placed on B's involvement in the project and the theorisation of the paper being the contribution that it was possible to make in these circumstances. This is not to deny that the assumption was a part of the reason for the division of labour but this at least followed discussion between the paper's authors about the contribution that each was best placed to make.

The project can, therefore, be seen as exploring the heterotopia of early childhood beyond the places, practices and artefacts which give it physical form, engaging with it instead as a space where things do not have to be as they first seem. McNamee (2000: 490) argues that 'through entering into some of the 'other' spaces ….. it is possible for children to escape some of the boundaries around childhood' and this is also what the project was seeking to do for its participants through its professional development activities. The sessions were concerned to create a 'space that eats and scrapes away at us' (Foucault, 2000:178) and to reveal the ways in which 'order is, at one and the same time …. the hidden network that determines the way (things) confront one another, and also that which has no existence except in the grid created by a glance, an examination, a language; and it is only in the blank spaces of this grid that order manifests itself in depth as though already there, waiting in silence for the moment of its expression' (Foucault, 2002: xxi). In common with Gonick and Hladki (2005), we were interested in exploring with practitioners the ways in which we have become accustomed to making things which are so similar and so different appear to hold so much in common. This is not an easy task since it requires the willingness and ability to view this 'as difficult knowledge, as troubled, problematic and agitated …. to make the categories usually used lose their transparency, and to interrogate systems of knowing through which categories are rendered possible' (Gonick and Hladki (2005: 290). It also involves the ability and the political will to consider

whether other meanings and ways of determining them may be more productive, less discriminatory, more freeing of children and their families.

Thus the project sought to work with these difficult notions and to use a process of academic and professional development which 'is a mirroring one but one in which we recognise ourselves as different from our reflection' (Hetherington, 2011: 465). Following Johnson (2013: 800), we sought to engage in professional development which 'disturbs and unsettles wherever it sheds its light' in order to resist 'the settling of binary thinking' and to establish 'new relationships and alliances' (Johnson, 2013: 800). We sought to do this by working to disrupt common early childhood practices with other ways of understanding and experiencing. Through its activities, the heterochronia of the programme offered a break from but relationship with the surrounding ordered time in order to create 'a space of illusion that denounces every real space, all real emplacements within which human life is partitioned, as being even more illusory … (Foucault, 2000: 184) and to explore the ways in which practice in early childhood settings could be about 'suggestion and refusal of signification' (Wesselman, 2013: 20).

This brings us to consideration of the 'effectiveness' of what we sought to do. The practitioners involved in writing this paper have identified that the academic setting and its staff did not enter sufficiently into practitioner settings to fully understand the familiar and the set of understandings that commonly circulate and give meaning to work with young children and how these bump against policy discourses. This is important given, as Delaney (2015: 385) notes, 'for teachers working within borderlands of practice, this sense-making provoked by dissonance may be an endless task …. teacher educators and researchers need to help teachers recognize and make sense of the landscape of competing conceptions'. Some arrangements were made for academics to visit the settings and to work with the children and for practitioners to visit each other's settings but this did not happen nearly as much as had been intended, largely for pragmatic reasons related to workload and setting requirements. This meant that the scope to engage with the assumptions and established ways of seeing, narrating and acting was limited. As we have seen above, the ideas and activities from the sessions were taken back into settings and setting staff talked to each other about their experiences but there was little opportunity for practitioners to share these conversations across settings and even less opportunity for practitioners to discuss with university staff what impact the sessions had had on people's thinking and practice and to engage in this troubling of assumptions. The new ways of thinking and posing questions about process rather than focussing on outcomes were important but practitioners were also aware of the evidence requirements of the regulatory force of the Early Years Foundation Stage and the way in which there is surveillance of this evidence through the disciplinary structures that local authorities and the state have put in place (not least of which through the mechanisms of Ofsted inspection). The project needs to continue to foster the 'growth of capabilities to resist and transgress systems that cast power relations and historical events as fixed and necessary (Lord, 2006:2) but we struggled to find sufficient space for such discussions. The opportunity for professional and academic discussions is therefore seen as important in helping challenge and make falter disciplinary mechanisms where they run counter to what we perceive to be in the interests and well-being of children and families.

It is also true that academics and researchers are often very good at asking questions about why things are done as they are, what the factors may be that might lead to things playing out in the way that they do, whether these factors lead to inequitable outcomes for particular children, families and groups of staff, whether other ways of doing, feeling and becoming are possible that might be more productive and might lead to better and fairer outcomes for all concerned. So far so good and very much in keeping with Henderson (2014: 280) who goes so far as to argue that 'our capacity to produce teacher learning in the in-between and to produce something new is also dependent on an openness to getting lost, again and again and again'. The problem, however, is that questioning whether there are other ways of doing things as we embrace being lost is difficult to reconcile with the requirements of regulatory mechanisms. The challenge, therefore, is to constantly question whilst finding ways of engaging ethically with notions such as school readiness, which are heavily imbued with deficit and discriminatory approaches to children and families and all that they mean in terms of discipline and control. Can we find ways of resisting these discourses whilst at the same time providing children with the opportunity to develop the skills that the state believes are the markers of success? Is behaving ethically to equip children with the skills they need for school readiness success whilst at the same time encouraging approaches which critique the very skills which are being developed and which promote broader concerns for children's well-being? If it is, how can academics and practitioners find ways of doing this with very young children? These are the questions that we continue to grapple with as the project enters its next phase.

References

Ailwood J (2003) Governing early childhood through play. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 4(3): 286–299.

Bourke T & Lidstone J (2015) What is plan b? Using Foucault's archaeology to enhance policy analysis. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 36 (6): 833-853

Brogaard Clausen S (2015) Schoolification or early years democracy? A cross-curricular perspective from Denmark and England. C*ontemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(4): 355-373.

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

Cannella GS & Viruru R (2004) *Childhood and (Post) Colonization in Power, Education and Contemporary Practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cannella GS & Soto LD (2010) *Childhoods: A Handbook (Rethinking Childhood).* Oxford: Peter Lang Publishing.

Carr W & Kemmis S (1986) *Becoming critical: education, knowledge and action research.* London: Falmer

Cons J (2014) Field dependencies: mediation, addiction and anxious fieldwork at the India-Bangladesh border. *Ethnography* 15 (3): 375–93

Dachyshyn D (2015) Being mindful, heartful, and ecological in early years care and education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(1): 32–41

Delaney K (2015) Dissonance for understanding: Exploring a new theoretical lens for understanding teacher identity formation in borderlands of practice. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(4): 374–389

Deleuze (1990) *The Logic of Sense* New York: Columbia University Press

Department for Education (2011) *Supporting Families in the Foundation Years.* London: Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2013) *More Great Childcare: Raising quality and giving parents more choice.* London: Crown Copyright.

Foucault M (1984) Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité, October 1984 (*'Des Espace Autres', March 1967) Translated from the French by Jay Miskowiec)

Foucault M (1998) *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality 1*. London: Penguin.

Foucault M (2000) *Aesthetics*: E*ssential Works,* volume 2. London: Penguin.

Foucault M (2002) *Power*: E*ssential Works,* volume 3. London: Penguin.

Foucault M (2002) *The Order of Things: An archeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge Classics.

Foucault M (2010*) Les Corps Utopique*, Les Hétérotopies. Clamercy: Éditions Lignes.

Franck K and Nilsen R (2015) The (in)competent child: subject positions of deviance in Norwegian day-care centres. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(3): 230–240

Gonick M & Hladki J (2005) Who are the participants? Rethinking representational practices and writing with heterotopic possibility in qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 18(3): 285-304.

Gordon A (2008) *Ghostly matters: haunting and the sociological imagination*, 2nd edn. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gordon A (2011) Some Thoughts on Haunting and Futurity. *Borderlands,*10(2): 1-21.

Guillemin M & Gillam L (2004) Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10 (2): 261-280.

Henderson L (2014) Teacher Learning in the In-between: encountering an 'invisible barrier' *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 15 (3): 272-283

Hetherington K (2011) Foucault, the museum and the diagram. *The Sociological Review*, 59(3): 458-475.

Holligan C (2015) Becoming a researcher: forms of capital associated with "research capacity" trajectories of young British social anthropologists. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 28 (10): 1249–1270

Holmes R & Jones L (2013) Flesh, wax, horse skin and hair: the many intensities of data. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13(4): 357–372

Holmes R (2014) Fresh kills: the spectacle of (de)composing data. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(6): 781–789

Holmes, R. (2016) My tongue on your theory: the bittersweet reminder of every-thing unnameable. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 37(5) Special issue 'Fabulous monsters: alternative discourses of childhood in education', guest editors, R. Holmes, L. Jones & M. MacLure

Jenkins SA (2015) Assistants, guides, collaborators, friends: the concealed figures of conflict research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 0891241615619993, first published on December 18, 2015

Johnson P (2013) The geographies of heterotopia. *Geography Compass* 7(11): 790–803.

Kwon Y-I (2002) Changing curriculum for early childhood education in England. *Early Childhood Research & Practice* 4(2): 1-13.

Locke T, Alcorn N & O'Neill J (2013) Ethical issues in collaborative action research. *Educational Action Research* 21(1): 107-123

Lord B (2006) Foucault's museum: difference, representation, and genealogy. Museum and Society 4(1): 1-14.

Macfarlane K and Lakhani A (2015) Performativity, propriety and productivity: The unintended consequences of investing in the Early Years. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(2): 179–191

MacLure M (2010) The offence of theory. *Journal of Education Policy* 25 (2): 277-286

MacLure M (2011) Qualitative inquiry: where are the ruins? *Qualitative Inquiry* 17(10) 997–1005

MacLure M (2013a) Researching without representation? Language and materiality in post-qualitative methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26 (6): 658-667

MacLure M (2013b) The Wonder of Data. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13(4) 228–232

Martinovic M, Wiebe N, Ratkovic S, Willard-Holt C, Spencer T & Cantalini-Williams M (2012) 'Doing research was inspiring': building a research community with teachers. *Educational Action Research* 20:3, 385-406

Middleton T and Cons J (2014). Coming to terms: reinserting research assistants into ethnography's past and present. *Ethnography* 15 (3)): 279–90.

McNamee S (2000) Foucault's heterotopia and children's everyday lives. *Childhood* 7 (4): 479-492.

Piaget J (1954) *The Child's Construction of Reality.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Piaget J (1975) *The Child's Conception of the World*. XXXX: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks

Postholm MB (2009) Research and development work: developing teachers as researchers or just teachers? *Educational Action Research* 17 (4): 551-565

Postholm MB & Skrøvset S (2013) The researcher reflecting on her own role during action research. *Educational Action Research* 21(4): 506-518

Rousseau J–J. (1993) *Emile*. London: Everyman

Simpson D and Envy R (2015) Subsidizing early childhood education and care for parents on low income: moving beyond the individualized economic rationale of neoliberalism. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 16(2): 166–178

Simpson D, Lumsden E & McDowall Clark R (2015) Neoliberalism, global poverty policy and early childhood education and care: a critique of local uptake in England. *Early Years* 35(1): 96-109.

Taylor A & Richardson C (2005) Queering home corner. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 6(2): 163-173.

Tilley SA (2003) "Challenging" research practices: turning a critical lens on the work of transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry* 9 (5): 750-773.

Vygotsky LS (1978) *Mind in Society*. London: Harvard University Press.

Walkerdine V (ed.) (2002*) Challenging Subjects: Critical Psychology for a New Millennium.* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Wesselman D (2013) The high line, "The Balloon," and heterotopia. *Space and Culture* 16(1): 16–27

Yu K (2011) Exploring the nature of the researcher–practitioner relationship in qualitative educational research publications. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 24 (7): 785-804