Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 31
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 12

Production and Products of Preschool Documentation

Entanglements of children, things, and
templates

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Department of Social and Welfare Studies
Linköping University, Sweden
Norrköping 2017

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Production and Products of Preschool Documentation:
Entanglements of children, things, and templates

© Katarina Elfström Pettersson, 2017

Coverphoto: Magnus Pettersson

Drawings: Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Printed in Sweden by LiU-Tryck, Linköping, Sweden, 2017

ISBN 978-91-7685-553-9

ISSN 1653-0101

Distributed by:

Department of Social and Welfare Studies

Linköpings University

SE-601 74 Norrköping

SWEDEN

Acknowledgement

– Hello Mum, I am going to take a part-time course in education next autumn!

– Oh, I have been waiting for this!

When I called my mother to tell her that, aside of my job as a preschool teacher, I was going to become a student again, she was not particularly surprised. But her joy with this was not to be mistaken. Unfortunately, she never saw me complete the first course: Education 1. And she never experienced me going on to Education 2, 3 and 4, taking a bachelor's, a master's, and, through a research school for preschool teachers (FöFoBa), also a licentiate degree.

Neither my mother nor my father lived to see this doctoral thesis written, but I know they would have been proud of me. They never had the opportunity of experiencing their daughter, who wanted to be a scientist when she grew up, going through a post graduate program. I wish, with all my heart, the two of them, but especially my mother, had been able to be there when I defend my thesis. I would have liked to thank my mother for always supporting me when I least deserved it. Instead, I will try to do that with this thesis: Thank you mum, I dedicate this text to you!

But this thesis did not write itself, nor would it have been written without the help of number of human and non-human resources. First of all I would like to thank my supervisors: Eva Reimers, who followed me from the start of my post graduate studies, thank you for encouraging me to take one step further after the licentiate degree, and thank you for guiding and challenging me; Susanne Severinsson, thank you for insights in posthumanist theories, and for quick responses and support in the latter part of the studies; Maria Simonsson, thank you for suggesting the word 'intra-visual' and for providing further literature about preschool (also in the latter part of the studies); Mathias Martinsson, thank you for making me think again during my licentiate studies.

Thank you also heads of preschool, preschool teachers, parents and children participating in the study. Thank you Mjölby kommun for financing my participation in FöFoBa, I would never have come this far without it.

Thank you everybody in Educational Practices at Campus Norrköping for letting me be a part of a creative, inspiring, fun and educational environment. Thanks to all of you, senior researchers, fellow doctoral students, and other staff: Linnéa Stenliden, Linnea Bodén, Lina Söderman Lago, Josefine Rostedt, Martin Harling, Mats Bevemyr, Anders Albinsson, Sara Dalgren, Ingrid Karlsson, Eva Bolander, Maria Simonsson, Polly Björk Willén, Eva Reimers, Jacob Cromdal, Linda Häll, Rizwan-ul Huq, Daniel Björklund, Katarina Eriksson Barajas, Kirsten Stoewer, Susanne Severinsson,

Lars Wallner, Anna Martin Bylund, Jörgen Nissen, Tünde Puskás, Helene Elvstrand, Alma Vladavic, Ulrika Bodén, Elinor Månsson, Ayaz Razmjooei, Thomas Dahl, Lotta Holmgren Lind, Anita Andersson, Birgitta Plymoth and Anna Ericson. Thank you Sara for sharing the rollercoaster trip of the later part of our doctoral studies and for sharing animated GIFs on Messenger! Thank you Lina for always being there, in the office next to me, and for sharing highs and lows with me. Thank you Alma for our quiet and chatty lunches in Louis De Geer, hope they will return soon! Thank you Anna and Linnea for being inspiring, especially in the first part of my studies. Thank you Linnéa for sharing thoughts and ideas in the corridor. Thank you Mats and Lars and Anders for being funny, amusing and comic (!) in such different ways.

A special thanks to Christian Eidevald for your thorough and sharp, but also respectful and encouraging reading of my text at the 90% seminar. Thank you also to the grading committee: Eva Ängdahl, Polly Björk Willén and Ann-Marie Markström for your wise and helpful comments.

Thank you little sister, Susanne Elfström, for chats, discussions and food photos, and for proofreading parts of the text. Thank you friend, Carina Nilsson, for chats about everything and anything. Thank you friend and neighbor, Linda Rhodes, for helping out with ‘gee-gees’ on occasion (and for proofreading this part of the text). I certainly hope we will have more time for fika (or wine) from now on.

A big, big thanks to my affectionate husband, Ove, for letting me do my own thing and for bearing with me through moments of despair over writing, always telling me that you ‘heard it before, and it worked out just fine then, so it’ll work out just fine again’. Thank you children, Magnus, Olle, Claes, Emma, for leading your own lives, producing whatever you produce, whether it is photographs, music, or grandchildren (Theodor, Jonna, Tino, Isolde and...).

Katarina Elfström Pettersson
Bondorlunda 26 March 2017

Contents

OPENING THE DOOR TO PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION. . .	1
. . .and Leaping in	3
ENTERING INTO PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION TRADITIONS	5
Educare as a Swedish Preschool Tradition	5
From Child Observation to Documentation	7
Pedagogical Documentation	11
Measuring and Evaluating Preschool Quality	14
Systematic Quality Development Work and Control	18
Summary: Swedish Preschool Documentation Connected to Previous and Current Traditions and Practices	21
ENGAGING WITH AGENTIAL REALISM	23
Phenomena, Apparatuses and Intra-action	24
Entanglements, Agential Cuts, Diffraction and Spacetime-mattering	26
Summary	28
AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	29
MOVING INTO PREVIOUS RESEARCH	31
Children and Documentation	33
Observed and Surveilled	33
Active and Competent	34
Undetectable or Unseen	36
Methods, Templates and Documents	37
Directive	38
Agentic	38
Challenging	39
Summary	41
PRODUCING EMPIRICAL MATERIAL	43
Research Apparatus	43
Producing the Researcher	43
Presenting Preschools	44
Preschool A	45
Preschools B–E	46
Empirical Engagement	47
Video Recording	48
Connecting with Documents	51
Analysing the Empirical Material	53
Analysing Production of Documentation	53
Analysing Products of Documentation	55
Producing Intra-visuals	58

Contents

Connecting to Ethics	64
Entangled Ethics	64
Ethical Vetting	65
Informing Participants	66
GOING THROUGH THE ARTICLES	69
Article 1 – Children’s Participation in Preschool Documentation Practices	69
Article 2 – Sticky Dots and Lion Adventures Playing a Part in Preschool Documentation Practices	71
Article 3 – Teachers’ Actions and Children’s Interests: Quality Becomings in Preschool Documentation	72
Article 4 – Security and Water Themes: How Documentation Produces Rather than Represents Preschool Quality	73
Summarising the Articles	74
ARRIVING AT A DISCUSSION	77
Children’s Participation as Detached from Documentation Methods	78
The Focus of Documentation Shifts Away from Individuals	79
Non-Representational Documentation Producing Elements of Quality	81
Producing Preschool Quality	83
Creating Possibilities	85
...and Challenging Preschool Documentation through Lively Stories?	86
SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING	89
Inledning och bakgrund till studien	89
Syfte och frågeställningar	91
Produktion av empiriskt material	92
Resultat och diskussion	93
REFERENCES	97
RESEARCH PAPERS INCLUDED IN THE THESIS	109

APPENDICES

Figures

Figure 1. National model for systematic quality development work (my translation from an original in Skolverket, 2015).	19
Figure 2. Overview of the preschool groups in the study.	45
Figure 3. One view of the video camera in a documentation activity.	49
Figure 4. Word cloud from all groups (from www.wordle.net).	57
Figure 5. The first drawing produced as ‘intra-visuals’.	59
Figure 6. The second drawing.	60
Figure 7. The third drawing.	61
Figure 8. The fourth drawing.	61
Figure 9. The fifth drawing.	62
Figure 10. The sixth drawing.	63

Opening the Door to Preschool

Documentation. . .

Working as a preschool teacher for twenty years, I have been involved in documentation and observation in a number of ways. I have used developmental charts of different kinds; for example, from Holle (1987), where children's normal development was followed and assessed. Another chart resembled a jigsaw puzzle: every piece showed a skill that children were supposed to develop, such as: 'completes sentences', 'counts 10 objects' or 'stacks six cubes'. There were puzzles for different ages, and I coloured the children's achievements in order to visualise their development. At that time I was influenced by stage theories from Piaget and Erikson (see Erikson, 1977; Piaget, 1929, 1972).

Another form of documentation that I used was 'My Book' (Lenz Taguchi, 2000, p. 103); every child had a personal binder in which text and photos were inserted. There were sections in the binders with different themes, such as 'the body', 'traditions', and 'primary functions' (e.g. food, rest, hygiene). When digital cameras arrived, the documentation was almost revolutionised. It was now possible to document what was going on during the day and show it to parents after their workday. I no longer had to wait a week for photos to be developed or to realise that the situation I had thought of as perfect to photograph had turned out blurred or black. Also, I could involve the children more actively by sticking recent photographs onto the walls.

However, during one period of time I hardly did any documentation. It was not considered appropriate to observe and document individual children, anymore; the general opinion was that children should not be scrutinised or assessed, and I was no longer sure of how or what to document. Documentation, which previously had almost exploded among some teachers, now became more restricted. The opinion emerged that documentation should be done only with an explicit purpose and should relate to curriculum learning goals. At this time thoughts from Reggio Emilia (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000) started to inspire me, and I questioned my earlier documentation: Why was every birthday

documented? Should I not document something more important, such as preschool practices? These questions started a process in which I and my colleagues began to make collective binders instead of making one binder for each child. The documentation in the collective binders focused on the practice rather than on individuals. All teachers in my preschool took great care in trying to produce relevant sections in the binders, sections that would categorise the documentation in order to cover all areas considered relevant to document. Efforts were made to make the binders in our different groups similar. However, a while later, some of us rejected sections completely, claiming that what would be important to document could differ from time to time and between groups, and that sections would govern what was documented.

I also read media debates as well as research about the ethics of exposing children visually (e.g. Sparrman & Lindgren, 2003). In addition, when preschool presentations were introduced on the municipality webpage, it should not be possible to recognise individual children. I had to ask permission from parents every time that I wanted to publish a photo of a child on the Web. Instead, I photographed empty rooms and sandboxes, toys, furniture and materials. There were also discussions on what kinds of photos were exposed *within* the preschool. Perhaps the photos should focus on the practice, on what was going on, without showing who was doing it? I sometimes asked myself: What did these photos do to preschool practices? What parts of the practice could be documented, and what happened with everything else? These questions haunted me as I entered the world of research, and they were gradually accompanied by questions about who, and what, was involved in documentation and what the documents themselves produced.

The reflections above originate in my personal recollection of documentation during the years as a preschool teacher. The order of events might therefore not be altogether accurate. Memories continue to be shaped and changed by the different events that a person goes through in life. Some of these things probably did follow one another, while others occurred simultaneously, were interwoven (or parallel), disappeared for a while (or completely) and came back (or did not). Different kinds of media, such as charts, cameras, binders and the Internet were involved in the documentation from time to time, some being discarded and some picked up again. There were no *official* obligations concerning documentation during this time, but documentation was considered as a productive way of working, and it was desirable to document the practice in order to inform officials at the municipal level (Socialstyrelsen, 1987). In the story above, a line can be detected that goes from observation of individual children towards documentation of preschool practice as a whole, but these activities also took place concurrently, or alternated, or were stratified, or... well: 'Let's go exploring!' (Watterson, 2005, p. 481).

. . .and Leaping in

During my time as a preschool teacher, I experienced how observation and documentation change, but also how they are entangled. Observations have long been recorded by writing on a piece of paper. Through the years different kinds of devices have been used to record the observations, that is, to document them. Written protocols of different kinds have been used, and so have photographs, video and audio recordings, and sometimes sketches. Currently, various technical aids, such as computers, camcorders, printers and tablets, are being used (Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Wehner-Godée, 2000). Documentation, displayed on preschool classroom walls or in binders, can be used in discussions between teachers, between teachers and children, and between children (Palmer, 2012). But documentation can also ‘use’ teachers, parents and children (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a). For example, documentation displayed on the walls can change what is happening in the preschool. Photos from recent activities might start discussions between teachers, parents and children, and children might take an interest in and want to try activities depicted in the photos. Furthermore, documentation is not just *one* thing; many Swedish preschools work with *multi-documentation*, using several different methods, such as pedagogical documentation, portfolios, diaries, parent questionnaires, and different kinds of evidence-related and standardised documentation forms (Vallberg Roth, 2012).

This thesis is about preschool documentation, about the practices and entities involved in the production and products of documentation, and about what they produce and how. Previous traditions still coexist with and influence current practices. The outline of this thesis can be likened to going for a visit, walking in and out of different rooms: ‘*Opening the Door to Preschool Documentation. . .*’ presented how my experiences as a preschool teacher connect to the study. ‘*Entering into Preschool Documentation Traditions*’ introduces Swedish traditions and current ways of doing documentation, from child observation to pedagogical documentation and documentation of systematic quality development work, and discusses how current preschool documentation practices connect to Swedish preschool history. ‘*Engaging with Agential Realism*’ theorises the movement and presents the theoretical approach and the concepts that are central to the study. This is followed by the ‘Aim and Research Questions’. ‘*Moving into Previous Research*’ considers research of interest for the study, focusing on how children, different documentation methods, templates and documents relate to each other in preschool documentation. ‘*Producing Empirical Material*’ introduces the concept of the research apparatus to present how the empirical material is produced and engaged with. ‘*Going Through the Articles*’ presents and summarises the four articles that comprise this thesis. ‘*Arriving at a Discussion*’ finally concludes and discusses the study.

Entering into Preschool Documentation Traditions

Swedish preschool has a long tradition of observation and documentation. Since the beginning of the 20th century, children and/or the practices in kindergartens, crèches and preschools have been documented in one form or another. In this chapter the preschool traditions and current practices related to documentation will be discussed. The chapter is divided into six subsections. To facilitate understanding of the different ways that these kinds of documentation have emerged, the first section presents and discusses the combination of education and care that is often seen as a trade-mark of Swedish preschools (Tallberg Broman, 2015). In the following section, the history of preschool observation and documentation is briefly presented. The third subsection continues with a presentation of pedagogical documentation, which is an understanding of documentation that has a great influence on how Swedish preschool teachers relate to documentation today. The fourth and fifth subsections deal with evaluating and measuring preschool quality, and systematic quality development work and control, respectively. In the final subsection, the preschool documentation traditions and practices are summarised.

Educare as a Swedish Preschool Tradition

To understand how preschool documentation connects to previous and current practices, this section presents a short overview in outline of how young children's education and care in Swedish preschool emerged. To fully describe this rather messy story would be to go into more detail than is necessary for this thesis. Swedish preschool practices stem from two different practices, one that emphasised (physical) care in the crèche (*barnkrubba*), and one that focused on education, embodied in kindergartens (*barnträdgårdar*) and in infant schools (*småbarnsskolor*). However, these differences varied from time to time and depending on the different interests and competences of the individuals involved (Folke-Fichtelius, 2008). Also, concepts such as open, half-open and closed childcare were used (Hatje, 1999). Open childcare refers to childcare at home, in families or in foster care. Orphanages and similar forms in which

children were fully cared for in institutions were referred to as closed childcare. Half-open childcare comprised the crèches and kindergartens, where children spent part of their day in institutions. Due to a critical debate on pedagogy and economy, infant schools disappeared in favour of the crèche and the kindergarten (further described in Westberg, 2008). The main focus on care, in crèches, or education, in kindergartens, gradually merged, and education and care were combined into what nowadays is commonly termed 'educare' (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011, p. 257). However, kindergartens were not schools, but rather focused on care as well as on education (Hatje, 1999). Over time (oversimplified and very briefly described) the crèches turned into daycare (*daghem*), and later, preschools (*förskolor*). Kindergarten became playschool (*lek-skola*), and later, part-time groups (*deltidsgrupper*) for six-year-old children.

Swedish preschool childcare was for a long time based in social services. In 1987 the National Board of Health and Welfare published national guidelines for preschools, 'the Pedagogical Programme for Preschool' (*Pedagogiskt program för förskolan*) (Socialstyrelsen, 1987). This text focuses on children's development and learning and includes care as a part of the pedagogical practice, in positive terms, but without further discussing what it means (Lindgren, 2000). During the 1990s there were thoughts of including preschool childcare within the school system. This was carried out in 1996, and the first curriculum for preschool was published in 1998 (Tellgren, 2008; Skolverket, 1998). In the curriculum, care is mentioned, and, according to Lindgren (2000), this time more as a means to develop empathy in children rather than as physical care of basic needs, such as food, rest and hygiene. The part-time groups merged into the schools, literally – often by being located physically in school buildings, and pedagogically – by inclusion in the curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the leisure-time centre (see Skolverket, 2016d).

In most countries childcare and education traditionally are, or have been, separated. A growing international trend of combining education and care, which is seen as favourable for preschool quality across nations, has resulted in care and education becoming more and more inseparable (Kaga, Bennett, & Moss, 2011). However, if this is true on an ideological level, it may differ in practice. For example, Lidholt (2000) brings forward the multiple functions of preschools, on the one hand, as institutions for children's education, and on the other hand, as places where children are looked after when parents work. These partly conflicting functions created dilemmas for the teachers in Lidholt's study, since they experienced difficulties in fulfilling the educational goals intended by the government when there was a lack of resources, for example, due to an increase in (children's) group size and a decrease in staffing level. This led the teachers to shift their view of the function of the preschool more towards supporting families than teaching children. This meant that,

in practice, teachers focused more on care than on education, or in Lidholt's (2000, p. 63) words: a shift from '*educare*' to '*educare*' (emphases in original). Nevertheless, in several studies of documentation of Swedish preschool systematic quality development work, care is at times found to be downplayed by the teachers, in favour of education (Löfgren, 2015; Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b), and care is also sometimes transformed into education (Löfdahl & Folke-Fichtelius, 2015). However, what care is, is often taken for granted. This was found by Lindgren (2000), studying Swedish policy texts, in which care was mentioned but not defined or discussed. Löfdahl and Folke Fichtelius (2015) discuss care as an activity, as caring for children, often in a physical sense, and as an approach, in the sense of being careful. Rather than connecting care and education to different kinds of practices, Halldén and Simonsson (2000) discuss these aspects as being reciprocal. Care and education are intertwined, and not just something given by teachers but also given as well as taken by children.

Despite the intentions of merging education and care, it is evident that there still exists a divide. Whilst the study by Lidholt (2000) discerns a discrepancy between governmental intentions and preschool practices, where teachers emphasise care, the studies by Löfgren (2015), and Löfdahl and Pérez Prieto (2009b) emphasise educational methods commonly used in school, sometimes referred to as 'schoolification' (Kaga, Bennett, & Moss, 2011), making the caring perspective less prominent, despite Swedish preschools' task and long tradition of combining education with care. This poses a problem with respect to whether certain ways of documenting produces certain preschool practices or activities as more favourable than others. To be able to elucidate how this relates to documentation, the next section will briefly outline the history of Swedish preschool documentation.

From Child Observation to Documentation

In the crèches, the focus was originally on fostering and caring for children from poor working-class families, with a main emphasis on nutrition, hygiene and health (Holmlund, 1996). This is also reflected in the focus of their documentation: starting at the beginning of the 20th century, records were kept on children's medical status and physical development, thoroughly mapped with protocols in the form of health cards for each child (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). On the other hand, in the kindergartens in the 1930s, observation was seen as a way for kindergarten teachers to increase their knowledge about children (Johansson, 1994; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Teachers sometimes observed children from a hidden vantage point (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Child observation had, from the 1940s, connections to child psychology, with theoretical underpinnings from developmental psychology (Emilson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). This developmental psychology came

from Bühler and Gesell¹ and was brought to Sweden by Ulin and Myrdal² (Tellgren, 2008). The observations were supposed to help preschool teachers to gain knowledge about children's natural development in order to form a pedagogy that stimulated children's natural development (Lenz Taguchi, 2000; SOU 1997:157). Thus, these observations were supposed to be made with the intention to develop the practice, rather than to assess the children (Eidevald, 2013). However, observation and documentation also focused on what is general and normal in children of a certain age (Wehner-Godée, 2000), and children who did not follow normal development had to be supported and corrected by the teachers (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). This means that, aside from a way to develop the practice, the observations could also be seen as normative regulatory practices or apparatuses (cf. Foucault, 1978). Nevertheless, child observations were also a way of legitimating kindergarten work, equivalent to the way children's school grading indicates the results of teaching (Tellgren, 2008). However, instead of following the observation methods from child psychology, Köhler³ had a vision that kindergarten teachers should design their own observation methods, as a means for developing the pedagogical practice (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). According to Lenz Taguchi (2000), this vision is partly met with the current use of pedagogical documentation (which will be presented below). It appears that thoughts of disengaging from medical and from psychological observation methods were present from an early stage.

In the 1970s and '80s, without changing the observational methods, the discourse around children gained influence from psychodynamic theory from Erikson (see, e.g., Erikson, 1977) and cognitive theories from Piaget (e.g. 1929, 1972) (Lenz Taguchi, 2000; SOU 1972:26). In the 1970s the ways that observations were done were questioned; children were now considered to be more active, and in dialogue with teachers. A report from the 1968 committee for childcare (*barnstugeutredningen*) emphasised that observations were supposed to provide a basis for how to support and guide children, and not a way to measure their achievements (SOU 1972:26). Despite this, the focus for observation was often the development of individual children (Åsén, 2002). Regardless of theoretical basis, the subject for observation (and, if necessary,

¹ Charlotte Bühler was a child psychology researcher from Vienna who focused on children's biological development. Arnold Gesell was an American medical doctor and psychologist who described children's development as following certain stages (Tellgren, 2008).

² Carin Ulin had a doctoral degree in child psychology, and Alva Myrdal in 1935 wrote the book "Stadsbarn" (City children). They started seminars for kindergarten teachers in 1934 and 1936 (Tellgren, 2008).

³ In 1936 Elsa Köhler, also from Vienna, wrote "Aktivitetspedagogik" (Activity pedagogics, which could compare to Dewey; 'learning by doing'), where documentation and assessment of the pedagogical process were thought of as essential concepts (Lenz Taguchi, 2000).

change) was still the child, rather than, for example, the teachers, the environment or the preschool practices.

In the 1980s and early '90s teachers were advised to also observe their own values, reactions and feelings (see Rubinstein Reich & Wesén, 1986, 1992). Observations now often focused on *why* something happened rather than on *what* happened. By the end of the 1990s there was also a shift from observation as normalising towards observation as evaluating of children's learning (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). This takes departure in ideas from the sociology of childhood and means that the universal child of developmental psychology was now rather seen as an active and competent individual (Corsaro, 2011; James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998; James & Prout, 1990). In connection with views on children as developing uniquely, as opposed to universally, the term observation was also more or less discarded in favour of the term documentation (Emilsson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). However, although the concepts of observation and documentation have different theoretical underpinnings, Emilsson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012) emphasise that it is not possible to document without observing.

The shift from observation to documentation is apparent in the proposition (SOU 1997:157) preceding the first Swedish curriculum for preschool (Skolverket, 1998). Here, *observation*, as a method, was described as being connected to child psychology and to efforts to understand what individual children need to develop. Whilst considered to serve as a point of departure for developing the pedagogical practice, observation was also described as a method to try to map and generalise how children of a certain age are, and what they need, to reduce the complexity that characterises the practices of education. As one alternative to this, *documentation* was considered as a way to include this complexity, and to consider children's own competence (SOU 1997:157), to focus on what children already know and to develop the pedagogical practice from this. Observation indicates that someone or something (in this case, the teacher) is observing and that someone or something else (the child) is being observed, while documentation suggests that there is a possibility to distribute observation and documentation more equally between teachers and children. In the proposition, the latter is favoured, and in line with thoughts from the sociology of childhood. Thus, documentation is considered to increase the opportunities for children to participate actively in evaluating the practice, especially in the type of documentation referred to as pedagogical documentation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000, 2013a). Pedagogical documentation was put forward in the proposition as one method to make visible and evaluate preschool practices (SOU 1997:157). It was also mentioned in the preface in the first edition of the curriculum, although not in the goals and guidelines (Skolverket, 1998). The preface was removed in 2006, leaving room for different interpretations of what the curriculum demands on documentation mean (Åsén & Moberg,

2015). It took until the revision in 2010 before documentation was mentioned again, now in chapter 2.6 in the curriculum,⁴ declaring that *different forms* of documentation and evaluation should be used (Skolverket, 2010).

In 2004 the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2004) evaluated how the first curriculum for preschool (Skolverket, 1998) and the preschool reform had been implemented and what tendencies this had resulted in. Their report shows that, contrary to the intentions of creating an equal quality preschool practice for all children, the differences between preschools had increased. In addition, despite the intention that the reformed preschool practice should build on and continue with the previous tradition of 'educare' (as described above), there was a tendency towards privileging education before care, once more producing a separation between them.

Apart from suggesting pedagogical documentation, the above-mentioned preface to the curriculum also emphasised that individual children's results should not be evaluated and compared (Skolverket, 1998). However, the 2004 report found that preschools tended to assess individual children rather than to evaluate how the practice worked in providing conditions to make children's learning possible (Skolverket, 2004). This evaluation report led to a publication of 'general advice' (*allmänna råd*) on preschool quality in 2005, in which the intentions of the curriculum were elucidated (Skolverket, 2005). Furthermore, an earlier demand on schools to write annual quality reports (from 1997) was now extended also to preschools (Skolverket, 2005).

A second evaluation was done in 2008, 10 years after the first curriculum was implemented (Skolverket, 2008). This report mentions the demand for annual quality reports as one possible reason for an increase in different kinds of self-assessments and evaluations. It also finds that preschool teachers and heads of preschool expressed concern about how to refrain from assessing individual children, especially since many municipalities required that individual development plans (IDP) should be drawn. Although many teachers and heads were sceptical towards IDPs, the report remarks an increase in the use of them and of different kinds of materials and templates for assessing individual children's development. Still, more than half of the municipalities used pedagogical documentation. Similar to the previous report, this report concludes that there were complexities and contradiction between the educare model and a narrowing of the practice towards an approach focusing on readiness for school.

After this, the curriculum was revised in 2010, and the new chapter, 2.6, about evaluation and documentation was introduced (see Skolverket, 2010, 2016c). Documentation now became mandatory. Since the curriculum contains goals to strive for rather than

⁴ Chapter 2.6 is titled *Follow-up, Evaluation and Development* (Skolverket, 2010, 2016c).

goals to achieve (different from the curriculum for school), it is not possible to measure results for individual children. However, the wording in the curriculum is not precise: it states that the overall preschool quality should be evaluated *and* that children's development should be followed, documented, and analysed (Skolverket, 2010, 2016c). The removal of the strong emphasis (in the preface) on not assessing individual children means that there is room for interpretation as to what the documentation should focus on (Folke-Fichtelius & Lundahl, 2015; von Greiff, Sjögren, & Wieselgren, 2012). This has created difficulties for preschool teachers, who have become ambivalent towards the task of documentation (Johansson, 2016).

In conclusion, I suggest that this broader scope for interpretation not only creates contradictions but, paired with the different discourses, objectives and methods for observation and documentation through history (of which some may still influence current practices), poses a problem of how to approach preschool documentation. As one way of resolving the problem of combining a focus on children's development and learning with documenting the preschool practice as a whole, a supportive text published by the National Agency for Education suggests using pedagogical documentation (Palmer, 2012). The next section focuses on this kind of documentation, which is currently widely used in many Swedish preschools.

Pedagogical Documentation

The concept of 'pedagogical documentation' (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999, p. 144) is common and widespread in Swedish preschools, although its content as well as the practices connected to it varies. Originating from critical pedagogy, it is situated furthest away from the documentation oriented towards medical health or psychology. The term pedagogical documentation was coined by Dahlberg in 1986/87 after visiting Reggio Emilia preschools (Alnervik, 2013), and it is often connected to the way documentation is done in Reggio Emilia preschools. Sometimes it is also referred to as 'Reggio Emilia-inspired documentation' (Given, Kuh, LeeKeenan, Mardell, Redditt, & Twombly, 2010, p. 36). According to Rinaldi (2006), there is a significant difference between conventional documentation, collected during an event but read and interpreted afterwards, and documentation done in the Reggio Emilia way. In Reggio Emilia preschools documentation is done as an integral part of 'the learning-teaching relationship' (Rinaldi, 2006, p. 63). Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation focuses on reflection and challenges prevalent views on children, teachers and pedagogical practice. It is claimed to be one way of trying to resist the earlier positivist view that is considered to be embedded in the observational traditions (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999). In this way pedagogical documentation is considered as a means for children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999;

Lenz Taguchi, 2000) and as a way of including children's own thoughts and ideas (Lenz Taguchi, 1997).

Nevertheless, the connection and relation to the 'Reggio Emilia Educational Project' (as Reggio Emilia educators prefer to call it, in contrast to the often used 'Reggio Approach') (Giamminuti, 2009, p. 17) and to the way documentation is done there is not the only way to define pedagogical documentation. One way of distinguishing documentation as pedagogical is that it encompasses reflection between teachers or between teachers and children (Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2009). Apart from being described as a method, and by connecting it to the thoughts of the posthumanist theorist Barad (2007), pedagogical documentation is also lately described as a 'knowledge apparatus' (*kunskapsapparat*) (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a, p. 59). Through this, it is claimed that teachers can go beyond their everyday assumptions, and thus, that the method can be used together with *any* kind of educational theory, not only theories that connect to the Reggio Emilia Educational Project. In addition, Sheridan and Pramling Samuelsson (2009) argue that documentation cannot be pedagogical in itself, but that it can become pedagogical in relation to how it is utilised, which means that they consider that any kind of documentation can become pedagogical, arguing that calling documentation pedagogical is not only applicable to practices in the tradition of Reggio Emilia.

Still, the Reggio Emilia approach has influenced many Swedish preschools. According to Dahlberg and Elfström (2014), the reason for an increase in this influence has to do with the notion that pedagogical documentation with inspiration from Reggio Emilia can be seen as an opposing force to thoughts and reforms connected to, for example, New Public Management (NPM). It is also seen as an alternative to standardised measuring instruments (Lenz Taguchi, 2013b). Turning to Reggio Emilia and pedagogical documentation might be a way of marking the specificity of preschool practices. In Swedish preschool there is a long tradition of opposing practices connected to school, such as measuring and grading children's knowledge (Folke-Fichtelius & Lundahl, 2015). Thus, turning to pedagogical documentation might be a way of trying to solve the problem of evaluating preschool practices without assessing individual children.

In an article, Blaise, Hamm and Iorio (2016) distinguish between child observation, pedagogical documentation and pedagogical narration, where *observation* distances the teacher from the observed child, for example, through observation lists or protocols, similar to the puzzle chart mentioned in the introductory chapter above. Unlike in observation, the teacher is part of and interprets *pedagogical documentation* (which is often visual, such as photos, drawings or video), and critically reflects on the practice in *pedagogical narration*. This results in a shift in focus towards including rather than distancing the teacher. Through a further shift, Blaise, Hamm and Iorio (2016) introduce 'lively stories' (p. 39) as a

way of also including ‘the more-than-human (i.e., plants and animals)’ (p. 35), which they claim ‘will help us understand how “we” are entangled with all sorts of forces, elements, and species beyond just the child’ (p. 39). They propose this as one way of working with (or teaching about) ecological concerns (which is also one of the subjects addressed in the Swedish curriculum for preschool). In the article, the authors present a lively story written by one of them in which a wasp is connected to the lives of the adult and some children. In this instance, this story is written by the adult. But by shifting the focus away from humans and including the more-than-human, perhaps children could also be involved in creating lively stories? This question will return in the final chapter, *Arriving at a Discussion*.

Returning to pedagogical documentation, in two Swedish official texts it is suggested as one suitable method⁵ for documentation and evaluation of preschool practices (Skolverket, 2005; Palmer, 2012). One of them, mentioned above as a supportive text, has a ‘postconstructionist’ (Palmer, 2012, p. 26) approach and emphasises pedagogical documentation as a way to ensure that children are able to take part in documenting and evaluating the practice, as prescribed by the Swedish curriculum (Palmer, 2012; Skolverket, 2010, 2016c). However, the human rights-based, and therefore anthropocentric, understanding of children’s participation in the curriculum, on the one hand, and the supportive text’s relational and postconstructionist⁶ view on preschool practices, on the other, are thoroughly discussed by Dahlbeck (2014), who finds them contradictory. Dahlbeck asks whether it is possible to create a useful policy from two such contradictory views.

Somewhat relatedly, Eidevald (2013), compares two directions, both of which oppose developmental psychology: on the one hand, the Reggio Emilia-inspired way of working in preschools, with influences from postmodernity/social constructivism and lately also connected to posthumanist thoughts, and, on the other hand, developmental pedagogy, which connects to variation theory and sociocultural theory (Eidevald, 2013), and emerged from a phenomenographic approach in the breakpoint between preschool developmental psychology and social constructivism (Pramling Samuelsson & Asplund Carlsson, 2003). Since the preschool documentation required by the Education Act (SFS 2010:800) is required to be conducted on a scientific basis, Eidevald (2013) asks: based on which kind of science? The documentation practices connected with these two directions differ; on the one hand, there is (the Reggio Emilia-inspired) pedagogical documentation, focusing on *how* children learn, and on the other, there is documentation, connected

⁵ In some of the text it is stressed that it is one method, meaning that there are also others. However, other methods are mentioned more in passing.

⁶ What Palmer (2012) and Dahlbeck (2014) refer to as a postconstructionist approach is also known as a posthumanist approach, in which materials and environments as well as humans are seen as agentic.

to developmental pedagogy and variation theory, of *what* children learn. However, Eidevald (2013) argues that these two are moving closer to each other. The differences discussed by Dahlbeck (2014) and Eidevald (2013) create dilemmas which complicate the task of documentation for preschool teachers. Thus, this creates a problem of what different methods for documentation can produce.

Wrapping up, my ambition above has been to elucidate that, although pedagogical documentation is sometimes thought of as one way (sometimes even *the* way) of resolving the problem of how to do preschool documentation, it is clear that using pedagogical documentation is not an altogether straightforward task. Aside from practical difficulties in how to do pedagogical documentation (whether or not to use photographs, how to include children, what to focus on documenting) the above-mentioned different ways of defining what it might be and the different theoretical approaches involved make pedagogical documentation a hard nut to crack.

When the term pedagogical documentation is used in the present study, it refers to preschool documentation practices that involve documentation of pedagogical practices or processes, and includes reflection by and between teachers, and/or between teachers and children. However, if a study of preschool documentation processes does not focus on how the documentation is *used*, it may not always be apparent whether the documentation *becomes* pedagogic or not (cf. Emilson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). Nevertheless, in the articles of the present study the term pedagogical documentation is used in accordance with how the practitioners taking part in the study use it themselves. Also, articles 1 and 2 of this thesis specifically distinguish Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation, since this is how the teachers in one of the studied groups refer to their documentation method.

This story about the history of preschool documentation (with slight detours back and forth) has now almost reached our present day. Still, whilst pedagogical documentation is supposed to be a means for preschool teachers to evaluate their practice, it is not the only means. The next section will focus on different ways that preschool quality is measured and evaluated.

Measuring and Evaluating Preschool Quality

A report by the preschool teachers union, *Lärarförbundet* (2014), concludes that children attending preschool show higher PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) results in maths and literacy. However, according to Sylva, Melhuish, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford and Taggart (2011), just attending preschool might not be enough; performance is also connected to the quality of the preschool. As might be expected, high-quality⁷ preschools have been

⁷ Here measured with ECERS-R (the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale) and ECERS-E (ECERS-Extension).

found to show better results than low-quality preschools (Sheridan, Pramling Samuelsson, & Johansson, 2009; Sylva et al., 2011). Also, high preschool quality is expected to raise Swedish PISA test results. This means that there is an interest in using methods and models of evaluation that can measure the degree of quality. Evaluating and measuring preschool quality is also of great interest due to a current general interest in evaluation and assessment, in society as a whole and in and of schools and preschools in Sweden, not only in comparison to other countries but also as a way for individual preschools to show their practice to parents, to enable them to choose which preschool to send their children to.

But what is preschool quality, and how can it be assessed? What preschool quality becomes has to do with a number of things, such as traditions, values, discourses and curriculum as well as with the measures and criteria used. Sheridan (2001) refers to a pedagogical and relational perspective on quality. She states that 'quality is constituted in the interplay between the individual (the child) and the environment' (p. 14). Another possible kind of preschool quality is *service quality*, which has to do with how parents value their children's preschool time. *Structural quality* is about external factors, organisation and resources. Preschool practices, interaction between teachers and children and pedagogical content, are examples of *processual quality* elements, and *result quality* is about what children develop and learn (Haug, 2003). Brodin, Hollerer, Renblad, and Stancheva-Popkostadinova (2014) find that preschool teachers from three countries (Sweden, Austria, Bulgaria) understand quality in both similar and different ways, and that they refer to factors related to structure as well as process. Teachers' own attitudes was one of the highest ranked factors in all three countries, while, for example, teacher training was highly ranked by the teachers in Austria but not by those in the other countries. Contrary to the aforementioned policies, documentation was not considered by the teachers in any of these countries to be an important factor for preschool quality (which is remarkable, since it is promoted as a way of developing preschool quality).

The current Swedish preschool curriculum refers to quality as the organisation, content and practice of the preschool (Skolverket, 2016c). Preschool quality is also related to fulfilling the curriculum goals (Skolverket, 2012, 2015). To accomplish this, the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2017) points to education and skills of the staff as the most important factor, and as a second important factor, the size and composition of the group of children. In other words, quality can encompass structure, processes and results. Since there are different ways of defining preschool quality, and since it can have multiple components, it is difficult (or impossible) to find simple and effective ways of measuring and evaluating preschool quality. In addition, fulfilling goals in preschool is a difficult task, since the Swedish preschool curriculum differs from the school curriculum in that the goals are written as

goals to strive for, and not to achieve. These goals indicate the direction for preschools and should not result in comparisons between individual children's achievements, which is emphasised in a recent publication of general advice from the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2017). Accordingly, the Swedish government and the National Agency for Education have emphasised the differences between school and preschool practices and goals (Skolverket, 2005; SOU 1997:157), and underlined that preschool evaluation (and quality) should concern how preschool practices can support children's development and learning, rather than, as is the case with schools, focusing on individual children and their results. However, the 2010 revision of the preschool curriculum, introducing the above-mentioned chapter 2.6, which states that children's development and learning should also be documented (Skolverket, 2010), opened up room for other interpretations.

The Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen, 2016a) finds that there is uncertainty among politicians and civil servants about what results and goal fulfilment mean in preschool, partly due to the lack of measurable systems, in contrast to the regime of grades and national tests in schools. Municipalities and/or individual preschools are at times influenced by methods of evaluation primarily used in schools, such as IDPs and different kinds of methods that often have developmental psychology underpinnings, and focus on individuals (Vallberg Roth, 2015). IDPs, or different kinds of standardised evaluation or observation methods, such as TRAS,⁸ are sometimes seen as contradictive to the aims of the curriculum, since they are considered to assess individual children against pre-set standards (Vallberg Roth, 2012). The use of these kinds of measures might have to do with increased general demands on evaluation and documentation (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). This is also connected to general ideas about and demands for accountability and models for quality assurance in society at large, also referred to as 'the audit society' (Power, 1999, p. xv). Many preschools also make individual assessments and individual educational plans (IEP) for children in need of special care. These are often made in order to receive additional resources, such as extra assistance for a specific child, or more personnel generally (Lutz, 2006; Lenz Taguchi, 2000).

Although preschool quality might be seen as elusive, sometimes it is defined as that which can be determined through certain measures. A few examples: models such as ECERS⁹ (which measure quality by indicators) are used for comparing preschools (Åsén & Vallberg Roth, 2012); ITES-R¹⁰ was found relevant for Norwegian preschools by Baustad (2012) and reasonably comparable to their preschool curriculum. Another model presented in international

⁸ A Swedish method for Early Registration of Language Development (Tidig Registrering Av Språkutveckling).

⁹ Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale.

¹⁰ Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale, Revised.

research is the global guidelines assessment method (ACEI-GGA) developed by the Association of Childhood Education International (Cecconi, Stegelin, Pintus, & Allegri, 2014). In all, there are a number of different instruments aimed at measuring preschool overall quality in different ways. Different instruments measure quality with different kinds of criteria that are considered relevant. These criteria can encompass physical and pedagogical aspects. Two such methods are BRUK¹¹ and the above-mentioned ECERS. The criteria in BRUK build on the topics in the Swedish preschool curriculum (Skolverket, 2014), and the criteria in ECERS focus on some structural aspects (Haug, 2003) but measure mainly process quality, emphasising physical features such as hygiene, space and equipment, while also relating to care provided by adults (Vermeer, van Ijzendoorn, Cárcamo, & Harrison, 2016). While ECERS is often used to compare preschools, the National Agency for Education emphasises that BRUK is supposed to develop school and preschool quality but not to measure and compare (Skolverket, 2014). This is interesting, since an earlier version of BRUK did not altogether rule out comparisons, but instead left the decision to the local schools (Johansson & Oljemark, 2001).

While some try to define quality as something that can be measured by using different universal scales, others want to go beyond (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999) or critically examine quality (Cannella, 2016). Salazar Pérez and Cahill (2016) argue that there is a risk that definitions of what is ‘good’ and ‘quality’ in preschools will narrow by using universal evaluation measures (which in their case was called QRIS¹²), rather than embracing more dynamic childhood experiences and focusing on assessing pedagogical processes rather than measurable results. Also, if the demands on documentation in the curriculum are interpreted as focusing solely on processes and not on individual children’s results, models or templates that focus on results might be unsuitable. On the other hand, since the wording in chapter 2.6 in the curriculum also includes gaining knowledge about every child’s understanding of the objective areas (Skolverket, 2016c), some forms of measuring might not contradict the intentions of the curriculum. Using models, templates or different kinds of measuring devices or methods might seem to be a good idea to save time and to facilitate the difficult and time-consuming practice of documenting systematic quality development work, especially since preschool teachers experience that they do not have time enough to see and work with children individually, which has to do with increased demands on teaching and documentation imposed by the curriculum (Williams, Sheridan, & Pramling Samuelsson, 2015).

¹¹ A Swedish method for school evaluation, which translates as Evaluation, Reflection, Development, Quality (Bedömning, Reflektion, Utveckling, Kvalitet).

¹² Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Thus, although there is consensus about the benefits of high-quality preschools, how or whether it is possible to define and measure quality is constantly under question. This produces a problem concerning how and whether different methods, models and/or templates can produce quality in different ways. One way to try to resolve this currently in Swedish preschools is through continuous systematic quality development work, which is the focus of the next section.

Systematic Quality Development Work and Control

Swedish preschools are required to conduct systematic quality development work, and to document this work, in order to ensure, evaluate and develop preschool quality so that every child, regardless of which preschool they attend, has an equal chance of a good education (SFS 2010:800; Skolverket, 2016c). In addition, while preschool is not mandatory, it follows that parents have to make a choice of which preschool to send their children to. This means that, whether the choice is based on proximity or quality, parents need to be informed (Hanspers & Mörk, 2011). One way of doing this is through quality measurement and evaluation (Åsén, 2015). Thus, documentation and systematic quality development work might be ways of also informing presumptive parents. Furthermore, systematic quality development work can also provide important material for the authorities in deciding how to distribute resources (Skolverket, 2017).

While the curriculum does not specify how to proceed, the National Agency for Education has provided two publications of general advice (*allmänna råd*) on how to do systematic quality development work. One of them is directed to the school system as a whole (Skolverket, 2012), while the other is directed at preschools (Skolverket, 2016b). These publications are supposed to direct the development of Swedish preschools. As a part of the systematic quality development work, the latter publication mentions a number of factors and aspects that should be continuously followed and documented, for example, the number of staff, the composition of the group of children, the physical environment of the preschool, the kinds of materials available and the interaction with and between children (Skolverket, 2016b).

As mentioned above (see p.10), regulations were introduced in 1997 requiring municipalities and schools to write annual quality reports (Skolverket, 2005). This did not encompass preschools until 2005, although they nevertheless were included from the start in some municipalities (Myndigheten för skolutveckling, 2007). In addition to writing quality reports, municipalities and schools were also required to draw up municipal and local school plans. In 2012, these demands were removed in favour of continuous documentation of systematic quality development work. The shift from regulated quality reports to continuous documentation had to do with

increasing governmental demands on systematic evaluations of schools, which led to lowered needs for detailed local regulations, the national requirements from the curriculum being considered sufficient. It was also a way of reducing the number of documents that schools and preschools have to produce (Prop. 2009/10:165).

But the shift also connects to ideas about quality, and about management by objectives: Bergh (2010) asks what the concept of quality does with education and what education does with the concept of quality. When the concept of quality meets education, the ideas come from the beginning of the 20th century and from control of industrial processes. The meaning of the concept also comes from international policy and from the market (what is currently referred to as NPM). Concepts such as *evidence*, *legal certainty*, *measurability* and *goal fulfilment* all come from areas other than education. These concepts are associated with a detached view of quality as something that is easy and possible to measure (Haug, 2003). Haug (2003) argues that there is a dilemma; the management by objectives idea in NPM contains ideas about decentralisation and increased individual freedom. This means that institutions are able to decide for themselves how to reach the objectives, which makes the idea of one single way of determining and measuring quality highly problematic. On the other hand, it might correspond with an open model for systematic quality development work, which specifies methods for neither documentation nor evaluation, like the one provided by the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2015).

Figure 1. National model for systematic quality development work (my translation from an original in Skolverket, 2015).

This model (Figure 1) presents how the process of systematic quality development work should be done. It consists of four steps, which

are similar to the phases in the PDCA¹³ cycle. The steps focus on different parts of the quality development process, as shown in Figure 1: a description of a present situation (Where are we?) is followed by analyses, which lead to formulating objectives, which in turn lead to planning and implementation. The last phase evaluates and defines a new present, and then it starts over again from phase one. The model also demands that this work should be documented, but without specifying by which methods (Skolverket, 2015).

Measuring preschool quality is an expression of market adaptation, which is seen as a way to increase freedom of choice, increase quality, make practices more effective and reduce bureaucracy (Hanspers & Mörk, 2011). Being able to measure quality could also be important for studying the effects of the exposure to competition that follows in market adaptation (Hanspers & Mörk, 2011). Furthermore, one way to overcome the problem of differences in quality between preschools, which has been found in studies (Sheridan, 2009b), is through regular quality audits by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate. The Swedish Schools Inspectorate was formed in 2008 (Dir. 2008:3) after an inquiry that aimed at establishing a better structure for the government in the area of schools and education, which previously had been fragmented (SOU 2007:79). This means that Swedish preschools are controlled by the curriculum, but perhaps to an even higher degree by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate. According to a survey conducted by the Inspectorate, their quality audits are primarily perceived as helpful for preschools' quality work. However, there is also the viewpoint that the focus on meeting the requirements of these the audits might become more important than working on developing the preschool practices (Skolinspektionen, 2017).

In a quality audit conducted in 2016 the Inspectorate criticised Swedish preschools for not focusing enough on teaching (*undervisning*). Also, it found that in routine situations that are often thought of as care, such as mealtime and getting dressed to go outside, teachers did not take the opportunity to focus on teaching (Skolinspektionen, 2016b). Consequently, even though the teachers emphasised that children learn in every situation, the Inspectorate found that care and education were separate. Furthermore, a report published in 2017 finds that there is great deal of difference between preschools, regarding organisation and practices, which affects the comparability between preschools (Skolinspektionen, 2017). Subsequently, a question arises about the relation between these results and the above-mentioned model for documentation of systematic quality development work. What part (if any) does the model play in the production of this separation between care and education?

To sum up, I find that inherent in systematic quality development work are the tensions between documentation focusing

¹³ Plan, Do, Check, Act. For further descriptions, see, for example, Sokovic, Pavletic and Pipan (2010) or Moen and Norman (2011).

on processes, on the one hand, and on monitoring quality to ensure that preschools provide high and equal quality for all children, on the other. According to Sheridan, Williams, and Sandberg (2013), there is a lack of know-ledge about how preschool teachers deal with systematic quality work. This problem might also concern how methods, models and templates are involved in preschool documentation practices and what this produces.

Summary: Swedish Preschool Documentation Connected to Previous and Current Traditions and Practices

Preschool documentation is a messy and complicated field where different interests, ideologies and aims meet, collide and intertwine. Preschool observation and documentation practices have emerged and changed in different ways from time to time, which means that current documentation practices did not appear from a vacuum, but are connected to a number of previous practices and notions. In addition, preschool documentation has multiple aims, such as to satisfy governmental control, to empower children and to serve as a means for increasing preschool quality and PISA results. Thus, documentation plugs into different ideas and views on children, to preschool practices on different levels and to a number of different kinds of institutions for young children's care and education.

The merging of education and care is an important tradition for Swedish preschool practices, but current documentation sometimes seems to disintegrate this entanglement in favour of education. Furthermore, although the term observation was discarded in favour of the term documentation, these activities are still connected and intertwined, since documentation presupposes observation. Even though the Swedish preschool curriculum declares that different forms of documentation methods are to be used (Skolverket, 2016c), pedagogical documentation is, and has been, promoted by the National Agency for Education in official documents.

In addition to pedagogical documentation, evaluating and measuring aspects of documentation are also present, and with these, also the use of different kinds of models and methods. Since documentation is supposed to be done to evaluate and develop preschool quality, the concept of quality is important. Quality can be seen as multidimensional, not easily measured, and sometimes questioned, which makes it difficult for preschool practitioners to work with. Therefore, a wish for different kinds of measuring methods and systems is understandable.

Apart from a means for increasing preschool quality, documentation is also used as a way of controlling preschools. This connects to ideas on quality measurement, but also to decentralisation and to management by objectives, including freedom to choose how to reach the objectives. However, seeing quality as stable and measurable, while at the same time opening up space for

preschools to function in multiple ways, is problematic. Nevertheless, an open model provided by the National Agency for Education might be able to do this job, which is why it is crucial to study how the models and templates are involved in preschool documentation.

Taken together, finding a method that makes documentation doable, that dovetails well with the intentions of the curriculum, and that serves the suggested purpose of developing preschool quality, is therefore a challenging and crucial task for preschool teachers. Taking this into account and considering also that documentation is done between teachers and children using methods and (technical) devices at a certain time and place (in the preschool when children are present), it is impossible to study parts of this practice in isolation from other parts.

The entanglement of past and present, of different objectives for documentation, of teachers and children and methods and materialities calls for a theory that can encompass this multiplicity and take into account the agential force of matter such as views and ideas, connections to previous practices, and human and non-human actors. Thus, the theoretical approach that emerges through this is agential realism, which is presented in the next chapter.

Engaging with Agential Realism

The entanglement of humans and non-humans, of past and present ways of doing observation and documentation, and of ideas of and aims for documentation called for a theoretical approach that acknowledges and takes into account this entanglement. When humans and non-humans, things and documents, models and templates (materials) that are involved in preschool documentation are considered to be entangled, with each other and with their connotations, contents, instructions and presumptions (discourse), there is no divide between materiality and discourse; rather, the documentation is regarded as material-discursive (Barad, 2007). In addition, this means that documentation is not seen as neutral, or passive. To be able to acknowledge how, for example, the sections in the binders mentioned in my opening reflections could actively govern the content of a binder or to take account of how a local template for systematic quality development work can become agentic, I have turned to the posthumanist approach of agential realism from Barad (2007). Thus, this chapter presents the theoretical approach and the concepts that are central to the study. The vantage point for these considerations is a posthumanist agential realist approach. Taking as a point of departure Barad's (2003) notion of performativity, this thesis asks what is produced when different kinds of material entities are seen as performative in preschool documentation.

In an agential realist account, it is assumed that discourse as well as objects and materiality shape the understanding of the world (Barad, 1996). This approach enables seeing how not only words, but also things such as cameras, computers, templates, models and national guidelines are performative in the emergence of preschool documentation. To Barad (2007), posthumanism signals a refusal both to take for granted a divide between human and non-human and to recognise the crucial role of non-humans in everyday life.

Posthumanism consists of diverse theories from different disciplines, which have in common scepticism towards an ontological and epistemological anthropocentrism (Pedersen, 2014). The theories include, for example, animal studies, material feminism, queer theory, object-oriented ontology, actor network

theory, new empiricism, indigenous theories and affect theory (Taylor, 2016). These theories question and challenge anthropocentrism in that they also acknowledge the agency of non-human actors, such as animals, objects and technology (Åsberg, 2012). However, through posthumanism, the primacy of humans should not be replaced by any other kind of primacy, such as any of the above-mentioned (Ferrando, 2013). Posthumanism neither privileges nor completely rules out the agency of humans; instead, for example, by applying a principle of symmetry,¹⁴ they place humans and non-humans on equal analytical levels, ‘replacing the idea that the human is a separate category from “everything else” with an ethic of mutual relation’ (Taylor, 2016, p. 8). This does not mean that the human subject is discarded. Instead of presuming a human/non-human dichotomy, or incidentally, any other dichotomy, distinctions and relations emerge through analyses (Pedersen, 2014). Thus, the distinctions between the preschool child, the photograph shown on the computer display and the printed documentation in the binder emerge through the documentation practices that they are involved in.

The following two subsections will focus on concepts of importance to the study, and the final subsection will summarise the chapter.

Phenomena, Apparatuses and Intra-action

In common terms, preschool documentation is often thought of as being produced by an active teacher, perhaps in collaboration with a likewise active child. They are the active agents producing documentation of what is really going on in the preschool. But what about the camera taking photos, the computer showing them, the software and the keyboard typing words, the printer making copies on paper? In Barad’s (2003, 2007) agential realism the terms agency and realism are reformulated to elucidate how materiality matters, challenging the separation between social constructionism and realism, between discourse and materiality. Reality is not ‘something out there’ that can be experienced and studied objectively by humans that are separate from it; neither is it a mere social construction. As opposed to classical realism, in which reality exists irrespective of how it is signified, and also to radical social constructionism, in which ‘the meaning of construction becomes that of linguistic monism, whereby everything is only and always language’ (Butler, 1993, p. 6), agential realism neither sees reality as a fixed essence nor as constructed by human language. Instead, the preschool (documentation) practices are constructed jointly by discourses around (documentation of) children and preschool and by the material environment and objects involved. In agential realism

¹⁴ ‘Symmetry’ comes from Latour (2005) and actor–network theory, meaning that humans and non-humans should be treated symmetrically instead of prioritising humans.

reality is ‘an ongoing dynamic of intra-activity’ (Barad, 2007, p. 206) of material configurations of the world that Barad names *phenomena*. In this thesis the phenomena are the documentations. For Barad (2007), phenomena, and not ‘things’, are the primary ontological units. This notion comes originally from Bohr’s quantum physics in which ‘phenomenon’ designates an inseparability between a quantum phenomenon and the arrangement needed for its observation. That is, it is not possible to separate the physical object from the practice through which it is measured or studied. This is then stretched to other areas by Barad, or rather, since quantum physics theorises how the world is constituted, Barad points out how this applies to the world in general. For the documentation practice this means that it is not possible to separate what is documented (‘the object’) from the documentation practice (‘the measuring practice’), which in turn means that documentation is about producing rather than representing something. The object is entangled with how it is measured.

The documentations are produced by different practices of documentation, by *apparatuses*. In Barad’s terms, ‘apparatuses are boundary-making practices’ (2007, p. 148). They are phenomena that themselves, through intra-actions, produce properties of entities within other phenomena. Simultaneously, the apparatuses themselves are constantly being produced. This means that they are productive of, as well as part of, phenomena, but also that they are not instruments for passive observing. For example, in a famous experiment using different kinds of apparatuses, or measuring devices, it was shown that electrons could behave as waves and as particles, depending on what kind of experimental apparatus is used, that is, that the phenomenon of the electron’s behaviour is entangled with the apparatus measuring it (Barad 2007).

Preschool documentation of systematic quality development work is in this thesis thought of as an apparatus that produces certain kinds of documentation. In turn, this overarching apparatus produces different kinds of phenomena that themselves can also become apparatuses. For example, the practices involved in making documentation on a daily basis (production of documentation) produce one apparatus, while the practices that are involved in systematic quality development documentation (products of documentation), which includes models and templates, produce another. In addition, the research process of this study can also be seen as an apparatus enacting ‘what matters and what is excluded from mattering’ (Barad, 2007, p. 148) as preschool documentation practices. In this apparatus, the researcher is produced as one of the entities involved, while children, teachers, computers, papers, toys, documents, theories, previous research and research material (video recordings and PowerPoint files) are produced as other entities. For Lenz Taguchi and Palmer (2013), drawing on Barad (2007), apparatuses are seen as material-discursive practices rather than discursive practices involving materiality. This means that material objects will

also become agentic and that there are no distinct divisions between human and object; instead, they are seen as entangled. Consequently, the researcher as well will ‘inevitably become an entangled part of these apparatuses’ (Lenz Taguchi & Palmer, 2013, p. 674), engaging with stories, written, told and photographed (Lenz Taguchi & Palmer, 2013), with a written piece of interview data (Lenz Taguchi, 2012), or with photos of children playing (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010). In these studies, Lenz Taguchi, Palmer, and Hultman used diffractive¹⁵ methodology to explore how children and pupils relate to and are produced by materiality and discourse. The present study uses diffractive methodology with a slightly different focus: to study how local templates relate to preschool documentation.

The inseparability of entities and measures means that there are no individually determinate entities that pre-exist relations; instead, relations precede relata, that is, entities are produced as such within a relation. Documents, and what they document, are part of the same phenomenon; they could also be said to emerge from *intra-action*. The term intra-action was coined by Barad (2007), emphasising that entities are not determined prior to their interactions, but rather the other way around: entities are produced as something determinate through intra-action. Through intra-action, things are locally determined and thus possible to be known. This also means that it is impossible to look at something from without (Barad, 2007), which entails that neither researcher nor what is researched are seen as active agents beforehand, but as produced by, or emerging through the specific intra-actions of the research process or apparatus.

Entanglements, Agential Cuts, Diffraction and Spacetime mattering

As previously mentioned, preschool documentation is a messy, complex and entangled business, made up of different discourses, practices and entities. The impossibility of standing aside of anything means that everything is entangled, without anything preceding anything else. Barad (2007) says, ‘We are a part of that nature that we seek to understand’ (p. 67). This is contrary to traditional realist thinking, where the world is a matter of discovery, and objects and observers are initially separate. Barad argues that agential realism is a social constructionism that does not reduce knowledge to language or reject objectivity but also takes materiality into account. Agency is ascribed neither to the observer nor to the observed, neither to the human nor to the non-human. They instead have agency together, between them, in a dynamically shifting mode (Barad, 2007). What the concept *entanglements* points to is that ‘our knowledge-making practices are material enactments that contribute to, and are part of, the phenomena we describe’ (Barad, 2007, p. 247), that is, we are parts of the world that we study, we are entangled in the objects of our inquiries. As a former preschool

¹⁵ The concept ‘diffraction’ will be further presented in the following section.

teacher previously involved in different kinds of documentation practices and now researching them, I, of course, am entangled in these practices (which is apparent in the opening reflections of this thesis). Through the agential realist approach, the entanglement encompasses the research practice itself, the encounters with literature, with preschools, children, teachers, computers, cameras, documents, photos, writing and on and on. While entangled in everything else, to be able to say something, *agential cuts* (Barad, 2007) are enacted, making temporary stops in this ongoing intra-active entanglement. Agential cuts are not made by someone or something; instead, they are enacted by specific intra-actions producing separation between ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ (Barad, 2007), for example, between researcher and that which is researched.

The entanglement also calls for a methodology that can take account of and focus on, for example, the complexity of preschool documentation as well as the multiplicity of quality (as in quality development work). Barad’s (2007) suggestion here is *diffraction*. Unlike reflection, which tries to mirror something that is already there, diffraction opens up for what will come out of intra-active encounters (Barad, 2007). Diffraction opens up opportunities for differences and creates different patterns (in an optical sense), while (optical) reflection ‘produce images – more or less faithful – of objects placed at a distance from the mirror’ (Barad, 2007, s. 81). This implies that diffractive reading will produce differences rather than try to grasp the essence of something. It avoids trying to read what something means and instead focuses on what it produces (Lenz Taguchi, 2012). Instead of reading different texts or ideas against each other, they are read through one another, producing patterns of difference. An example of this is that a diffractive reading in article 3 of a drawing depicting a teacher and a group of children reading a book, together with a text of Sørensen (2013), opened up a number of different ways of seeing the drawing. Reading diffractively means reading *with* the data, installing oneself in it in order to uncover one of many realities that already exist, and in which the researcher is entangled. Reading diffractively means to engage oneself in the reading, to refrain from trying to find essences and to acknowledge agency of the text itself. This is challenging, especially since ‘the position of objects ‘behind’ or at least ‘separated’ from discourse is embedded in the very logic of European languages’ (Jones & Hoskins, 2016, p. 81).

As the previous chapter indicated, the entangled discourses and material agents that produce preschool documentation are also spread out in time and space. This entails that not only human and non-human agents, but also space and time are entangled. The Baradian concept *spacetime mattering* (Barad, 2007, p. 179) focuses on phenomena as relations rather than as ‘things’. Spatiality and temporality are produced as something specific through intra-action, as are humans and matter. The entities involved are produced together in one ongoing movement through spacetime mattering

(Barad, 2007; Juelskjaer, 2013). This means that the entities do not pre-exist but are produced through iterative intra-actions in which time and space are also involved *and* produced as something specific: ‘space, time and matter are mutually constituted through the dynamics of iterative intra-activity’ (Barad, 2007, p. 181). Neither space nor matter are static: instead, they are in a constant process of becoming; and time is not just passing by: instead, past and future both matter for the present – they are ‘enfolded participants in matter’s iterative becoming’ (Barad, 2007, p. 181).

Summary

Instead of understanding entities, such as preschool teachers, children, documents and the researcher, as initially separate, Barad’s agential realist terminology sees them as entangled, but becoming separated through *intra-actions*, which enact *agential cuts* (Barad, 2003). These cuts are enacted by *apparatuses* which produce entities within *phenomena* as something specific; they produce differences. For example, the research practice (or apparatus) that I am entangled in produces differences between me and what is studied, so that I become the researcher and the documentation practice becomes that which is studied. Without the research apparatus, neither of us exists as such. The intra-action of the research apparatus enacts agential cuts that produce me as researcher and the documentation practice as research material (Barad, 2007). The research apparatus produces differences between entities, thus temporarily separating the researcher from what is researched. When studying something with conventional methods, when the researcher is seen as detached from the research object, the goal is often to find something that is inherent in or essential to the research object. In agential realist research, this is not a possibility (since there is no such thing as an essential reality). To be able to focus on differences and their relations, thinking of them as *diffractive* patterns can be productive. In addition, since space and time also are entangled, the concept *space-timemattering* is used to analyse how different discourses and material agents are connected in space and time.

Aim and Research Questions

The first two chapters above produce a story about how current Swedish preschool documentation practices are entangled with preschool traditions which stress the interconnectedness of care and education. It interweaves with different and changing views on children and documentation, and with a number of purposes for doing documentation. The preconditions for preschools to provide education and care also vary. Thoughts of emancipation and children's rights to participation interweave with aims of increasing measurable learning results. In addition, a will to give children an equal chance of a good future, and also to give them opportunities to influence preschool practices, is enmeshed with thoughts of improving and equalising the quality of preschools. Taken together, there has emerged an increased demand from the authorities for documentation. The different discourses, objectives and methods for observation and documentation from preschool documentation traditions create a complex situation for teachers regarding how to deal with preschool documentation. Difficulties for teachers of finding time, and knowing what, to document, produce an impetus for models and local templates that are time saving and easy to use. This calls for inquiry into what certain methods, models and templates for documenting might produce. In addition, this involves questions about how and whether different kinds of documentation, such as observation or pedagogical documentation, or different kinds of evaluation models, might produce preschool quality in different ways. These things taken together make it crucial to study what parts different entities such as children and templates might play in documentation practices.

The aim of this thesis is to produce knowledge and questions about how Swedish preschool documentation is accomplished in five Swedish preschools. This is done by exploring how humans and materiality produce preschool documentation and what is produced as quality through preschool documentation.

From this aim the following questions are formulated:

- How do computers, teachers, children and other entities play a part in and produce documentation?

- What kinds of participation are produced through intra-action in the production of preschool documentation?
- How do models and templates play a part in preschool documentation of systematic quality development work?
- What is produced as quality through this intra-action?

Moving into Previous Research

The present study focuses on preschool documentation and how children, different documentation methods, templates, and documents relate to each other in documentation practices. It concentrates on the production and products of documentation, as entangled in preschool documentation. In this chapter previous research on preschool documentation and systematic quality development work, especially in relation to children, methods, templates and documents is presented and discussed. The review is divided in three subsections; the first focuses on children and documentation, the second on methods, templates and documents, and the final subsection summarises the chapter. Before this chapter starts to explore the areas of research of specific importance for this study, I present a quick overview of research on preschool documentation and on preschool systematic quality development work.

There is a body of research engaging in documentation and assessment of preschool and preschool children. Documentation of preschool systematic quality work is supposed to be helpful in assessing and developing preschool quality. Measuring outcomes for children at age 11 and comparing those to preschool quality (measured with ECERS), Sylva et al. (2011) found that high preschool quality led to benefits in social and cognitive development. Sheridan (2001) showed how high preschool quality (measured with ECERS) is related to teacher's competence and to the interaction between children and teachers. However, Ritchie (2016) argues that universal measures and definitions of quality (e.g. ECERS) do not take into account differences in and between cultures, marginalising certain qualities while privileging, and at the same time obscuring, a white western norm. Bergh (2010, 2011) studied the concept of quality in relation to education in Swedish government texts from 1997 to 2008. The study found that the meaning of the concept changed from an emphasis on education for individuals as well as for society at large, with reference also to welfare, equality and democracy, to an emphasis on results, knowledge, and goal fulfilment aimed at raising Sweden's status as a knowledge nation. However, a recent review of research on preschool assessment and documentation shows that documentation is more researched than

assessment, and that the Scandinavian studies on assessment often focus more on activities than on outcomes (Vallberg Roth, 2017).

Previous research on preschool documentation and on systematic quality development work often focus either on pedagogical documentation (e.g. Bjervås, 2011; Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000), on how individual children and their learning are assessed (e.g. Vallberg Roth, 2015; Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2008), on methods for measuring the outcome of teaching (Sylva et al., 2011) or on systematic quality development work in relation to how teachers use or talk about it (Lager, 2010; Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b). Engaging in the production of (pedagogical) documentation and in the products of documentation of systematic quality development work, this thesis sheds light on the complexity and entanglement of preschool documentation and systematic quality development work.

Some research puts forward how pedagogical documentation can be an alternative to methods that focus on measuring and assessing individual children, and how pedagogical documentation instead can empower children and make their voices heard (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). There is also research engaging in preschool teachers' talk about documentation and systematic quality work that finds that teachers consider pedagogical documentation to be beneficial for their practice, but also that it is difficult to do (Bjervås, 2011). Other research finds teachers expressing difficulties in how to define and use pedagogical documentation (Lindgren Eneflo, 2014). A study by Johansson (Johansson, 2016), on preschool documentation in general (not just pedagogical documentation) finds teachers to be ambivalent towards the task of documentation. On the one hand, focusing on documenting children's learning is seen as raising the status of preschool in relation to school. On the other hand, the same practice leads teachers to worry about preschool pedagogy losing its specificity as holistic, focusing on education as well as on care, and instead becoming more like school (Johansson, 2016). Teachers are also found to interpret the demands on documentation in a variety of ways, creating an uncertainty in the work groups as to how, what and why to document (Emmoth, 2014). In other studies preschool teachers point to the problem that some parts of the practice are easy to make visible through documentation whilst making other parts invisible. For example, certain kinds of social work with children cannot be documented due to concern for children's and families' privacy (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b). There is also research that points to risks and negative consequences of documentation (Alasuutari, Markström, & Vallberg Roth, 2014; Lindgren, 2012; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010) and of the focus on preschool quality (Cannella, 2016; Moss, 2016).

This short overview evinces that documentation and quality work in preschool is a complex area of research, encompassing a number of different views on what preschool quality and docu-

mentation are about. The following subsection will focus on research concerning the relation between children and documentation.

Children and Documentation

Since one focus of this thesis is the relation between children, teachers and other material agents in preschool documentation, the ways that children are produced in, and (maybe) produce, documentation are of high interest. This relates to how children are viewed and depicted in documentation as well as to whether they are active in the documentation process or not. Therefore, this part of the review presents different ways that children are produced in preschool documentation research. As presented above, preschool documentation often connects to quality as a means of evaluating and developing preschool quality. One of the most important aspects for pedagogical quality is interaction between teacher and child (Persson, 2015; Sheridan, 2009a). This, in turn, connects to children's participation in that children are considered to have more influence on daily activities in high-quality preschools than in preschools of lesser quality (Pramling Samuelsson & Sheridan, 2003; Sheridan, 2001).

Observed and Surveilled

Being documented, children can become objects of observation, which can be thought of both as recognition and as control. The importance of visibility is often stressed in Swedish preschools. Making children as well as the preschool practice visible is, in official documents as well as by teachers themselves, often seen as inherently good, because it is a way of recognising the individual child (Lindgren, 2012; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010). The notion of children's visibility as something unambiguously good is questioned in two studies examining preschool documentation in different media: firstly, discussing different ways of documenting (such as photographing and video-recording) Sparrman and Lindgren argue that preschool documentation might 'teach children to adapt to life in a surveillance society' (Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010, p. 250). Even if the teachers do not intend surveillance, it is still there, since photos are often displayed on the walls of the preschool, thus relating documentation to control and power. Sparrman and Lindgren discuss what documentation and being looked at means for children, 'to be seen is to exist' (Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010, p. 259) and ask whether this will generate individuals who are used to being looked at to such an extent that they readily accept surveillance without blinking, or thinking.

Secondly, Lindgren (2012) studied student teachers discussing pedagogical documentation in their blogs. The students compared their own experiences of being photographed, whether or not they wanted to be, to the situation of the children. When benefits and restrictions related to the use of digital cameras were discussed, the ethical implications with respect to the children were more or less

discarded, and documentation was seen as neutral and inevitable, as a useful and necessary method for preschool practice. The student teachers constructed documentation as means to observe children, rather than to create dialogue with them. Two competing preschool discourses are discerned here: on the one hand, the good of visualising (and implicitly, observing) as a kind of good governance, and on the other hand, the danger of jeopardising the self-governance of the participative, competent child. Lindgren calls for recognition of the visual as a powerful and complex method and for highlighting adults' position in relation to children, which, in her study, the student teachers were found not to problematise.

Moreover, children might become objects of study, irrespective of whether this is intended or not by the teachers documenting (Emilson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012; Insulander & Svärden Åberg, 2014). Insulander and Svärden Åberg (2014) relate this to complex and contradicting views and attitudes in the preschool practices. This might also fold back to the uncertainties in the wording in chapter 2.6 of the curriculum (Skolverket, 2016c), as described above.¹⁶ Whilst having a comprehensive view of preschool practice, teachers still seemed more interested in documenting individual children's development and learning, but often without systematic reflection on how preschool practices provide for children's development and learning. In a study by Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012) teachers were found to focus mainly on children's achievements, even though they claimed to be working with pedagogical documentation. This led the teachers to see children's competences as residing within the child. According to the authors, this goes against the theoretical claims associated with pedagogical documentation, in which competence is seen as relational.

Whilst children in some research on documentation in preschool are produced as observed and surveilled, in research on pedagogical documentation in particular they are instead often produced as active and competent.

Active and Competent

Some research forwards the potential for certain kinds of documentation to involve and empower children, in line with a view of children as active and competent introduced with the sociology of childhood (e.g. James & Prout, 1990). As described in the section titled *Pedagogical Documentation* above, an argument for using pedagogical documentation is that it is claimed to promote children's voices, and through this, become a means for children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). In post-structuralist research, pedagogical documentation is favoured for its emancipative effects, for children as well as for teachers, and for its

¹⁶ See the sections titled *From Child Observation to Documentation* and *Measuring and Evaluating Preschool Quality*.

potential for resisting views and practices that are taken for granted (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). In a study of preschool teachers talking about pedagogical documentation, the teachers considered it as a way for children's voices to be heard and as a way to make children aware of their own learning and their competences (Bjervås, 2011).

Making children's voices heard through documentation might include seeing children as active in producing documentation. One way to try to involve children in documentation is through collective drawing, which, tested by a group of researchers, is also claimed to be a useful way of including children in research (Knight, Zollo, McArdle, Cumming, Bone, Ridgway, & Li, 2016). When documenting by drawing, children can be invited, and be able, to participate in developing preschool projects (Elfström, 2013). In a licentiate thesis, children were found to participate in documentation practices to different degrees, and the degree of their participation connected to different material agents such as photos and colour-coded labels (Elfström Pettersson, 2014). In addition, to empower children and actively engage them in research on preschool practice, researchers sometimes provide them with cameras (Einarsdóttir, 2005; Luttrell, 2010; Änggård, 2015). In parallel, this is also sometimes done by practitioners in preschools (see DeMarie & Ethridge, 2006).

The degree to which practices of pedagogical documentation can be said to be democratic and to promote children's participation can be questioned in terms of 'whether they also help maintain a subordinate position and corrected self-image among children' (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011, p. 258). However, this might also depend on the kind of pedagogical documentation used¹⁷ or on the focus of the documentation. Nevertheless, as described in the previous section, teachers also sometimes forward documentation as inevitable and leave some of its consequences, such as surveillance, unproblematised (Lindgren, 2012). Still, giving children a voice and stressing their own responsibility and capability might be seen as another way of controlling or governing them, since this allows only one specific way of being a child: as active, capable and responsible (Kjørholt, 2005; Söderlind & Engwall, 2005). This is also apparent in a study by Liljestrand and Hammarberg (2017), who found documentation panels, including photographs, displayed on the walls of a preschool to depict children as competent, thus excluding any other way of being a child.

Although documentation is sometimes suggested as enabling children to be active and competent, and although there may be efforts to involve children in documentation by, for example, drawing, there are studies that find children to have limited involvement in producing documentation (Bath, 2012; Garrick, Bath, Dunn, Maconochie, Willis, & Wolstenholme, 2010). Not having the ability to read, preschool children sometimes feel excluded by written records. Although children might become more involved when photographs are used, they were in one study also sometimes

¹⁷ See also the section titled *Pedagogical Documentation*.

puzzled about why a certain photo was taken (Bath, 2012). Furthermore, Lindgren and Sparrman (2003) argue that there is a risk of children's subordination being further strengthened when children are the ones being looked on whilst both children and teachers are the onlookers. In addition, studying subject positions for children in Norwegian daycare centres, Franck & Nilsen (2015) found that the discourse of the competent child intertwined with a discourse of early interventions for children with special needs and 'othered' children that, in different ways, would not fit with the discourse of the active and competent child.

Furthermore, the tendency to see children's competence as inherent in them is increasingly contested (Prout, 2005; Samuelsson, Sparrman, Cardell, & Lindgren, 2015). This tendency often neglects how social and material factors in the environment may facilitate or complicate children's agency, which is discussed by Samuelsson, Sparrman, Cardell, and Lindgren (2015), who argue that it is necessary to focus on how children are produced as competent and active in relation to other human and non-human actors. Taken together, the 'competent child' of child-hood sociology is no longer an obvious 'truth' among researchers; instead, the interdependency of children, adults and materiality is increasingly widespread.

Even though the Swedish curriculum for the preschool points out that each child's development and learning should be followed and documented, the emphasis on documentation and evaluation of preschool practices (Skolverket, 2016c) produces uncertainty about what to document (also mentioned in the section above), which might lead teachers to refrain from documenting individual children. Being observed and taking part in and through documentation might be ways for children to be recognised, but also controlled – but what happens when the focus of documentation shifts away from the child and towards teachers or the practice?

Undetectable or Unseen

Some research finds that, except for being observed through and active in documentation, children are less prominent in documentation, paradoxically enough in a practice that focuses on, and whose foremost task is, the care and education of children. In addition, some research on documentation of systematic quality development work has found activities to be advanced as more important for preschool practices than for the children, whilst children and their perspectives become more or less absent (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009a). In documentation that focuses on teachers and on the practice, children are in some cases almost unseen. An interview study from an interactionist and ecological perspective found a shift in the focus of documentation from individual children's learning and development to teachers' approaches and their interaction with children (Sheridan et al., 2013). The teachers seemed to focus more on their practice or on their profession than on how children were developing and what they learned. Children were observed in order

to see how the practice was working, and teachers evaluated their work instead of the children. Johansson (2016) found one consequence of this to be that ‘the child becomes hidden, but appear “between the lines” in the texts of the practice’ (p. 277). Through this, children’s personalities, rather than assessment of the pedagogical practices, became the focus of teachers’ assessments. Bjervås (2011), discussing the result of her study of preschool teachers’ talk about pedagogical documentation, asks whether pedagogical documentation might make children’s vulnerability invisible: What happens with those children who do not live up to the picture of the competent and active child? If documentation only promotes the children who behave actively and express themselves, children whose behaviour is quiet and withdrawn might be unseen. Thus, there is also the question of which children are made visible, and whether these children might become visible at the expense of other children’s invisibility.

This first part of the review presents how the positions of and views of children in preschool documentation vary and shift between being observed, being active and competent, and being undetectable and more or less unseen. The research focused on how children are produced by the documentation; some also focused on whether and how children take part in producing documentation. The present study does not concern the way that children are depicted through documentation but will rather focus on whether and how children can be active together with teachers, computers, photos and other kinds of material agents in producing preschool documentation. Another focus of the present study is how the products of documentation, together with templates, policy texts and other material agents produce elements of preschool quality. The following subsection will therefore present research focusing on different methods, and on how templates and documents can become agentic and what this produces.

Methods, Templates and Documents

Ahead of presenting how methods, templates and documents are discerned in research, this brief introduction points out that the methods involved in preschool documentation sometimes also serve as methods for research. For example, there is research *on* different kinds of more or less standardised methods such as IDPs or ECERS (Cecconi et al., 2014; Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011). There is also research *using* standardised methods to measure quality as a point of departure for studying how different aspects of children’s learning or preschool practices relate to preschool quality (Sylva et al., 2011; Vermeer et al., 2016). Pedagogical documentation is studied in different ways by a number of researchers (Alnervik, 2013; Bjervås, 2011; Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Elfström, 2013; Lenz Taguchi, 2000, 2013a; Olsson, 2012) and it is also *used* in research, in cooperation with teachers (Olsson, 2012) and as empirical material (Alnervik, 2013; Olsson, 2008) and also as taking

part in the process of constructing empirical material (Bjervås, 2011; Elfström, 2013). Next the review will focus on how methods, models and templates are viewed as directive, as agentic and as challenging in research on preschool documentation.

Directive

This section emphasises research that finds and/or focus on what methods, models and templates do or produce: how they can be directive. For example, teachers doing systematic quality development work were found to be more occupied with ‘quality wheels/systems/templates/models’ (Lager, 2010, p. 162) and doing the right thing at the right time than with documenting in order to develop their practice. That documentation of preschool systematic quality development work focuses more on methods than on content, such as children’s development and learning, or preschool practices, was somewhat unexpected to Lager (2010). In addition, Johansson (2016) found that preschool teachers often focus more on the procedure of documentation than on its content, and that preschool practices are highly regulated through documentation, which in turn is controlled and regulated through supportive texts and governmental inspections. To document ‘properly’, to do it the right way, was in her study more important to the teachers than to focus on, for example, how and what children learn (Johansson, 2016). Other research finds templates directing what areas the preschool documentation focuses on (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2008), and teachers adjusting their documentation to fit the templates (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b; Vermeer et al., 2016). In an interview study involving a school leader and a teacher, what was made visible through documentation was that which fit into common templates (developed by school leaders), which also made important parts of preschool practice invisible. For example, in one preschool, social work with families and children, which took a lot of the preschool teachers’ time and effort, was not promoted, since it had no place in the template (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b).

In some of the research presented above, the agency of the methods, plans, templates or forms is not the primary focus, but emerges as a result of the studies. Other research (including the present study) will open up possibilities to see documentation and other kinds of materiality as agentic.

Agentic

Whilst commonly thought of as a neutral method, documentation is also argued to govern children, teachers and parents (Alasuutari, Markström, & Vallberg Roth, 2014). For example, individual educational plans (IEPs) have been found to be agentic in teacher–parent conferences, structuring discussions and defining agendas (Alasuutari, 2015). However, as shown by Alasuutari (2015), whilst the IEPs strongly shape discussions, they can also be resisted by teachers and parents, producing them as one of the active parts in the

relation between documents and humans. Similarly, worksheets, in the form of a kind of instrument used for documentation, can participate actively during observation and documentation of young children's learning, producing, and also presupposing, an institutionalised learning child (Schulz, 2015). Moreover, templates and forms have been found to be strongly agentic in research on documentation of students in residential care: for example, in a study by Severinsson (2016), headings and lack of headings directed the documentation towards things other than those connected to school subjects and matters. Davies (2011) discusses documentation as a practice of 'open listening' (p. 124), arguing that the technology of documentation, including photographs and texts on walls, itself becomes actively agentic. She also calls for attention to 'a danger of no longer listening' (p. 125), of letting the products of documentation become fixed, for example, becoming static evidence of good teaching instead of being actively inviting of further thought.

One way of trying to come to terms with this is suggested by Olsson (2008): using concepts from Deleuze and Guattari, she treats pedagogical documentation as events, and by this claims that the documentation plays an important part in children's learning. This way of treating pedagogical documentation contributes to an 'approach to learning and knowledge as concerning *the art of constructing a problem*' (Olsson, 2008, p. 195) (emphasis in original), rather than to capturing or measuring what children learn. Knowledge and learning are treated as changing and ongoing rather than as static. Through this, Olsson argues that children are able to participate in, and learn to manage, the contemporary fast production of knowledge.

This means neither that methods, templates and documents are passive, nor that they simplify and make documentation more effective, but rather that they are active agents in the production of preschool documentation. Taking it one step further, some documentation methods might not only be active but might also be able to challenge prevailing views on observation and documentation. In addition, some of the above research is done from a posthumanist stance, and to use this kind of approach might be one way of challenging established views on documentation.

Challenging

Posthumanism was introduced into the field of early childhood education studies by Lenz Taguchi (2010) and is a growing approach in this field (see Davies, 2014; Hultman, 2011; Lenz Taguchi, 2013a; Nordtømme, 2012; Palmer, 2010a; Änggård, 2016). In research from a posthumanist stance, the conventional view on observation and documentation is claimed to be challenged (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010; Lenz Taguchi, 2013a; Otterstad & Nordbrønd, 2015; Olsson, 2008). When methods, templates and documents are established as being active agents in documentation, it is possible, in addition to focusing on human agency, to also include other material

(non-human) agents. For example, through seeing a photograph, and the gaze itself, as active, the separation between the observed and the observer is challenged (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010). Instead of the gaze or the photo being seen as representing something, they are seen as being involved in, and actively producing a reality. This means that relations that are often overlooked or taken for granted in conventional research, such as relations between children and things or spaces, can be forwarded.

A posthumanist approach (which in the thesis by Olsson, 2008, is Deleuzian) is claimed to enable a shift of focus from outcomes to process, for example, from the learning goals to the learning process (Olsson, 2008). Experimenting with observation, by decentring the human, breaking the binary of child/adult and including materialities and affect, the status of observation and documentation as inevitable and necessary methods to produce knowledge about children in preschools can be questioned and challenged. An example of this is to question that observation takes place only through vision and hearing, and realise that affect, such as thinking/feeling, is also included in observation (Otterstad & Nordbrønd, 2015). Also Blaise, Hamm and Iorio (2016) rethink what observation is about, not by questioning the use of the senses, but rather through presenting different ways of documenting in preschool. They argue that pedagogical documentation, pedagogical narration, and, especially, creating 'lively stories' (p. 9) can be ways of moving away from observational practices that presuppose the possibility of obtaining knowledge about children through objective observations and moving towards practices that are able to also take into account 'human and more-than-human encounters' (p. 39). Taking departure in agential realism and doing pedagogical narrations with preschool student teachers, Kummen (2014) found that artefacts produced within the pedagogical narrations (photos and texts) became agentic, pushing conversations in unexpected directions. For example, intra-actions of the artefacts, the researcher and texts from a course about views on children actively shifted the conversations in the classroom from views on children towards a focus on race and whiteness.

The posthumanist stance is argued to enable the posing of questions to documentation other than those reflecting conventional views, for example, how protocols used when observing a child can function as performative agents, producing teachers' as well as children's own understandings of a documenting situation (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a). For instance, in analysing pedagogical documentation, Palmer (2010a) found that materiality was as important as subjects, discourse and interpersonal interaction, which led her towards the material turn and Barad. Pedagogical documentation was in her study found to be an active key for understanding and challenging notions about mathematics that are taken for granted. An example is given in an article by Palmer (2010b) in which pedagogical documentation, as well as objects such as pens, cameras, printed photographs on the wall, symbols and drawings,

became active and performative agents producing certain kinds of mathematical knowledge as well as stereotypical gender relations in an activity planned by a student teacher.

Summary

In previous research, making children's voices heard is sometimes suggested as one positive result of using pedagogical documentation. Meanwhile, children themselves, despite different efforts to include them, are not always involved in documentation practices. In addition, the alleged benefit of making children and preschool practices visible is problematised and also questioned by some researchers, who instead bring forward documentation as surveillance, which means that children wind up as the onlooked, the observed, rather as the onlooking, the observers, or as participants. This subordinates children and contradicts the ideas of the active and competent child who is empowered through, for example, pedagogical documentation. Moreover, when documentation focuses on preschool practices instead of on individual children, the children become unseen, and almost absent, in favour of teachers and preschool activities.

Although not always the main focus of the research, documentation methods and templates are in some studies found to play an important part in and to shape the documentation through their own agency. The focus on the agency of models and templates can be transferred to other material agents through a posthumanist approach. This approach is growing in early childhood research and can be useful in enabling new ways of studying preschool practices that can pose other kinds of questions and focus on aspects other than what is possible through conventional methods.

The present study takes departure in the above-presented ambivalences and uncertainties that teachers sometimes have about documentation. However, rather than studying how individual children are documented or how teachers talk about documentation, this study focuses on how documentation is produced, between children, teachers and other material agents. This means that the present study shifts from focusing solely on human agents towards also including non-human agents, in line with the studies in the latter part of the review. The research on methods, templates and documents presented above suggests that these are not passive and innocent tools, but rather that they contribute to and shape the practices they aim to document. Through the posthumanist lens of agential realism, the present study includes both humans and non-humans as active agents in producing preschool documentation. In line with some previous studies, it challenges the view of, for example, documentation, photos, and templates as passive. Contrary to some of the above studies, the present study does not consider any specific method as a 'better' way to do preschool documentation, but instead focuses on how documentation is produced through intra-action of human and non-human agents, and also how elements of

preschool quality are produced through this. Vallberg Roth (2017) asks for more research on different ways to assess and document in preschools. Although this thesis does not address assessment, it will contribute knowledge about ways of documenting preschool practices and how these produce certain elements of quality.

Through a research apparatus including a number of entities, such as the researcher, preschools, video recordings, documentation, analysis, intra-visuals and connections to ethics, this study will be produced through, whilst it will also produce, four articles, a discussion and this thesis.

Producing Empirical Material

This chapter is divided into six subsections. The first introduces the research apparatus and how the researcher is produced. The preschools taking part in the study, and how they were contacted, are presented in the second subsection. The third subsection elucidates how the empirical material is produced. The fourth subsection presents the analyses of the empirical material. Since images (video recordings, photos and drawings) are an important part of the empirical material, the way that they participate in the study is discussed in the fifth subsection, which also indicates how one kind of visual material is produced. The sixth subsection discusses ethical concerns involved with the study.

Research Apparatus

In analogy with viewing the documentation practices as apparatuses that produce different kinds of documentation, the research process is an apparatus that produces a certain kind of knowledge. The components of the research apparatus are not fixed entities that come together to perform a research practice; instead, they are constantly being produced as such through the research process. The research apparatus is not an instrument that is passively used by the researcher; instead, it is both part of and produces the research (Barad, 2007).

The entities included in (and produced through) the research apparatus are, for example, the researcher, the empirical material, previous research, theories, and the analysing and the writing of this thesis. All of these are agentially involved, or entangled, in the research process, which also includes the knowledge that is produced. To be able to describe to the reader how the research has been conducted, the entities are temporarily separated in this thesis. Some of them have already been presented (theory, previous research), and others will be presented in the subsections of this chapter. First of all, a few words will introduce how the researcher in the present study is produced.

Producing the Researcher

The posthumanist agential realist approach shapes how the researcher is produced: non-humans and humans are intertwined,

entities are not seen as separate and pre-existing but rather as produced as such by intra-actions of a phenomenon. This means that the researcher's presence in a studied preschool becomes a part of the preschool, and that the researcher's reading of preschool documentation is part of what it becomes. Through intra-action of the researcher-me and teachers and children and a visited preschool, in a research context, I am produced as similar to any visiting adult *and* as a researcher. The intra-action of me and the documents that are studied produces me as researcher, and the documents as research materials. To photograph, video record, or take notes when visiting the preschool adds to the preschool documentation practice, as this behaviour resembles 'normal' preschool teacher documentation practice. In a similar way, it also adds to the research practice. In addition, the ways that the preschools were approached, and before that, the ways that I encountered the doctoral studies, are parts of how the researcher-me is produced.

How the researcher is produced is also very much connected to space, time and materiality. It is not about being produced by or through something; rather, it is about being produced with, for example, the physical environment. Being placed within university buildings, such as lecture and seminar rooms, and in an office, during a specific time; meeting up with, entering and leaving a preschool building, with no other connections to it but as a researcher, are parts of how the researcher is produced and reproduced, over and over again. The time that a computer is connected to a preschool teacher is very limited, but this time is massive in relation to a researcher. Sitting, reading and writing all day seemed, at the start of the doctoral studies, as quite absurd to the preschool teacher-me who was used to moving around all day. Connections with computers, with reading and writing, with video recording and engaging with documents, with entering university and preschool buildings, as well as preschool teacher experiences, are all ways that the researcher-me is produced with other parts of the research apparatus.

Presenting Preschools

In this section, five preschools that were engaged in the study are presented. One part of the study focuses on children, teachers, computers and other entities producing documentation, if you will: an initial phase of preschool systematic quality development work. In this part of the study two preschool groups (which in article 1 are called the Giraffe and the Zebra group) from one preschool (here called preschool A) were involved. The other part of the study engaged in the products of documentation from 10 groups from four preschools (B, C, D and E presented below). The documents produced by teachers, children, computers, templates, models and other entities can also be thought of as a final phase of the documentation of preschool systematic quality development work. A graphical overview of the preschool groups involved in the study is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Overview of the preschool groups in the study.

This overview presents the preschools involved in the study. The first level (dark grey boxes) presents preschool units, which can consist of one or more preschools. Below the units, the second level (outlined boxes) presents the preschools, which consist of one or several preschool groups. Under each preschool, the groups are indicated by grey and white boxes. The groups that agreed to take part in the study are shaded with grey. Names are consistent with how they are used in the articles.

Preschool A

One way of finding suitable preschools, in order to study how children produce and are produced in and through documentation practices, was to search the Internet¹⁸ for preschools that prioritised children's participation in documentation practices. This search involved the researcher-me, the computer, the webpages, the Web editors, and the preschool personnel, who presented their practice on the Web. The search produced 10 webpages that presented preschools in accordance with the research questions. This way, they could be said to have chosen me, whilst I chose them. Each of the 10 preschools was contacted by telephone, asking whether their children were actively engaged in the documentation process, and especially whether they were involved in using cameras and computers. Two preschools answered that their children were, and these were both visited. However, during the visit to one of the preschools the teachers stated that children were not very interested in taking part in documentation, anymore. This resulted in the remaining preschool (from here on referred to as preschool A) being chosen to participate in the study. In preschool A, teachers and children regularly created documentation with pictures (photos, drawings) and text, using cameras and computers.

¹⁸ It is common in Sweden for preschools, whether municipal, private or cooperative, to present themselves on the Internet.

Preschool A is situated in a small Swedish municipality and consists of three groups of three teachers and about 20 children each, aged 1–5 years. Two of the preschool groups are involved in this study based on their more explicit focus on children's participation in documentation. In these groups, the children often dictate to the teachers what to write about a particular photo, take part in discussing the outcome of activities (which the teachers then write down) and make drawings. Documents are mainly printed and placed in portfolios, which are often viewed by the children during the day, and they are used as a basis for discussion in parent–teacher conferences. Documentation is also kept in digital format on computers, and recent photos are often on show in a digital photo frame in the preschool. In addition, video recordings are sometimes viewed on the computer by teachers and children.

Preschools B–E

To study how templates are involved in systematic quality development documentation, preschools using some kind of model or template were engaged. From an earlier assignment, I had an opportunity to read documentation from around 20 preschool groups. This brought insight into how systematic quality work could be conducted and what kinds of models might be involved. It also produced a curiosity, about how different kinds of templates could play a part in systematic quality development work. Thus, intra-actions of the researcher-me and of the reading of the preschool documentation produced a desire to further engage in studying the relations between preschool documentation and templates.

To enable me, as researcher, to engage with documents suitable for the study, the heads of preschool in a second small Swedish municipality were contacted and asked whether they provided any kind of model or template for documenting systematic quality development work. This means that the model or template was one active part in distilling (or selecting) the preschools to include in the study. In this municipality, all heads of preschool manage one 'unit' each. One unit consists of two or more preschools; each preschool has one to seven preschool groups, each with around three to five teachers and 15–25 children, 1–5 years of age. The heads were informed about the research project, and two of them (the heads of Unit One and Unit Two¹⁹) were positive towards taking part in the study. Both of them have designed their own local templates from the model provided by the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2015).

Unit One consists of three preschools with, in all, 10 preschool groups. In this unit, the groups are organised in pairs that work together and share their systematic quality development documentation between them. Unit Two consists of two preschools with 9 groups (see Figure 2). Two (pairs of) groups from two of the

¹⁹ The names of the units are pseudonyms.

preschools (B and C) in Unit One and eight groups from the two preschools (D and E) in Unit Two agreed to participate in the study. Each (single) group consists of around 15–20 children aged 1–5 years and three to four teachers. All of these groups use the local templates when doing the systematic quality development documentation. There are some differences between the two units in how the templates are used and in which format the documentation is made, which played a part in how the documentation was chosen; this will be described in the subsection titled *Connecting with Documents* in the following section.

Empirical Engagement

Since the entangled nature of the research apparatus makes it impossible to sort out certain things as ‘data’, the choice was made to instead write about *empirical material*, *production* and *engagements*. Thus, empirical material is not something that is retrieved ‘out there’ but rather something that is *produced* in different ways within the study, and *engaged with* in different ways throughout the research process. This is how it differs from the notion of data.

The empirical material was produced by video recording and engaging with documents. In this thesis, the concept empirical material also refers to transcripts of dialogue, to descriptions of parts of the video recordings in text and drawings, to the model presented by the National Agency for Education and its local adaptations and to drawings from photos in the Unit Two documentation. Engagement points to the entangled relations of the researcher with that which is researched (Bodén, 2016). Instead of trying to see the researcher as detached from studying something, the intertwined and entangled aspects of being and knowing are acknowledged; in an interview Barad claims that ‘knowing is a direct material engagement’ (Dolphijn & van der Tuin, 2012, p. 52), as opposed to knowing from a distance, or from without. In this study, this connects to the ways that the diffractive methodology was conducted.

The objective of the study is not separate from the agency of its observation or engagement. There is no prior distinction between the studied practices and documentation and the way they are studied; instead, this distinction emerges through intra-actions of the researcher-me and the research materials produced. To be able to study anything at all, some kind of distinction has to be made. Thus, in this study agential cuts are enacted (Barad, 1999). These cuts are produced through the research process and are connected to the way that the empirical materials are produced, which in turn connects to the research questions.

Engaging with video recording seemed to be useful when studying the practices of documentation production for more than one reason: video recordings make it possible to transport information from one place to another (Sverrisson, 2011), the focus is on ‘more than words’ (Staunaes & Kofoed, 2015, p. 1233), and such engagement facilitates taking relations between human and

non-human actors into account without privileging one over the other (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010). Therefore, it served as a method for producing empirical material for the study of how documentation is produced between children, teachers and other material agents. Engaging with documents enabled studying the involvement of templates in documentation of systematic quality development work. These practices and the acts of choosing them, together with the reasons why they were chosen, enact the agential cuts needed to make it possible to study this kind of preschool documentation production and products the way that they are studied. This 'loop' (studying something the way it is studied) depicts the entanglement of measuring apparatus and measure.

Video Recording

For the study of documentation production, preschool A was visited briefly in April 2011 and a few documenting situations were video recorded. This way, the research apparatus, which includes the video equipment and the researcher-me, was tried out. When the research project started this visit was considered as a 'pilot' study (Boréus, 2011). Since then, further engagement in posthumanist theorisation has changed the status of these videos. The initial video recordings are no longer viewed as a 'pilot' but as one of the empirical productions that make up this thesis. After the first visit, the preschool was visited on 11 occasions from November 2011 to January 2012. During the first visits in November the video camera did not accompany me; instead, to be able to get a feel for which kind of situations would be interesting to further video record, the preschool with its documentation practices and I engaged and became familiarised. The choices of what to video record emerged through this engagement; in other words, they emerged through intra-actions of the preschool practices and the researcher. For example, one of the preschool teachers explicitly pointed out when to work with documentation on a couple of occasions. Also, the practice itself determined *when* it was possible to document, for example, in between meals and other activities, and *where*, since most of the documentation practices took place indoors.

What was video recorded also had to do with the design and furnishing of the rooms, determining where and how the camera could be placed. For example, when video recording a teacher and child at the computer placed at a wall, the video camera had to be placed facing the computer and the backs of the teacher and child, at a slight angle. Figure 3 depicts an example of the view of the video camera in a documentation activity involving a teacher, a child and a computer.

Figure 3. One view of the video camera in a documentation activity.

On the following visits, situations in which children and teachers produced different kinds of documentation in several ways were video recorded. One of the preschool groups (the Giraffe group) produced portfolio documentation (Ellmin & Ellmin Cederholm, 2012), which predominantly contained photographs with captions. This documentation was often assembled jointly between a teacher and a child at the computer, which means that this setup itself had already chosen one possible kind of situation to video record: children and teachers documenting at the computer. The portfolio documentation practice also involved other situations, for example, fetching the documents from the printer, putting them into plastic pockets and then into binders; these situations were also video recorded. The other group (the Zebra group) expressed that they were inspired by Reggio Emilia and did pedagogical documentation. During my visits to the preschool, the teachers declared that the Zebra group documentation practices were integrated into the preschool activities (see also the section titled *Pedagogical Documentation*). This way, the choices of situations to video record were a lot wider, and the situations connected to documentation less well defined. The average length of the video recordings in the respective groups might be an indication of this, since recordings from the Giraffe group, on average, are shorter than those from the Zebra group (see Appendix 1). For example, the video camera and I were invited to follow a whole introduction of a theme in the Zebra group, in which different kinds of documentation activities were integrated into the activities of the introduction. In addition, video recordings were done during discussions between children and a teacher about a recent activity, before and while they looked at photographs of the activity. Altogether, there are 4 hours and 45 minutes of video recordings from 9 different situations from the two groups (see Appendix 1). The focus was on how children, teachers and other material agents *produce* documentation. In some situations, the camera was held by my hand, and in others it was held by a tripod, facing a computer. Additionally, in one setting a micro-

phone, connected to the camera, was hung above the computer, where a teacher and a child were documenting together.

The initial thoughts on video recording reflected an interest in how materiality matters. In contrast to video recording, interviews might, for example, impede focusing on intra-actions of objects, positions and body language. Video recording was a productive way of engaging with situations in which teachers and children, computers and a diverse range of objects participated in the documentation practice, focusing on 'aspects that go beyond the purely linguistic' (Staunaes & Kofoed, 2015, p. 1233). In addition, it seemed to be a fruitful way of engaging in the study 'without a thinking that formulates itself from a hierarchic division between humans and non-humans' (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 538). Furthermore, video recordings can be replayed over and over again (Rolfe & Emmet, 2010), which makes it possible to re-think the situation several times, and through several perspectives. According to Flewitt (2006), they can also be useful in understanding complexities and dynamics of processes. Minor parts of the video recordings were also presented and discussed in research seminars, engaging research colleagues and supervisors who then became parts of the apparatus, enabling new and different views and angles on the research.

The approach in this study does not consider that it is possible to obtain knowledge from a world 'out there', but rather that one part of the world makes itself knowledgeable to another part. Thus, social construction and materiality are intertwined (Barad, 2007). The video recordings that are part of this study are therefore considered to be produced through the research apparatus as well as parts of it, including the researcher-me and the video camera, rather than obtained by the researcher, and reflecting reality. This means that the research apparatus produces one reality, among many others, rather than looks at *the* reality.

Since academic practices are very much about language (for example, as written texts and spoken discussions), writing down observations when watching the videos became one part of doing this research. The obvious start, back at the office, in relation to the focus on language, was to watch the video recordings, to put the visual into words and to listen to and write down what was said. The spoken words of the video-recorded sequences were transcribed verbatim, and some of the positions, actions and bodily movements of the children and teachers were described in writing. Thus, the transcriptions from the video recordings were included in the production of empirical material. Yet, this is to be seen as a way of further familiarising with the recordings rather than as a transformation of them, although even in approaches where transcriptions are considered as 'data' they are seen as something other than the actual situation, as abstractions (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). However, instead of treating transcriptions as 'data', as often is the case in conventional research, especially in interview studies, Honan

(2014, p. 14) argues that this approach to making transcripts ‘creates an artificial reality, a clichéd representation’ of interactions, which are also parts of what makes up the study. Encounters between the video recordings and me also include the computer and software for playing the video recordings.

Another way of producing empirical material is to make drawings. This might also be a way of making sure that participants are anonymous (Flewitt, 2006). Drawing made it possible to further engage with body language, positions and material objects in the video recordings. In addition, when making the drawings, parts of my body engaged other than those that engaged in typing or reading. My hands made different movements with the pen on the paper, and while tracing still images captured from the videos, with the stylus (digital pen) on the digital tablet as well, than they did while typing on the keyboard. With the expression ‘thinking in movement’, Sheets Johnstone (2011, p. 421) challenges the assumption that thinking and movement are separate and proposes that thinking also involves bodily movement in humans as well as non-human animals. Thus, the movements of the drawing activity can be seen as parts of the thinking process in this kind of empirical production, perhaps similar to the way thoughts and insights sometimes pop up when going for a walk or engaging in something else than writing up a text at the computer.

Since the focus for the study is *intra-actions* of teachers, children and other material agents, the further engagements with the video recordings were concentrated in the in-between of the participants, on what was *happening* rather than on what was said or acted. An example of how the focus on the intra-actions within one part of the video recordings emerged is the presentation of one of the drawings in the section titled *Producing Intra-visuals* below (see Figure 10).

Connecting with Documents

For the study of documentation products, to be able to connect with and engage in documents from preschools B, C and D, the heads of preschool were informed about the research project and asked for permission to approach the preschool personnel. At a meeting between the researcher-me, the head and a group of pedagogical leaders (one teacher from each preschool group), the teachers were informed about the project and asked whether they would like to participate. The teachers were also invited to ask questions about the study. Since not all personnel attended this meeting, I offered to visit each preschool to answer any questions from those who were absent. As mentioned above, two (pairs of) groups from preschools B and C in Unit One and eight groups from preschools D and E in Unit Two agreed to take part in the study (see Figure 2).

The documents are produced by the preschool personnel. The local templates that are made by the heads of Unit One and Unit Two were also included. In Unit One the documentation is written or

printed on paper, placed in binders, and consists of 123 pages. In Unit Two the documentation is kept in digital format, as PowerPoint (PPT) files in a computer, consisting of a total of 340 PPT slides (see Appendix 2). In both cases, the documentation consists of text alternating with photos and other kinds of textual/visual material (e.g. mind maps). To transport the documentation from the preschools to the office for further study, the documentation kept in binders from Unit One was photographed, and the digital documentation from Unit Two was copied onto a memory stick. There are also other differences between the units: from Unit One only two (pairs of) groups in two preschools (B and C) agreed to take part in the study (producing two binders) compared to eight groups (eight PPT files) in two preschools (D and E) from Unit Two. The Unit One documentation is organised chronologically in the binders: there are sections labelled with the months of the year, under which a diverse range of documents are kept. These are protocols from meetings, blank forms, parent surveys, lists of children, handwritten diary notes, descriptions of activities, evaluations of activities, letters to parents, protocols for reflection, invitations to seminars and meetings, photos and children's drawings. A copy of the unit's template was kept in the preschool B binder, but not in the binder from preschool C. Unlike Unit One, Unit Two uses a digital template, in the form of a PPT document of 11 slides. The Unit Two documentation is written within the template, and in some of the groups is organised chronologically within each part of the template. The small number of binders from Unit One, the organisation of their documents and the messiness regarding which kinds of documents are kept in the binders make it hard to determine how (or whether) they relate to the template. Since eight groups from Unit Two agreed to participate, since their documentation is digital and since the template is present in every document, the present study focuses on Unit Two. The decision to do this might be seen as mine, but although I take the responsibility, I see this as part of the intra-action of the practical material-discursive aspects described above.

The documentation of the systematic quality development work in the Unit Two groups is produced for the purpose of evaluation and development of preschool practice; it is produced by and for the teachers themselves. But it is also produced for the head of the preschool, who uses the documentation as a foundation when producing an annual report directed to the municipal authority. It might also (indirectly, through the annual report from the head) be subject to scrutiny of the Swedish School Inspectorate, as part of their quality audits. Thus, the documentation has more than one purpose. The documentation is made as an ongoing process, and not as a finished product. The documentation has no clear end; it may never end up in a completely finished product with a specific recipient, except as a basis for the annual report. Instead, it is used continuously in the preschool practice, being written and rewritten.

However, at certain points of the year the documentation could be seen as an evaluation of what has been accomplished so far.

Analysing the Empirical Material

When the researcher is entangled with the research material, how can one part of the entanglement separate from it to analyse another part? Gunnarsson (2015) solves this through a ‘tracing engagement’ (p. 71), and Bodén (2016) through ‘engagements with questions’ (p. 62), engaging, respectively, with events and questions, to temporarily cut apart the entanglement of researcher and researched. Others use diffractive analysis ‘as an embodied engagement with the materiality of research data: a becoming-with the data as researcher’ (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 265) or reading texts through each other (see e.g. Ceder, 2016).

In this thesis, the analyses involve both material and discursive elements. The analyses also include the whole research process, that is, the research apparatus, from encountering the topic of the study to writing this thesis. One part of the analyses is about handling the empirical materials in different ways. In the documentation production part of the study this includes, for example, viewing video recordings, transcribing, and making drawings and figures. The products of documentation part of the study includes reading the documentation, printing and cutting it, making word clouds and so on (further described below).

The respective analyses were done through processes that could be compared to how a chemist separates different materials in different ways, such as through distillation, decanting, filtering or magnetism. What comes out of these different ways of separating depends on the method. Distillation produces a separation of volatile liquids, and decanting and filtering separate solid particles from liquids, while magnetism separates out magnetic materials. The outcome of the separation depends not only on the equipment used and the skills of the chemist but also on the materials involved; for example, magnetism is useless in separating liquids, and liquids and solutions require different methods for separation according to the kind of liquid or solution that is present. Thus, the analysis depends on the empirical material, on the research questions and on the researcher, in short: on the research apparatus. Although some actions in the respective parts of the study (on production and on products) are similar, there are also differences. To enable the reader to follow the process, they are therefore presented separately in the following text.

Analysing Production of Documentation

The study of production of documentation focuses on relations between teachers, children and material objects. As presented above, the video recordings and the researcher encountered each other in several ways; the videos playing and the researcher-me viewing and listening led to the writing and drawing in connection with the visual

and aural observations. The engagements with the video recordings focused on how human and non-human agents engaged in producing documentation, or on the apparatus of producing documentation, with a specific focus on how this produced children's participation in the documentation practices. This could include instances where teachers asked for children's opinions or instances where children initiated or refused to do something, which the teacher responded to or ignored. Furthermore, the focus was also on instances where things, such as toys, children's crafts or computers in some way impinged on (e.g. changed or initiated) children's actions. In addition, these engagements with the video recordings alternated with my reading of literature.

The transcriptions were printed and sentences and shorter sections of text physically cut out. The sentences and sections of text were disassembled, sorted and resorted, and coded into different themes, which were constructed and reconstructed over and over again. However, coding does not agree with agential realism or posthumanism, since it implies that the researcher is separate from the researched object. Coding also 'ignores the entanglements of language and matter, words and things' (MacLure, 2013). Still, coding, although moving the researcher away from the empirical material, also means familiarisation, entangling the researcher in it, making it possible to experiment and even play with the material, enabling the researcher to see things in new perspectives (MacLure, 2013). In this study, the task of coding and constructing themes is seen as part of the process of analysis, not as a way to find out what the empirical material *actually* reveals. Reading, coding, viewing, making drawings and so on could be thought of as waves of activities not unlike diffraction: diverse ways of engaging with the material that produce patterns of difference.

The various ways of handling the empirical material could be seen as asking different questions of it (cf. Bodén, 2016), which produced different insights. For example, focusing on conditions for children's participation in the documentation practice produced an emphasis on the products of documentation: the piece of paper, the binder that would hold the papers and the walls on which the paper were stuck. Focusing instead on teachers' and children's actions produced, respectively, an emphasis on how teachers posed questions to children, or how they followed, doubted or played with children, and an emphasis on how children verbalised, played, resisted or took part in producing documents. MacLure (2013) points out that coding almost always results in some features being left out – features that do not fit in anywhere. Some examples of this are that focusing on conditions excluded teachers' actions, focusing on teachers' actions excluded children's actions and focusing on what children were doing excluded what teachers were doing.

When the different insights (presented above) met, new questions arose, and it struck me that children's participation in documentation practices was in some situations very physical; it

entailed pushing buttons, fetching papers, putting papers into plastic pockets and then into binders, drawing and so on. It was about engaging with different things, such as pencils, crayons, scissors, sticky dots, printers and computer keyboards. In many situations it was also about producing something, such as a drawing or a printed document. MacLure (2013, p. 175) puts it this way: ‘During the process of coding, some things gradually grow, or glow, into greater significance than others, and become the preoccupations around which thought and writing cluster.’ Thus, the things that glowed to me were, precisely, things (such as the ones mentioned above).

The analysis then focused on the intra-actions of teachers, children and objects and on what was happening between them. This is more obvious in article 2 than in article 1. Initially, I was not as familiar with the posthumanist perspective, which means that the slightly different perspectives in articles 1 and 2 are an indication of how the research apparatus emerged. One way of trying to place the focus *in between* the entities was to use a drawing (which is further presented and discussed in *Producing Intra-visuals*, see also Figure 10). This drawing facilitated focusing on something other than separate entities, namely, what was happening in the in-between, the verbs; this means that the drawing was also active in producing a different (diffractive?) way of looking at a video recorded situation.

Analysing Products of Documentation

To study the products of documentation means engaging with different kinds of documents, such as the PPT files, templates and models, policy texts and research. Rather than representing a reality that already exists in the studied preschool, the documents are producing a reality *and* being produced simultaneously, similar to how this thesis is producing a reality while also being produced. This means that they form an apparatus of the products of documentation, where documents, models and templates are considered not only as things but also as practices. As mentioned above, when everything is entangled with everything else, for one part of the entanglement (the researcher) to be able to know something about another part (here, the documents), a certain kind of research process is needed. For this part of the study, especially in article 3, a diffractive methodology (Barad, 2007) was used. In this thesis, diffractive reading consists of the process of handling and reading the PPT files in different ways, reading them through different texts (cf. Ceder, 2016; Mazzei, 2014), through a local template, a national model and previous research, focusing on what is produced. This reading produced certain specific knowledge that emerged through the in-between of the researcher-me and the research object (see Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010). However, by not trying to find ‘hidden truths’ but instead seeing the knowledge as produced by intra-actions, the analyses focus on the differences that emerge when the documentation is handled and read through other documents rather than establishing what the documentation ‘really is’.

Thus, what comes out of reading the documentation diffractively, together with other texts, leads in different directions, spreading thoughts and knowledge (Mazzei, 2014). By making word clouds,²⁰ counting words, printing, cutting out pieces and putting them together again, quite similarly to how the transcripts of the video recordings were handled (see above), I physically ‘played’ and experimented with the documents, and simultaneously, they ‘played’ with me. Through this ‘play’, opportunities to see things in multiple ways emerged. For example, the initial encounter between me, the PPT files, and the local template produced certain aspects as central. With these aspects in mind, I also read the curriculum, the national guidelines, and previous research, all of which became entangled in the research process, producing new insights. Thus, diffraction helps by highlighting how documentation is entangled with templates and different texts. The digital format facilitated the diffractive engagement with the documentation. Thus, it mattered that the documentation was produced as PPT files, since this enabled handling it in ways that otherwise would have been difficult or impossible. For example, selecting and counting words would have been a lot more difficult if all of the documentation had been kept as papers in binders, as was the case in Unit One. When choosing words to count, the initial focus, I at first concentrated on those that could be connected to education or care, since they are important areas in the Swedish preschool curriculum (Skolverket, 2016c). I then focused on the most frequent words in the different PPT files.

One example of how diffraction guided the analysis is when two different focuses in the documentation (on teachers and on children) met and produced questions about how the documentation relates to preschool quality. On the one hand, from an initial reading the documents seemed to focus primarily on what teachers did. The following example comes from the template, from a slide titled *Evaluation* (my translation):

- Did it turn out as planned? What surprised us?
- What kind of changed knowledge did we see during the thematic work? Explain, how do we know this?
- What did we learn? How do we apply our knowledge?
- What are the children interested in and which learning processes are they in? Explain, how do we see this?
- How can we challenge the children further?

These questions are supposed to guide the teachers towards documenting the evaluation of a part of the practice. The questions focus mainly on teacher’s work, whether the plan was followed, how

²⁰ This was done by inserting text into word cloud-generating software such as wordle.net and worditout.com.

they could see the 'changed knowledge' (in children), what the teachers learned and so on.

On the other hand, although most the PPT files had several photos, only a few of them depicted teachers. In addition, in the word clouds the word ‘children’ (*barnen*) stood out in all of the documents from the groups. Figure 4 presents the result of pasting the texts from all eight groups into the word cloud generator:

Figure 4. Word cloud from all groups (from www.wordle.net).

From this starting point, other texts were also included in the analysis: national guidelines, the curriculum and previous research. This is further discussed in article 3.

In addition to exploring their substance or details in different ways, the PPT files were also examined in a physical sense, for example, looking at the kinds of physical content (such as text and photos) that were included. In the diffractive reading *photos* as well as *text* were involved. It also involved *reading* as well as *playing* with the documents as described above (making word clouds, cutting and assembling pieces of text, and so on). As in the study of documentation production, this also included making drawings. Also in this part of the study, questions were asked of the empirical material, for example: Since the PPT files, through the chosen perspective, can be seen as both a part of and as one of the entities (and/or practices) producing systematic quality work, what consequences can diffractive reading have for what is produced as preschool quality in the studied documentation?

In article 4 *spacetime mattering* (Barad, 2007) is forwarded as an analytical concept for studying these documents. Documentation is seen as entangled in space and time, such as when and where to conduct it, and with different materials, such as camera, computers, papers and pencils. The documents are read as enactments rather than as representations (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), which means that what can be known is based on what is produced through intra-actions of the researcher/research process and the documentation. Thus, this reading of the documentation is an important part of the research apparatus, as is its digital format. The concept of

spacetime mattering is used to enable exploration of how preschool systematic quality documentation is entangled with a number of practices – with previous thoughts and practices in preschool documentation, *and* with how preschools are thought of as producing education and care for a future generation, *and also* with the kinds of places, practices and things that are presently involved in its production. Another way of putting it is that the physical *space* of the preschool, in which thoughts and practices are embedded,²¹ connects to past, present and future *times*, as well as to material-discursive aspects of policy texts and templates, which all *matter* for the production of preschool quality development documentation.

Producing Intra-visuals

The term intra-visuals does not refer to what is within visuals; rather, the term is used (very) tentatively in analogy with how, for example, Bodén (2016) uses intraview as a way of weaving together the concepts interview and intra-action (Barad, 2007). Thus, intra-visuals refer to the way that visuals serve as a way of doing diffractive analysis.

‘An image is never just an image. Images are always situated in time, space and cultural/historic conditions’ (Sparrman, 2005, p. 253). Just as in this quote, images play an important part in different ways in this thesis. They are part of the empirical material and therefore also of the research apparatus. The empirical material consists of images in the form of video recordings of the production of documentation, and of photos and other images within the documentation products. Also, the slides of PPT files are in Swedish referred to as ‘*bilder*’ (images). These images become intra-visuals through the intra-actions of the research apparatus. Intra-visuals are also produced by making drawings from the video recordings and photos in the documentation. Initially, this was a way of describing or illustrating body language, positions and artefacts from the video recordings, as a way of presenting situations visually without revealing identities (Flewitt, 2006). However, through the research process this changed into seeing the drawings more as analytical devices, as research material and also as involved in or intertwined with the research process (or apparatus), as intra-visuals.

Attending a workshop by Knight (2015), at the *Summer Institute in Qualitative Research* at Manchester Metropolitan University in the UK in July 2015, further inspired me to view drawing as a kind of analytical experimentation. Knight believes that there are interesting similarities between her way of using drawing as a research method and, for example, a theoretical physicist working with equations and processes on a board. At the workshop she remarked that there is a similar physical engagement; both create some kinds of figures and images on a surface. This challenges and

²¹ Sometimes also referred to as embedded in the walls of the preschool (Ekholm & Hedin, 1993).

poses questions about which kinds of activities are seen as research and which are not. Also, the question of whether it is possible for researchers to make use of artistic methods, such as drawing, without being artistically skilled indicates that there is only one way to look at all kinds of artistic activity (Knight, Mc Ardle, Cumming, Bone, Li, Peterken, & Ridgway, 2015). Seeing drawing solely as a form of art might be similar to ‘judging all writing as poetry irrespective of its intention’ (Knight et al., 2016, p. 322). Instead, it is important not to compare the way researchers make use of artistic expression to artistic work, but to recognise that, for example, drawing can function in different ways and be seen as one of many methods that can be used in research (Knight et al., 2015; Knight et al., 2016).

One way that intra-visuals function in the research process is in how the drawing mentioned above²² was produced (see Figure 10). This drawing might in conventional terms be seen as representing a setting in a preschool situation. However, by exploring how this drawing emerged, through a series of drawings, I argue that it (and they) plays an important part in the production of the study in article 2, rather than representing an actual situation. The intra-visuals take departure in a video clip from the Zebra group in preschool A, in which a wall, six chairs, four children, a laptop, a projector, a researcher, a video camera, the floor and two teachers are involved.

In the first drawing (Figure 5) a transcript of the dialogue and some of the actions involved in the setting, in a (conventionally) numbered list, is placed within a drawing (unconventionally?) of one person sitting on the floor and two persons on high chairs.

Figure 5. The first drawing produced as ‘intra-visuals’.

²² In the subsections titled *Video Recording and Analysing Production of Documentation*.

Utterances belonging to the persons are placed close to their respective depictions. This presentation of the setting can be seen as representational and also as anthropocentric, focusing on pictures of individual humans (even if these are not lifelike) and on their dialogue, attempting to show parts of the setting. As an attempt to try to see this otherwise, the drawings are then erased in the second drawing (Figure 6). Descriptions of actions are now inserted in boxes. Using names instead of drawings does not change much, if the drawing is seen as representation; the focus remains on humans as names, and on the dialogue inserted in speech bubbles instead of as a numbered list. However, the difference between dialogue and actions is emphasised due to their respective graphical presentation: Words in rounded speech bubbles and actions in boxes. The actions are differentiated from the actors, and begin to come forward, little by little.

Figure 6. The second drawing.

In the third drawing (Figure 7) the researcher and some material objects are added. Persons are still named, and part of the dialogue remains, but the laptop, the projector, the photo on the wall and the researcher are now included. The names of the humans are written next to grey circles. The words 'laptop computer' and 'projector hanging from ceiling' are inserted in black boxes. Inserted in white boxes are a description of the content of a photo and an action belonging to one person. The action of the projector is further accentuated by being inserted in a grey arrow in the centre of the drawing. This drawing includes the researcher and material objects as parts of the setting; they are not as separate as they are in the previous drawings. In addition, actions themselves are differentiated,

and one of them, belonging to the projector, is emphasised more than the others.

Figure 7. The third drawing.

The fourth drawing (Figure 8) completely lacks words; instead, drawings of projectors, laptops, human-like figures and a photo on the wall are placed on both sides of a curved line, which loops from left to right and back again several times.

Figure 8. The fourth drawing.

This drawing helped me to focus on actors and on the flows between them rather than on words: the laptop producing a signal to the projector → producing a photo on the wall → producing an utterance of a child → producing an utterance from the teacher → producing an utterance from a child → producing an action of the teacher on the laptop → producing a signal to the projector. . . and so on. This drawing operates as a way to become aware of actions instead of words and dialogue, and as a way of more actively including also material objects, such as the computer and the laptop.

The fifth drawing (Figure 9) produces and makes the actions visible as a main focus, both to me as researcher and to a presumptive reader. This drawing contains words, but the dialogue is removed; humans are still (re)presented as circles (labelled teacher, children and researcher) and the digital devices as black boxes. The word 'image' is written in a large rectangle. Actions are written in grey arrows, single and double, indicating in which direction the actions might flow. Humans (circles) are still differentiated from the digital devices (rectangles), but the emphasis in the drawing is more on what lies in between them than on the humans and non-humans themselves.

Figure 9. The fifth drawing.

Finally, the sixth drawing (Figure 10) can be seen as a way of clarifying the drawing to the reader. The difference between human and non-human actors is slightly reduced by using the same colour: all actors are depicted in black. Also, a difference in the size of the dots distinguishes the adults from the children. A differentiation is added to the arrows: they are darker according to the significance of

the actions for the analysis, in order to make it clear what the analysis in article 2 focuses on.

The emergence of Figure 10, through the series of different drawings, is thus part of the research process rather than representing an actual setting in the preschool. The intra-visuals originate in the setting, but are translated and transformed through a process of making the different drawings, which affected my thoughts and made it possible to see something that was not immediately obvious. The drawings helped me to shift focus from an emphasis on human dialogue to one on actions, or rather, intra-actions, between human and non-human actors. Using drawing enabled a way of seeing things otherwise, to solve the problem of focusing on intra-action in ways that would be more or less impossible through words and language (McNiff, 2008).

Figure 10. The sixth drawing.

By seeing the drawings as performative agents rather than as representations (of a ‘real’ reality as well as representing the video recordings), it is possible to shed light on how they intra-act with the researcher and with the written text: they become intra-visuals. In line with the posthumanist approach, in which it is important not to take entities involved in the research for granted beforehand, drawings are used as a way of working with the empirical material. Pictures are sometimes used in research texts for illustration or clarification. The way that the drawings in the articles of this thesis are used could be seen as something similar, and initially they were, but through the research process, they became performative agents. In resisting the idea of representation, the drawings need to be discussed.

Connecting to Ethics

In this section, ethical concerns involved with the study will be discussed. The ethical concerns or problems of the present study can be seen on two levels. One level connects to general ethical requirements for research in relation to the (human) participants in the study. To ensure that participants are not harmed in any way, that their integrity is protected and that they are aware of what they are agreeing to participate in, it is necessary to follow requirements from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). This concerns human participants and produces clear boundaries between the researcher and the subject(s) of the research. When regulatory ethical requirements have been met, the research is considered to be ethical.

The other level concerns the posthumanist approach in which ethics is not just about approval and concerns for individuals, but also entangled in, and an integral part of, the research process; because of the entanglements of the world it is not possible for anyone or anything to stand aside of it and look at something (Barad, 2007). Seeing the world as entangled, the researcher and the researched (whether human or non-human) as parts of the same only intra-actively and temporarily separated, calls for other ways of thinking about ethics. Rather than, once and for all and from a distance, establishing the research as ethical, constantly being *of* the world means that ethical considerations never end: ‘[a] delicate tissue of ethicality runs through the marrow of being’ (Barad, 2007, p. 396). The intertwined relation of ethics, knowing and being is termed ‘ethico-onto-epistem-ology’ by Barad (2007, p. 185). This highlights that being, knowing and ethics are inseparable. We cannot exist without knowing. This entanglement also means that we cannot ‘merely observe the universe without disturbing it’ (Barad, 2007, p. 386), that is, that there is no starting point from which to begin thinking with ethics; instead, being always/already entangled means that ethics needs to be always present in the cuts that produce certain knowledge.

The chapter has three subsections in which, respectively, entangled ethics, ethical vetting and informing the participants are presented and discussed.

Entangled Ethics

This is a different way of thinking about ethics, in which ethics is more than asking for permission to video record children or engage with documentation from teachers. Ethics is also about considering that the ways that, for example, preschool documentation is studied and written about matter. It is to ‘be aware of how the agential cuts produce a specific version of the phenomenon and to take responsibility for the fact that the world is materialised differently through different practices’ (Bodén, 2016, p. 48). It includes being responsible for the kind of reality that the research apparatus produces, building on previous research traditions but also

questioning them (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). This means that this thesis builds on previous research on preschool documentation and systematic quality development work and, through the lens of agential realism, studies how diverse ways of approaching documentation in preschool can produce children's participation and elements of preschool quality differently.

For this study in particular this means that the preschool teacher experiences of preschool documentation, as presented in the initial chapter, as well as from reading preschool documentation in an earlier assignment (see *Preschools B–E* above), connect with the present study and how the study is conducted. The experiences and encounters (or intra-actions) that produce this study also connect with what the study becomes. For the researcher-me this means that, being one agential part of the research apparatus and of preschool, entangled with, for example, teachers, children, things and templates, ethics is also about responsibility towards all of these. Responsibility here is about inviting the response of the other (Barad, 2012), which might be human as well as non-human, and it is always entangled with everything else. However, rather than being responsible *for* the other, it is instead about '*response-ability with others*' (Thiele, 2014, p. 213) (emphasis in original). Thus, it is about making it possible also for teachers, children, things and templates to respond *with* the study and to open up to ways that the preschool documentation can become different. This means that in this study an openness towards what might emerge through the production and analysis of the empirical material was crucial. This is apparent in the example presented in the subsection above, titled *Analysing Products of Documentation*. Playing with word cloud generators produced the word 'children' as significant, even though the texts promoted teachers' actions. Thus, the ethical way of addressing this was to be responsible *with* the word cloud and the texts, and proceed to inquire how this word was significant.

Ethical responsibility, in posthumanist terms, is not finished when all possible actions around information and consent have been undertaken. Nevertheless, this thesis is included in a bigger research apparatus, consisting of the overall research community, which stipulates what an ethical approach to the (human) research participants should look like, and what needs to be done to meet the ethical requirements. Therefore, the following subsections will primarily present how the study deals with the ethical requirements of the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002), and establish how they are met.

Ethical Vetting

Since the video recording of the documentation *production* involves young children, to ensure that it was conducted in an ethical way in relation to the children, this part of the study was vetted and approved by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Linköping (www.epn.se). Focusing on the *products* of documentation, which

emphasise preschool practice rather than individual children, raises ethical questions of a different kind than studies involving children more directly. Documentation of systematic quality development work includes children, but will, according to my previous experiences as a preschool teacher, in most cases not focus on them as individuals. But how is it possible to distinguish between the emphasis on preschool practice, on the one hand, and the focus on individual children, on the other, if, for example, there are identifiable children in photos in the documents? Would this also require informed consent from parents and children? How can focusing on documentation of preschool systematic quality development work be said to exclude involving the children? Children *are* involved, but not as individuals, since the study focuses on products of documentation that do not focus on individual children, and on the products of documentation in relation to templates not primarily on its content. This means that the study of documentation products does not focus on, or involve, children directly. This part of the study was therefore not considered for ethical vetting. Nevertheless, certain measures were taken to follow the ethical requirements for research, which will be further described below.

Informing Participants

Before the video recording in preschool A started, the teachers (Appendix 3) and the parents (Appendix 4) received letters to sign if they consented to their or their children's participation in the study. Young children are in a vulnerable position and dependent on their caretakers; therefore it is considered necessary that the caretakers are asked for consent on behalf of the children. Since 'information about the study should be written so that the child can understand it.' (Hermerén, 2011, p. 43), a pamphlet (Appendix 5) directed to the children in Preschool A was produced. The pamphlet explains what a researcher is, what research is about and what the researcher is doing at their preschool. It also explains ethics and makes it clear that children can say no to participating in the study at any time. The pamphlet was distributed together with the letter to the parents, to be read at home with the children. Copies were also given to the teachers, to be used in the preschool with the children.

The teachers explained to the children that video recordings were going to be made during discussion about photos viewed on the computer. In research in the field of early childhood education, ethical issues concerning children in research are crucial. But is it possible to obtain informed consent from a young child? Asking the caretakers for consent on behalf of the child and not asking for children's own consent might produce a view of children as objects of study (Mayne & Howitt, 2015). However, parents are sometimes asked for informed consent, while children instead are asked for *assent* (Dockett, Einarsdottir, & Perry, 2009). Some researchers, such as Mayne and Howitt (2015), ask for a more respectful research

culture in which children are listened to and their voices acknowledged. The Preschool A children, being used to photographing and video recording, might not be cautious about being filmed. The entrance into this preschool of the researcher-me, with a camera and notepad, *and* as an adult helping with shoelaces and buttons and playing board games, might be viewed by the children in the same way as any adult taking part in or visiting the preschool. Dockett et al. (2009) mentions that children sometimes agree to participate when an authority figure asks them to, even if they are not all that eager to do so. Since the documents provided to the teachers and parents allowed the researcher-me to enter the preschool, the children might be inclined to agree to participate as well. Still, during the visits to preschool A, the children were repeatedly asked whether they would allow the camera to video record them, and they accepted.

During the video recording in preschool A, the children often came up and looked into the video camera, sometimes they 'acted' in front of the camera, often by saying hello or by making funny faces towards the camera, and towards their friends and me looking into the camera from the other side. The camera invited the children to take part in the production of their becoming photographers or 'actors'. This can be compared to Sparrman (2005), who found that children in her study sometimes danced and acted in front of the video camera. Sparrman understood this as children's ways of making the camera's presence understandable and as their awareness of the cultural meaning of video cameras as things that produce, for example, music videos.

The problem of how to properly inform the participants not only concerns children but also applies to adults. In the study of documentation products, several steps were made to resolve this. As described above (in the subsection titled *Connecting with Documents*), meetings were held with the heads of preschool and with the pedagogical leaders of each group, in which they were informed about the project and invited to ask questions. Each group was also offered second visits, should they wish for more information. A letter was prepared with information and a consent form to sign if the teachers agreed to participate in the study (Appendix 6). By these measures, the teachers were given information and also opportunities to ask further questions and time to make up their minds (see Oliver, 2010). Although the verbal information was presented to groups of teachers, the question of possible group pressure on individual teachers is not addressed. One way of dealing with this might be to inform every participant individually about the right to refuse and withdraw participation. This way every presumptive participant would have an opportunity to individually ask questions about the research as well as about their participation. However, each teacher received a personal information letter and consent form, and the offer to return to each group was opened up to individual contact, had someone so wished.

According to previous experiences (from reading documentation in a previous assignment, as described in the subsection titled *Preschools B–E* above), the kinds of documentation products found in this part of the study do not normally contain sensitive information about individuals and are therefore not harmful to anyone's integrity. However, the documentation is being written for purposes other than research. Moreover, unlike the situation of an interview, there is no chance of explaining a statement. The teacher's formulations in the documents might be seen as personal. Furthermore, as this is a relatively new practice to them, introduced in 2012 (Skolverket, 2012), teachers might feel a little sensitive about giving their documentation up for a study. The teachers might also be wary about whether their documentation would be assessed and valued in the study. To resolve this, the focus on the models and templates was emphasised in the information to the teachers (see Appendix 6).

Going Through the Articles

This chapter presents the four articles comprising the thesis. As previously mentioned, the first two articles focus on the *production* of documentation, while the second two focus on documentation *products*. Articles 1 and 2 are also part of a licentiate thesis (Elfström Pettersson, 2014), article 1 in the published version, and article 2 in a previous version. Article 2 has since then also been published. The four articles cover different parts of the documentation process, from producing material for systematic quality development work to the compilation and analysis of it in the products. In a final subsection, the articles are summarised.

The articles are presented chronologically, in the order in which they were written (and published, when this is the case). This makes it possible to follow how the research questions and the theoretical approach emerged. The research questions initially emphasised how things and practices affect the ways children participate in documentation production; this changed to an emphasis on the involvement of templates for the documentation product. The slight shift in theoretical approach and the style of writing also produces how the researcher-me changed. For example, the first article indicates an emphasis that is more anthropocentric than that of the fourth article. The posthumanist approach is emphasised more in the later articles than in the earlier, as a sign of the researcher's learning process and growing insights into this theoretical approach.

Article 1 – Children's Participation in Preschool Documentation Practices

The first article explores how children participate in the production of documentation and what can happen when they do. Questions were asked about what actions are involved in constructing children's participation in documentation production and what agents are active in this construction. The study was conducted through engaging with video recordings of situations in which teachers and children were involved with different kinds of documentation practices in one preschool. The video recordings were analysed by making and engaging with drawings, and with transcribed dialogue between teachers and children. The drawings in this article depict physical positions of teachers, children and objects

from the documentation situation, rather than functioning as intra-visuals (see the section titled *Producing Intra-visuals*). In addition, comparisons between placement and postures of teachers and children were made in order to discuss how these postures were not always indicative of supporting children's participation. However, whilst not being aware at that moment of how drawings might be used as intra-visuals, by making them, certain thoughts and insights probably did appear, which otherwise would not have.

The answers to the questions asked in this article include that the products of documentation, such as drawings, photographs or documents including text and photos were produced as important. Actions involved were, for example, relations between teachers' and children's physical positions, handling objects such as a toy lion and paper crafts, physically moving a child on a chair closer to the computer and the teacher providing photos of interest to the child. The latter produced an entirely different kind of documentation than expected, through the intra-actions of the documentation situation, including the teacher, the computer and the child; instead of documenting a crafting activity, it became a story about a vampire.

One main point in this article is that a number of things and actions are involved in constructing children's participation and influence in producing documentation. The article lists what to document, differences in teachers' and children's agendas, children's interests, teachers' flexibility and the notion of what documentation is as being more important for children's participation than which form or method (and its respective theoretical underpinning) for documentation is used. Thus, the main argument of this article concerns the mismatch of the theoretical connotations of the documentation approaches (portfolio and Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation) and their respective implications for children's participation. Although pedagogical documentation with inspiration from Reggio Emilia is often considered a means for enabling children's participation and influence (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000), this article produces an argument that this may not always be the case. However, although the article mentioned bodily positions, children's crafts, paper documents and digital images as important, in the conclusions they were not (yet) suggested as affecting children's participation.

In this first article non-human entities could be considered to 'knock on the door', to try to enter the inquiry into children's participation in producing preschool documentation. The methods for, and products of, documentation tried to enter the scene, but did not succeed altogether. Between the first and second articles a number of material agents found their way into the inquiry, and it became impossible not to take account of them.

Article 2 – Sticky Dots and Lion Adventures Playing a Part in Preschool Documentation Practices

Article 2 explores how material objects influence documentation practices, specifically, how intra-action of different kinds of material agents produces children's participation in the production of preschool documentation. Focusing on intra-actions of children, teachers and material objects and on what they produce, questions are asked about what happens when material objects are seen as agentic. There are also questions about how the documentation practice is produced through intra-action of children, teachers and materiality, and about what governs children's participation in preschool documentation.

Engaging with theories of governmentality (Foucault, 1980), documentality (Steyerl, 2003), and agential realism (Barad, 2007), the article emphasises children's participation as produced between teachers, children and other material agents. Video recordings of documentation situations involving products of documentation, tools used in documentation activities, teachers and children are analysed in this article. Engaging with written descriptions, transcribed dialogue and the drawing presented in the section above titled *Producing Intra-visuals* (see Figure 10), the analysis focuses on intra-actions of the material agents, including children and teachers, and what they produce. This article also finds that pedagogical documentation does not automatically endorse giving children a voice, but that enabling children to participate in documentation practices is a more complex affair. Instead, photographs projected on a wall became involved in power relations and in controlling what the children could talk about. Moreover, adhesive labels, or 'sticky dots', were involved in producing documentation as valuable in different ways, for teachers and children. In the conclusions, the article emphasises the importance of taking account of materiality involved in the documentation practice. The photographs and sticky dots played an important part in forming prerequisites for how children were able to participate in producing documentation. They made documentation important, but in different ways, to teachers and children, respectively.

Thus, in this second article material agents such as projected photographs and sticky dots became active agents together with teachers and children in the production of preschool documentation. Computers, photographs and dots, rather than the documentation method used, played an important part in children's participation in producing documentation. Hence, the non-humans were on their way, entering confidently into the study. However, the intra-actions described in the article were those that took place within the video-recorded activity. This means that an agential cut was made between the events of the activity, and the researcher and video camera. Although the researcher connected to the preschool and the activities

through, and together with, the video camera, the text of the article focused mainly on what was going on in front of the researcher and camera, and not on what was going on between the researcher-with-camera and the preschool activity. Thus, what was going on between children, teachers, laptop, projector and image was cut together (included), while the researcher and video camera were cut apart (excluded) from it, in this text. Still, the article could, in itself (and together with the video camera), also be seen as cutting the researcher together with the preschool activity.

Article 3 – Teachers’ Actions and Children’s Interests: Quality Becomings in Preschool Documentation

The third article argues that what preschool quality becomes has to do with the kinds of models, templates or measures involved. The article examines how a local template and a national model play a part, and produce elements of quality, in documentation of preschool systematic quality development work. Through a posthumanist agential realist approach (Barad 2003, 2007), the article focuses on documentation made by preschool teachers in eight preschool groups using the same local template, which was an adaptation from the model provided by the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2015). The analysis is conducted through asking what consequences diffractive reading of the PPT documentation from the groups can have for how preschool quality is produced. This diffractive reading involved photos as well as text, and reading, handling and ‘playing’ with the PPT files and other texts.

The article argues that preschool quality cannot be established once and for all. Instead, it finds it important to account for the different practices and entities that are involved in documentation of systematic quality development work, and thus produce elements of quality. Through reading the documentation diffractively, teachers’ actions and children’s interests were produced as two aspects of preschool quality. The article discusses a couple of consequences of using a template when documenting, such as whether the findings of the study were the main concerns in these groups or whether they were produced by the template. It also discusses whether the focus on children’s interests might promote certain children’s interests whilst obscuring others’. The article concludes that the models and local templates that are used in preschool documentation play a significant part in producing and forwarding certain aspects as preschool quality and that it is important to consider the means and methods by which preschool quality is supposed to be evaluated.

This third article takes departure in the idea that models and templates are not neutral and passive, but instead, they are active in producing elements of quality in preschool documentation. The argument is that it is important to take into account the measures that are involved when measuring, or alternatively, perhaps, construct-

ing, quality. In this way, questions about how quality is produced, rather than, for example, how it is measured, can be posed. Teacher's actions and children's interests were here produced as elements of quality.

Article 4 – Security and Water Themes: How Documentation Produces Rather than Represents Preschool Quality

The fourth and last article explores how a template for documentation of preschool systematic quality development work participates actively in producing elements of quality. Considering documentation as enactment rather than as representation, the article discusses how the template connects with preschool traditions, policy texts and documentation, and what this produces as elements of preschool quality. For this study, connections were made with documentation from one of the eight preschool groups in article 3.

Read through the concept of *spacetime mattering* (Barad, 2007), the template, and the documents produced within it, entangles with different material agents, space and time. The content (discourse) and design (materiality) of the template produce thematic work as an inevitable element of preschool quality. Due to a change in thematic focus, the documentation in the studied group stood out from the others and produced a curiosity in me that led to it becoming the focus of this article. Aside from thematic work being produced as an inevitable element of preschool quality, the study also produces education and care, with a slight emphasis on education, as becoming important elements of quality in the documentation from this group. The documentation from the studied group started out with a theme connected to care (security), as a way of trying to induce a feeling of safety and security in newcomers to the preschool. Despite a strong indication from the template that a theme should last for a whole school year, the theme of this group changed. The second theme (water) was related to knowledge and was produced as the 'actual' or 'real' theme. Thus, in the documentation studied, an aspect of care became a subject for the theme, while an educational subject evolved later. The article also problematises the production of care as a theme, which might increase the dichotomy between education and care, cutting them together and apart.

Thus, in this article a template is strongly agentic, and rather than representing preschool quality, it produces thematic work as an inevitable part of documentation and preschool quality. The template is also an active part in producing aspects of care (the feeling of security and safety) and education (related to water) as subjects for the theme. By using the concept *spacetime mattering*, questions were posed about how the documentation connects to, entangles with and is produced by previous as well as present preschool traditions and by connections to ideas from other places. The article points out how

this matters for what is produced in the documentation of one preschool group.

Summarising the Articles

The two first articles deal with children's participation in preschool documentation practices. They argue that the possibility for children's participation does not necessarily relate to the documentation methods, but that it instead connects to and is produced through intra-actions of a number of different entities. As the section *Pedagogical Documentation* above points out, it is often argued that methods such as (Reggio Emilia-inspired) pedagogical documentation will endorse giving children a voice and enable children's participation and influence (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). However, the first and second articles of this thesis argue that this is not always true. In preschool A, in producing documentation, and through the specific research apparatus engaged in this study, children's participation was produced as detached from the respective approaches to documentation in the two groups. Thus, the two first articles of the thesis produce preschool documentation as practices that have a possibility of enabling children's participation in the production of documentation, irrespective of whether it attaches to Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation or not. Intra-actions of a number of material agents, of the practice, of the teachers and children, are entangled in the ways that the children within this study are involved in the production of documentation.

Whilst the two first articles explore the *production* of documentation, the two latter articles focus on the *products* of documentation of systematic quality development work. In the first two articles the focus on material agents in the (apparatus of the) production of documentation opens up a space for studying how material agents are also entangled in other parts of preschool documentation practices, or in other documentation apparatuses. Since the production of pedagogical documentation can be seen as a starting point for, or one part of, systematic quality development work, a curiosity arose about another part of this work, about the products of documentation. The two latter articles deal with what is produced through intra-action of entities such as local templates and documentation of systematic quality development work made within these templates; in short: it deals with the apparatus of documentation *products*. These articles challenge the notion of documentation as representation and argue that certain elements of quality are produced through intra-action of different entities such as models, templates, space and time. Teachers' actions, children's interests (or

in(tra)ests²³) and thematic work, focusing on care and education, are in these articles produced as important elements of quality.

Taken together, the four articles produce knowledge about how documentation is produced between entities such as teachers, children, things, and preschool practices and spaces. Departing from considering material entities as active agents, the articles show how a number of entities participate in preschool documentation and what is produced through this. They show how children's participation in *production* of documentation does not depend on which documentation method is used, but that it is produced through intra-action of several active agents, such as children, teachers, computers, photos, sticky dots and toy lions. The articles also show how the *products* of documentation, intra-acting with a local template, with past and present preschool traditions and policies, produce rather than represent certain elements of quality, such as teachers' actions, children's interests and thematic work. Thus, quality is here not an entity that can be easily captured, made visible or measured; rather, it is an entity that is produced through intra-actions of a specific documentation apparatus. The articles also produce knowledge about how the focus of preschool documentation shifts away from individual children towards emphasising teachers' activities and creates possibilities for what pre-school practices and quality may become.

²³ Playing with the words intra-action and interest produced the word in(tra)est which points to interest as something produced between children and their environment rather than as inherent in them.

Arriving at a Discussion

Observation and documentation were some of the tasks I performed, in a number of ways, while working as a preschool teacher. To observe and document was sometimes obvious, and at other times questioned, as were the methods and devices that we used. For example, after using puzzle charts for a long time, we decided to revamp them. They seemed outdated and did not cover all areas of children's development, we thought. During the process of trying to update them, we suddenly realised that they were actually not applicable at all. How, for example, could you describe children's social development in steps? Were the puzzles not extremely normalising, after all? By trying to find a simple and time-saving method of documentation, we almost fell into the trap of going against our own values. With some embarrassment and without further discussion, we ensured that the puzzles were quickly destroyed. Obviously, we had been influenced by earlier ideas of how and what to document and were looking for useful templates that would ease the burden of the inevitable paperwork. But this almost caused us to violate our ideals and our views on children as active and competent.

The apparatus of preschool documentation of systematic quality development work was in the section titled *Phenomena, Apparatuses and Intra-action* presented as an overarching apparatus which produces different kinds of phenomena that in turn become apparatuses (in the present study). Thus, the apparatus of preschool documentation and the research apparatus of this thesis produce the apparatuses of the *production* of documentation and of the *products* of documentation. Preschool documentation is also a phenomenon that is produced in and through preschool practices and through the research apparatus of the present study. Preschool documentation (as an apparatus) is not one finite, once-and-for-all determined thing, object or entity. Instead, it is a phenomenon that is constantly being produced. Depending on who and what is involved when and where, both the research apparatus and the apparatuses of preschool documentation take shape differently, and are made up by relations rather than by entities.

This last chapter emerges from the research apparatus of this thesis, from the aims and research questions, and by reading the

conclusions and questions of the articles diffractively through preschool documentation traditions, through agential realism and previous research. It puts the research apparatus to work by discussing the apparatuses of preschool documentation. The chapter is organised in four subsections which focus on the aforementioned knowledge produced through the study: children's participation as detached from the documentation method used, the focus of documentation shifting away from individual children, non-representational documentation producing rather than representing elements of quality and creating possibilities of moving forward rather than looking back.

Children's Participation as Detached from Documentation Methods

In the present study children participate in documentation in different ways, but this is not connected to which documentation method is used. Instead, the participation relates to a number of different 'things', or entities. As mentioned in the section titled *Pedagogical Documentation* above, pedagogical documentation (especially the kind inspired by Reggio Emilia) is forwarded as one means for enabling children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 1997, 2000). However, this is not obvious in the present study; instead, the children involved in the study participate in the documentation practice in different ways, irrespective of whether Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation is used as a documentation method or not. Children's participation is, in the preschool curriculum, promoted as important in the present, as well as for the future, to foster democratic citizens. It is forwarded in a separate chapter in the curriculum (ch. 2.3) and as one element of importance for documentation in chapter 2.6 (Skolverket, 2016c). In some official texts children's participation is clearly linked to pedagogical documentation, which is presented in the *Pedagogical Documentation* section. In that section several cited authors also point out that the potential for pedagogical documentation to enable children's voices and their participation is often used as an argument for using it as a (and sometimes the only) tool for preschool documentation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 1997, 2000; Palmer, 2012). However, reading the present study through this, the immediate connection between children's participation and pedagogical documentation is cut; this study produces children's participation in documentation as detached from the documentation methods used. This is not to say that pedagogical documentation cannot enable children's participation; it might. What it says is that pedagogical documentation does not necessarily enable children's participation and that children's participation can emerge when using any method for documentation.

The present study indicates that children sometimes are actively involved in producing documentation. Agential realism enabled me to acknowledge how this participation is produced through intra-

action (Barad, 2007), which involves and produces a number of different entities. This is read *with* the studies by Bath (2012) and Garrick et al. (2010), previously presented in the subsection titled *Active and Competent*, who find children's participation in producing documentation to be limited due to children's inability to read, and also that children sometimes do not understand why a specific photo is taken. This reading produces differences in accounting for how documentation is done between their studies and the present. In the Bath and the Garrick et al. studies children are produced as potential participants, not on their own account, but on adults' terms, since these studies refer to children's inability to read and to their limited understanding of why a photo was taken (assuming that there is one single reason for taking a photograph). In the present study, however, children's involvement with photos and text (as their spoken narratives are written down by teachers) emerged from their intra-action with a number of different entities (such as computer, photo, keyboard, teacher, memories; see articles 1 and 2). Thus, the former studies produce children's competence in producing documentation (as inherent in them and) in comparison to how teachers might do documentation, assuming that there is one (adult) way of approaching documentation. Thus, the way children might approach documentation is incomplete (not literate, etc.), which produces children's approach as situated on a lower hierarchical level. The present study produces children's participation in producing documentation as a relation that involves human and non-human entities – as an entanglement. This means that it is not possible to compare how children and teachers are active in producing documentation or how their different ways of participating might be hierarchical. Instead, their different activities and participation are produced through intra-action of documentation practices. Reading the present study through research that focuses on children's competence as not inherent in them (presented in *Active and Competent*) but distributed through human and non-human relations (Samuelsson, Sparrman, Cardell, & Lindgren, 2015), children's competence and participation in producing documentation is produced as relational. It is produced through intra-action of the documentation practices, which involves and produces a number of entities such as the children themselves, teachers, computers, cameras and documents, as well as ideas of how to do documentation and the curriculum.

The Focus of Documentation Shifts Away from Individuals

In the present study it is apparent that the focus of documentation shifts away from individuals. Whether children, things or templates are actively participating in producing documentation, individual children are not the primary focus of the documentation. Instead, it focuses primarily on practices and on teachers' actions. Furthermore, considering documentation as non-representational makes turning

children into study objects impossible. When documentation produces rather than represents, a child appearing in documentation cannot be perceived as an object of study; rather, the whole documented situation produces the child (and the situation) as something new. The documentation affects the documented situation (cf. Barad, 2007, p. 87) and produces it as something other than what it was when it happened. Reading the present study though research presented in the subsection titled *Undetectable and Unseen* produces a pattern of congruence. Those research findings point to documentation as shifting towards preschool practices and teachers' approach and away from individual children's learning and development (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009a; Sheridan et al., 2013). A further reading, the section *From Child Observation to Documentation*, produces the writings in the 1997 preface to the curriculum (since removed), emphasising that individual children's results should not be assessed, as still 'alive and kicking'.

As presented in the chapter *Entering into Preschool Documentation Traditions*, throughout Swedish preschool history the focus and purpose of documentation has shifted between individual children and the practice as a whole. Also, chapter 2.6 in the curriculum (Skolverket, 2016c), about documenting the development and learning of each child whilst focusing on overall preschool quality, creates ambivalence in teachers about how and what to document (Johansson, 2016). Reading this together produces a picture of preschool documentation that shifts its focus back and forth, between the children and preschool practices. Adding some of the studies presented in *Children and Documentation* above to the reading further expands and complicates the diffractive pattern. The documentation does not only shift between focusing on children and on practices but also in relation to the approach to children. Some find children to become objects of study, whether intended by teachers or not (Emilson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012; Insulander & Svärden Åberg, 2014). Others discuss ethics of documenting individual children (Lindgren, 2012; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010). Some focus on documentation as a means of making children's voices heard (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Yet others focus on how visual documentation depicts children as competent, which excludes other ways of being a child (Liljestrand & Hammarberg, 2017) (cf. also Franck & Nilsen, 2015). Reading the present study through this produces major differences between this previous research and the present study. A research apparatus, like the present one, that focuses on what happens in the spaces between children and documentation, and between templates and documents, enables the production of knowledge about relations between human and non-human entities. But in contrast to the above-mentioned studies, the research apparatus of this study does not explore how children are depicted. Furthermore, since the theoretical approach makes it impossible for documentation to represent, neither has it the possibility to focus on whether the documentation might assess or

evaluate preschool practices or children's development and learning (cf. Vallberg Roth, 2017). Instead, the present research apparatus enables focusing on what the different documentation practices (production and products of documentation) produce.

When documentation shifts away from individuals, when it is considered as non-representational and done *with* children rather than *on* children, it cannot produce children as objects of study. When the focus of documentation instead shifts towards practices and teachers' actions, the object of study also changes, as does the (presumptive) focus for surveillance. Thus, instead of surveilling children, documentation can be understood as a way of surveilling teachers, or practices. This connects to the quality audits that are performed by the National Schools Inspectorate (see Skolinspektionen, 2016a, 2017). I will return to this in the next section. However, the present study can be read through the research presented under *Observed and Surveilled*, which discusses documentation as surveillance of children (Lindgren, 2012; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010), and through studies that have found children to become objects of study, despite teachers' intentions (Emilson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012; Insulander & Svärde Åberg, 2014). When documentation is considered as non-representational, it is not possible for it to become surveillance. However, the focus on surveillance in previous research raises a question about how non-representational documentation might relate to surveillance. Reading these together, the answer is that the reading produces a diffractive pattern which includes an understanding of documentation that runs a risk of being perceived as, or rather, produced as, surveillance. Let me explain: documentation is often done through visual media, which includes different kinds of cameras. A camera directed towards something might be perceived as surveillance (of children or of the practice), irrespective of whether it is turned on, whether it takes a picture, or not. By simply turning its eyes (lenses) towards something, it might be understood as a device for surveillance. That is, intra-actions of the camera, where it is, the surroundings and notions of security cameras (for example, in shops) might produce the camera as being connected to surveillance. Therefore, the notion of documentation as non-representational, and being done *with* children, does not guarantee that documentation practices are not produced, or *perceived*, as surveillance.

Non-Representational Documentation Producing Elements of Quality

When the children in the study were truly participating in producing documentation, in other words, when their participation had an impact on the documentation, the idea of documentation as representation was subverted. The idea of representation means that the 'practices of representation have no effect on the objects of investigation' (Barad, 2007, p. 87), that is, that reality is not affected

by being represented, that reflecting (the) reality has no impact on it. In this study this was not the case, since, for example, photographs, teachers and children created stories around documented situations that went beyond what had taken place before. The documentation activities produced a (new) reality, which means that they did have an impact on the documented situations. What had happened was clearly not reflected through the documentation practices; instead, these practices produced something other than what had previously occurred. Since the documentation did not reflect a previous situation, the opportunity to look back at activities and to evaluate them was lost through this kind of documentation. As an alternative to this, the documentation might be able to produce new points of departure for the practice. Instead of looking back at a recent activity, the preschool practice might take departure in that which is produced through the documentation activity and therefrom create new activities.

Also, spacetime matters, including the agency of the template in documentation of systematic quality development work, played a part in producing, rather than representing, elements of quality. By participating in directing the documentation towards certain elements (teachers' actions, children's interests and thematic work), these were produced as important for preschool quality. Thus, the template was actively participating in affecting what preschool quality could become. Reading this through the previous research presented in *Methods, Templates and Documents* above, which focuses more on material aspects of documentation, produces a picture of documentation templates as active parts in preschool documentation. Examples of this are that teachers seem to focus on the methods, models and templates more than on preschool practices and on how and what children learn (Johansson, 2016; Lager, 2010; Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b), and that templates and forms direct the focus of the documentation (Severinsson, 2016; Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2008). Reading the agency of the template through the quality audits by the National School Inspectorate, mentioned in the section *Systematic Quality Development Work and Control*, tensions are produced between, on the one hand, documentation and quality audits as a means for evaluating and comparing preschools, and, on the other, documentation as producing quality elements and developing practices. When documentation produces rather than represents preschool quality, the viewpoint mentioned in *Systematic Quality Development Work and Control*, about meeting the requirements of quality audits rather than developing practices (Skolinspektionen, 2017), chafes against the purpose of the quality audits, which is to help preschools to develop a high and equal quality throughout the country. Following this viewpoint, the audits by the Inspectorate work in a similar way to the active template. That is, there is a risk that meeting the requirements of an audit or following a template might become the main objective, instead of their becoming entities with possibilities to assist preschools in

documenting and developing their daily practices. Thus, when documentation is done to meet the requirements of these audits, it works as a way of surveilling teachers and preschool practices.

However, whilst spacetimematterings, including the local template, directed the documentation towards, for example, thematic work, spacetimematterings of the practice (such as young newcomers' needs for security when entering a new space for the first time) also had an impact on what the documentation produced. That is, entanglements of the template and preschool practices, of space and time, produced certain elements of quality, through intra-action. In this case, an aspect of care was produced as one focus of thematic work, and an aspect of education as another. Reading this through the section about *educare* above produces a certain tension within the concept of *educare*: whilst *educare* emphasises the inseparability of education and care, producing care as one and education as another focus for thematic work separates them again. Reading this with Lidholt's (2000) study about teachers' dilemmas regarding how to work with education and care, shifting the focus between *edu* and *care* back and forth, produces a similar shift, and perhaps also poses a dilemma for the teachers of the present study. Combining care with education might not be all that obvious when the curriculum places an evident focus on education whilst underlining the importance of combining education and care (Skolverket, 2016c). Further readings, through the National Schools Inspectorate quality audit mentioned above, which criticised preschools for not focusing enough on teaching whilst not taking advantage of situations of care for educational purposes (Skolinspektionen, 2016b), complicates the picture even more. An inseparability of education and care is produced, but it also produces care as a part of education, and not as important for its own sake. An example of this is presented in article 4: whilst care was produced as a precondition for education, the young newcomers might not be open to being taught (about, for example, 'water') until they were feeling safe and secure. (Meanwhile, the children, implicitly, were probably taught about how to deal with being present in the preschool.)

Producing Preschool Quality

The preschool documentation produced in the present study *produces* certain elements of quality, but it does not *evaluate* preschool quality. The different aspects of preschool quality that are brought forward by Sheridan (2001), service, structural, processual and result quality, are thus impossible to evaluate through this kind of documentation. This also includes preschool quality as defined by the curriculum: the organisation, content, preschool practice and fulfilment of the curriculum goals (Skolverket, 2016c). Although impossible to evaluate, some of these aspects of quality might be made visible through the kind of documentation performed in the studied preschools. For example, documentation might produce elements of quality that connect to processes, contents and

curriculum goals. Thus, some of the aspects of quality mentioned by Sheridan (2001) and the curriculum for preschool could be produced through non-representational documentation.

The National Agency for Education asks not only for documentation of preschool practices or children's learning but also for documentation of structural factors. One of the publications of general advice that was mentioned in the section *Systematic Quality Development Work and Control* above, from the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2016b), mentions some of the structural factors: the number of staff, the composition of the group of children, the physical environment of the preschool, and the kinds of materials available. The number and composition of staff might be a question solely for the head. However, the consequences of the composition of the group of personnel might be something worth documenting by the preschool teachers in their daily practice. And what about the group of children? The importance of size of the groups of children is emphasised in two publications of general advice from the National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2016b, 2017), and also in a report especially focusing on the size of preschool groups (Skolverket, 2016a). Group size in Swedish preschools has also been debated in the media (see Ramirez, 2016; Williams, Sheridan, & Pramling Samuelsson, 2016; Kågstöm, 2017). Thus, this is an aspect that is currently highlighted as being of great importance for preschool quality, but one that is not at all mentioned in the studied documentation. However, the size of the group may not have been an issue in these specific preschools. Nevertheless, this may also relate to the findings of Löfdahl and Pérez Prieto (2009b) about preschool documentation making visible that which fits into common templates.

Reading the idea of non-representational documentation through certain ways of defining pedagogical documentation produces a pattern of resemblance or correspondence. Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation being intertwined in the practice (Rinaldi, 2006) and pedagogical documentation connected to posthumanist approaches (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a) are both considered to produce rather than to represent preschool practices. However, the concept of pedagogical documentation is often (by preschool teachers) used comprehensively, primarily encompassing (almost any kind of) visual documentation. As previously mentioned, it is also suggested as a method for evaluation of preschool practices (Skolverket, 2005; Palmer, 2012). This produces a slight incongruity between the different definitions of the concepts as well as between the different ways pedagogical documentation is used. Thus, I would not suggest that 'pedagogical documentation' is an overall solution that might answer a problem of combining documentation as non-representation with evaluating preschool quality. Instead, I would say that (non-representational) documentation produces potentialities of becoming, rather than evaluating what has been done previously, and that pedagogical documentation

is one possible form of documentation (out of several) that could be involved in this.

Creating Possibilities

The present study evinces that the impossibility of representation for documentation creates documentation that produces future possibilities rather than evaluations. Also, instead of assessing what has been done, the documentation produces stories in relation to preschool practices. These stories can work as points of departure for what the preschool practice can become. The documentation practices of this study did not mention the structural pre-conditions of the preschools, from their respective resources in the form of organisation, number of teachers and children, or the environment, which should be documented according to the policy document titled 'Quality Work in Practice' (*Kvalitetsarbete i praktiken*) (Skolverket, 2015). The National Agency for Education also brings forward the importance of following each child's learning and development (Skolverket, 2016c) and of documenting the organisation of preschool practices (Skolverket, 2015). Differing from this, in the present study, intra-actions of entities such as the national model, a local template, previous and present documentation traditions and preschool policies, produce elements of quality as important for the preschool practices or as answers to the quality work template. The structural preconditions were not mentioned; instead, one precondition that was put forward consisted of finding out about children's interests (both in relation to how they are able to participate in producing documentation and in relation to what activities to focus on in preschool practice). The matter of children's interests, or in(tr)aest was raised in article 3. In the most recent quality audit by the National Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen, 2017) one of the points made is that teachers do take account of children's interests, but that the teachers are too passive. Teachers do not move forward from and expand children's interests into new knowledge. They often wait for children to express their interests and seldom challenge and guide the children further. Could the concept of in(tr)aest be a way of accounting for interests as emerging from intra-action of multiple entities? Could it make it possible to refrain from treating children's interests as inherent in them and as something that should be shielded from outside influence (for example, of teachers)? Although it took departure in children's interests, the studied documentation focused mainly on teachers' actions. Whilst children are the main focus, as active participants in preschool practices as well as in producing documentation, on the one hand, and for the goals to strive for in the curriculum, on the other, teachers are the ones responsible for this. Thus, there is a certain tension between preschool (and documentation) practices *with* children and preschool practices *for* children.

The documentation process is often presented as circular, and was so on more than one occasion in this study (see Figure 1 on p. 19, and the figures in articles 3 and 4). Reading the process as a circle, or a wheel, implies that the process is continuous – there is neither a starting point nor an end. The process moves forward from any precondition; there is no minimum standard required. This means that irrespective of the preconditions, socio-economic standards, number of children with special needs, level of education of teachers and so on, all preschools are obliged to work on developing their quality. A preschool in a privileged area, with the most highly educated teachers, has the same obligations as preschools in problem areas with low numbers of educated teachers. However, whilst the policy documents do not define a minimum standard, reports from the National Schools Inspectorate point out what preschools should focus on. Critique of how teachers conduct their work (such as the above, about teachers sometimes being too passive) might make it even more important for teachers to highlight their importance for/in preschool practices. Reading the present study through this produces the focus on teachers' actions through documentation as a crucial way of showing how their work is important *for* children. Thus, it is not unexpected to find that the documentation focuses mainly on the preschool practice and teachers' actions.

. . .and Challenging Preschool Documentation through Lively Stories?

Lively stories, as presented in the article by Blaise, Hamm and Iorio (2016) (see *Pedagogical Documentation*), are principally suggested as a way of working with ecological issues in preschool. But what if lively stories could be a way of working with anything, and everything? Although lively stories with Blaise et al. focus on including the 'more-than-human' in the form of plants and animals, the children and teachers in articles 1 and 2 created stories that included fictitious more-than-humans (a vampire and a toy lion). Perhaps these stories could also function as ways for teachers and children to explore different kinds of subjects, similar to how the lively stories in the Blaise et al. article were suggested as a means to teach children about ecology? To some extent, this could be what many preschools do when using picture books as part of teaching activities in their thematic work (see Simonsson, 2004). In addition, treating documentation as events (Olsson, 2008), as actively involved in producing the ongoing and changing practices of knowing and learning, makes it possible to challenge the views on documentation in preschool quality work. For example, Lenz Taguchi (2010, 2013a) suggests that (pedagogical) documentation has a potential of producing new realities. By 're-living' (Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 170) previous situations through documentation, the situations, the children and the teachers have a possibility of 'becoming-other' (p. 172, with reference to Deleuze and Guattari,

1987), and thus, to learn. By using documentation of ‘lively stories’ *with* children as a way of exploring different topics, non-representational documentation might serve as a point of departure for further exploration, rather than as evaluation of what has been done. Through this, relations between children, teachers, spaces, time and matter can be taken into account. This might be one way that, by being a part of and producing the practice, documentation is valuable for discussing and influencing what preschool practices might become.

The present thesis produces knowledge about how children’s participation in documentation becomes detached from the method of documentation that is used and how material agents also play a part in the production of preschool documentation. It produces knowledge about how the focus of preschool documentation shifts away from individual children, towards emphasising teachers’ activities. It also produces knowledge about how non-representational documentation produces elements of preschool quality and creates possibilities for what pre-school practices and quality may become. This answers the research questions.

The thesis also produces questions about how to relate to structural aspects of preschool quality, and whether lively stories might be one way of working with documentation in preschool. An additional question could concern what happens when non-representational documentation meets current demands of accountability (cf. Vallberg Roth, 2017). The present study focuses mainly on the relation between entities involved in preschool documentation practices. Further questions might also focus on contents and on relations within documents. What does the documentation focus on? Moreover, how do photographs play a part in preschool documentation, and what does this produce (see Liljestrand & Hammarberg, 2017)? Perhaps there is a chance of returning to these questions in the future?

By focusing on the documentation produced between humans and materiality and how this, in turn, produces different elements of quality, I have shown, firstly, how children’s participation in the documentation process does not necessarily relate to the documentation methods used. Secondly, my results show how the documentation process is intertwined with a variety of entities, which in this case are a local template, and former and current preschool traditions and policies. Rather than representing or examining previous events, the entanglement of documentation, template, traditions and policies, play part in producing elements of preschool quality. Thirdly, the results show that when children and templates are actively involved in documenting, documentation shifts its focus from individual children to teachers’ activities. Fourthly, when documentation produces, instead of represents events, rather than evaluating previous activities, documentation creates possibilities for what preschool practices may become.

Svensk sammanfattning

Inledning och bakgrund till studien

Under mina tjugo år som förskollärare har jag upplevt många förändringar avseende dokumentation och observation. Jag har dokumenterat med hjälp av olika typer av prefabricerade scheman och samlat foton, teckningar och nedskrivna observationer, exempelvis av ett barns dag på förskolan. När digitalkameran kom förmilgen exploderade fotograferandet och dokumentationen liknade mest fotoalbum. Tankar på vad dokumentationen skulle leda till uppstod så småningom. Skulle det handla om de enskilda barnen eller var det verksamheten som skulle dokumenteras? Att dokumentera var inte obligatoriskt under min tid som förskollärare, men ansågs vara viktigt bland annat som underlag för utvärderingar och föräldrasamtal.

I och med revideringen av läroplanen 2010 blev det obligatoriskt att dokumentera i den svenska förskolan. Förskollärare är sedan 2012 även ålagda att utföra ett systematiskt kvalitetsarbete och att fortlöpande dokumentera detta arbete (Skolverket, 2012). Förskolans dokumentation har genom åren uppstått och utvecklats ur en mängd idéer och synsätt. Det har handlat om allt från att notera barnens hälsotillstånd och fysiska utveckling i barnkrubborna (Holmlund, 1996) till att lära sig mer om barn och deras utveckling, både för att utveckla verksamheten i barnträdgårdar och förskolor men också för att "korrigera" enskilda barns utveckling mot ett normativt ideal (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Det har skett förskjutningar från att fokusera på barnen till att fokusera på vad verksamheten kan erbjuda. Idag syftar dokumentationen av det systematiska kvalitetsarbetet till att utveckla förskolornas kvalitet så att de uppfyller de nationella målen och ger alla barn en likvärdig utbildning (Skolverket, 2012).

Förskolans dokumentation är alltså sammanflätad med olika traditioner, teorier och praktiker. I dokumentationen sammanflätas också lärande och omsorg, ofta benämnt "educare" (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011, s. 257). Det verkar dock finnas tendenser som går mot att dokumentationen leder till att lärande fokuseras i större grad än omsorg (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b; Löfgren, 2015). Dokumentation i förskolan är också starkt sammanflätat med den typ av dokumentation som benämns som pedagogisk, och som ofta

förknippas med ett arbetssätt som används i förskolor i den italienska staden Reggio Emilia (SOU 1997:157). Tidigare forskning har bland annat förordat pedagogisk dokumentation med inspiration från Reggio Emilia som ett sätt att göra barns röster hörda och ge barn inflytande över sitt eget lärande (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Däremot har vissa forskare funnit att barn inte alltid är delaktiga i att göra/producera dokumentation (Bath, 2012; Garrick et al., 2010). Ytterligare andra har problematiserat och diskuterat om pedagogisk dokumentation verkligen verkar för ett demokratiskt förhållningssätt eller om den hjälper till att bibehålla barns underordnade position (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011).

Samtidigt som pedagogisk dokumentation framhålls som en lämplig metod för dokumentation och utvärdering i förskolan (Palmer, 2012) förekommer en mängd andra metoder och modeller. Skolverket tillhandahåller ett analysverktyg för självskattning, BRUK (Bedömning, Reflektion, Utveckling, Kvalitet). Andra exempel är IUP (Individuella Utvecklings-Planer), TRAS (Tidig Registrering Av Språkutveckling) och ECERS (Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale) (Vallberg Roth, 2015). Vallberg Roth (2012) benämner förskolans dokumentation som ”multidokumentation”. Men också den pedagogiska dokumentation står på flera ben: vissa anser att olika typer av dokumentation kan bli pedagogisk utifrån det sätt som den används (Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2009). Ett annat sätt att se på pedagogisk dokumentation är att se den som en aktiv agent (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a). Detta innebär att dokumentationen, inte passivt avbildar något utan deltar aktivt i att skapa kunskap.

Som tidigare nämnts syftar dokumentation av förskolans systematiska kvalitetsarbete till att utveckla kvalitet. Att försöka definiera kvalitet i förskolan är inte helt enkelt. Ibland definieras det som något som kan mätas med hjälp av olika skalor, till exempel ovan nämnda ECERS (Åsén & Vallberg Roth, 2012). Andra kritiserar detta och menar att kvalitet i förskolan är omöjligt att mäta (Cannella, 2016). Ibland har dokumentations- och utvärderingsmetoder som fokuserar på enskilda barn ansetts oförenliga med läroplanen (Vallberg Roth, 2012), men eftersom läroplanen också innehåller skrivningar om att det behövs kunskap om varje barn (Skolverket, 2016c), är det möjligt att dessa mätmetoder inte alls strider mot läroplanens intentioner. Då systematiskt kvalitetsarbete och dokumentation är tidskrävande (Williams, Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2015) är det inte så märkligt att förskollärare efterfrågar modeller och mallar som underlättar detta arbete. Dock har tidigare forskning visat att när förskollärare dokumenterar och fokuserar på verksamheten blir barnen och deras perspektiv mer eller mindre osynliga (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009a). Istället blir metoder, modeller och mallar viktiga. Ibland blir det viktigare att följa mallen än att dokumentera för att utveckla verksamheten (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b). När mallar och modeller blir viktiga kan de sägas ha egen agens, vilket är något som framhävs bland annat i post-

humanistisk forskning (se t.ex. Alasuutari, 2015; Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010; Severinsson, 2016). Alla dessa sammanflätningar ledde till att den föreliggande studien behövde en teori som kan omfatta och tillvarata denna multiplicitet och komplexitet och inbegripa det materiella såväl som det diskursiva. Ett posthumanistiskt perspektiv möjliggör frågor som till exempel hur bilder eller anteckningar från ett observationstillfälle aktivt kan inverka på förskollärares och barns förståelse av en situation (Lenz Taguchi, 2013a).

En utgångspunkt i denna avhandling är att människor och icke-människor ses som sammanflätade, och att båda kan tillskrivas agens. Det som undersöks är fenomen som inkluderar både forskaren och det som beforskas, vilka intra-agerar (Barad, 2007). Istället för att förstå, till exempel, förskollärare, barn, dokument och forskaren som skilda åt, så är de i Barad's (2007) agentiska realism sammanflätade och i intra-aktion med varandra. Intra-aktionen skapar agentiska snitt som tillfälligt separerar de olika agenterna från varandra. Ett exempel: istället för att utgå från att forskaren från början är skild från det som beforskas, förstås skillnaden som tillfälligt producerad genom den forskningsprocess eller forskningsapparat som forskaren ingår i. Forskningsapparaten inkluderar det som studeras men också de teorier och metoder som är inblandade i forskningsprocessen. Forskaren blir med andra ord till genom forskningsprocessen. Detta gäller också för det som studeras. Den föreliggande studien utgår från den ambivalens och osäkerhet som förskolepersonal ibland uttrycker i samband med dokumentation (Johansson, 2016). Istället för att studera vad personalen tänker, tycker och gör fokuserar denna studie på hur dokumentation produceras mellan barn, förskollärare, datorer, foton, mallar och modeller, m.m. Genom agentisk realism bidrar denna avhandling med kunskap om olika delar av dokumentationspraktiken och hur de producerar aspekter av kvalitet.

Syfte och frågeställningar

Syftet med avhandlingen är att producera kunskap och frågor om hur dokumentation går till i några svenska förskolor. Detta görs genom att undersöka hur människor och materialitet producerar dokumentation i förskolan och vad som produceras som kvalitet genom denna dokumentation.

Utifrån detta syfte formuleras följande frågor:

- Hur är datorer, lärare, barn och andra entiteter delaktiga i produktion av dokumentation?
- Vilka typer av delaktighet produceras genom intra-aktion i förskolans dokumentationsproduktion?
- På vilket sätt deltar modeller och mallar i dokumentation av förskolans systematiska kvalitetsarbete?
- Vad produceras som kvalitet genom denna intra-aktion?

Produktion av empiriskt material

I denna avhandling ses dokumentation i förskolans systematiska kvalitetsarbete som en övergripande apparat. Denna apparat är samtidigt ett fenomen som produceras i och genom förskolans verksamhet. Dessutom produceras den genom den forskningsapparat som den här studien utgör. Den övergripande dokumentationsapparatens producerar i sin tur olika apparater som också producerar olika saker. Föreliggande studie fokuserar på två av dessa: dels den apparat som utgörs av de processer där dokumentation produceras av, exempelvis, barn, förskollärare, datorer och kameror, och dels den apparat som utgörs av de dokument som skapas genom användandet av modeller och lokala mallar. Jag kallar dessa för produktionsapparatens respektive produktapparatens. Dessa båda apparater är alltså också sammanflätade med varandra och ingår i (och produceras av) den övergripande dokumentationsapparatens och i (och av) denna studies forskningsapparat. Forskningsprocessen utgör en ytterligare apparat som består av och samtidigt producerar forskaren, det empiriska materialet och forskningsresultaten. I den föreliggande studien har två typer av empiriskt material producerats. Det ena utgörs av videofilmer från situationer där förskollärare, barn, datorer och foton tillsammans producerar dokumentation i den vardagliga förskolepraktiken. Det andra utgörs av dokument som kopplats samman med forskningsapparatens genom att det hämtats, lästs och ”lekt med” av mig (eller kanske det är de som lekt med mig?).

Fem förskolor engagerades för studien. Studien kom att fokusera på tre av dessa. I en av förskolorna gjordes videofilmerna och de två andra bidrog med dokument. Den föreliggande studien har granskats av den centrala etikprövningsnämnden (www.epn.se). Etiska överväganden har i denna studie uppmärksamats på två nivåer. Den ena handlar om de deltagande barnen och förskollärarna, medan den andra hänger samman med det posthumanistiska perspektivet. I detta perspektiv handlar etiska överväganden också om att det inte är möjligt att ställa sig vid sidan av något och titta på (Barad, 2007) utan om att det är viktigt att hela tiden beakta vad som produceras och hur. I den analytiska processen bearbetades materialet på olika sätt, exempelvis genom att transkribera tal och händelser från videofilmerna, och genom att arbeta med text och bild på olika sätt. Dokumenten från de två sistnämnda förskolorna bearbetades genom att till exempel skriva ut, klippa isär och sedan kombinera textavsnitt på olika sätt. Textavsnitten sattes även in i ordmolnsgeneratorer²⁴. Genom att ”umgås” med materialet på olika sätt med fokus på vad som produceras har vissa saker framträtt. Det kan handla om att något stuckit ut eller ”glimmat till” (MacLure, 2013), exempelvis att barns delaktighet i att producera dokumentation kunde vara väldigt fysisk och kopplad till olika ting. Det kan

²⁴ Exempel på ordmolnsgeneratorer som användes är wordle.net eller worditout.com

också handla om saker som återkommer vilket är fallet då till exempel temaarbete framträdde som en viktig aspekt av kvalitet.

Resultat och diskussion

Avhandlingen producerar kunskap om hur dokumentation produceras i förskolan mellan lärare, barn, ting, praktiker och plats (rum). Genom att utgå från att materialitet kan ha agens visar de fyra artiklarna hur olika entiteter (mänskliga såväl som icke-mänskliga) intra-agerar och blir delaktiga i dokumentationen och hur detta producerar vissa aspekter som kvalitet. Avhandlingen visar att barns delaktighet i att producera dokumentation inte entydigt kan kopplas till vilken dokumentationsmetod som används. Istället produceras delaktigheten genom intra-aktion som involverar en mängd olika aktiva agenter. Avhandlingen visar också hur dokumentation intra-agerar med en lokal mall, med tidigare och nuvarande förskole-traditioner och styrdokument, och då producerar snarare än representerar vissa aspekter som kvalitet. Istället för att återge det som gjorts i verksamheten produceras olika bilder och berättelser som utgår från det som skett. Samtidigt syftar dokumentationen till att granska verksamheten för att utveckla dess kvalitet. Därmed skapas det som produceras genom dokumentationen som kvalitets-aspekter. I denna studie blir alltså kvalitet något som produceras genom dokumentationsapparaten. Avhandlingen visar även att dokumentationen, i och med mallen och kravet på att utveckla ett arbete med kvalitet, kommer att fokusera lärares aktivitet, medan enskilda barn i stort sett inte alls uppmärksammas. Det visar också hur dokumentationen skapar möjligheter för vad förskolepraktik och kvalitet kan bli, snarare än att utvärdera.

Ofta anses möjliggörandet av barns inflytande vara ett argument för att använda (Reggio Emilia inspirerad) pedagogisk dokumentation (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 1997, 2000). Denna studie visar dock att barn kan vara delaktiga på olika sätt i att producera dokumentation, utan att detta kopplas till en specifik dokumentationsmetod. Det är alltså inte givet att just pedagogisk dokumentation möjliggör barns inflytande mer än någon annan dokumentationsmetod. I den studerade dokumentationsproduktionen medverkar också olika materialiteter såsom datorer, kameror, foton, färgade etiketter och leksakslejon. Vissa tidigare studier har visat att barns delaktighet i att producera dokumentation är begränsad, exempelvis utifrån deras oförmåga att läsa, och att barn ibland undrar varför ett visst foto används i dokumentation (Bath, 2012; Garrick et al., 2010). Detta menar jag är att se barns delaktighet utifrån en vuxennorm om att dokumentation är på ett enda sätt (till exempel att det är en avbildning av en tidigare situation). Genom att inte utgå från att människan är i centrum, utan att istället se henne som en del av dokumentationspraktiken och som producerad som något specifikt (till exempel som förskollärare eller förskolebarn) genom intra-aktion, visar studien hur barns delaktighet kan produceras på olika sätt. Dokumentation utifrån ett foto kan då

(med hjälp av att en vuxen skriver ned barnens berättelser) istället bli ett sätt att undersöka något genom att skapa berättelser om detta. Detta liknar det som Blaise, Hamm och Iorio (2016) benämner som "lively stories", vilket handlar om att skapa berättelser som inkluderar det mer-än-mänskliga²⁵, i deras fall växter och djur. I mitt fall handlade det om fiktiva figurer, såsom vampyrer och leksaks-lejon. Berättelser som skapas i interaktion mellan förskollärare, barn och foton skulle kunna tjäna som utgångspunkt för fortsatt undersökande av olika fenomen. Detta skulle kunna vara ett möjligt sätt att arbeta med dokumentation i förskolan. Detta betyder också att när barnen i studien hade verkligt inflytande över dokumentationen, det vill säga, när barnens inflytande inverkade på och förändrade dokumentationen var det inte möjligt att förstå den som representation av en tidigare händelse eller aktivitet, istället skapades nya berättelser utifrån de bilder som hade tagits vid tidigare tillfällen. Dokumentationen blev alltså något annat än avbilder eller representationer. Av den anledningen blev det inte längre möjligt att använda dessa dokumentationer för att utvärdera något som hänt tidigare.

Inte bara barnen var delaktiga i att producera dokumentation. I den del av studien som fokuserar på produkterna av dokumentation visade det sig att en lokal mall hade stor betydelse för vad som producerades som kvalitet. Att mallar och formulär har agens har även tidigare forskning visat (se t.ex. Alasuutari, 2015; Schulz, 2015). Det som denna studie bidrar med är inte bara att visa att mallar har agens utan också *hur* en mall kan bidra till att producera kvalitet och vilka aspekter som produceras som kvalitet. Detta skapar en spänning mellan olika sätt att förhålla sig till dokumentation: till exempel mellan att mäta och utvärdera, och att producera aspekter av kvalitet och utveckla praktiker.

I denna studie, liksom i vissa tidigare studier, visar det sig att dokumentationens fokus förskjuts från de enskilda barnen mot förskolans verksamhet och praktiker, samt lärares aktivitet (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009a; Sheridan et al., 2013). Detta gör också att fokus för det som övervakas förskjuts. Istället för att övervaka barn blir dokumentationen då en form av övervakning av förskollärarna och av verksamheten. Dessutom, när dokumentation förstås som producerande snarare än som representerande och dokumentation görs *med* barn, i stället för att ha barn som objekt för dokumentationen, blir det omöjligt att se barn som studieobjekt. Det som då händer är att dokumentationen påverkar verksamheten snarare än utvärderar den. När detta läses diffraktivt genom den tidigare forskning som fokuserar på dokumentation som övervakning (Lindgren, 2012; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2003) uppstår ett mönster där dokumenterande med hjälp av kameror, i sig självt, kan uppfattas som övervakning. Det vill säga, trots att icke-representerande dokumentation per definition inte kan fungera som övervakning och inte heller gör det möjligt att se barn som studieobjekt, finns det inga

²⁵ "the more-than-human" (Blaise, Hamm, & Iorio, 2016, s. 35)

garantier för att denna dokumentation inte uppfattas, eller skapas, som övervakning.

När dokumentation producerar vissa aspekter av kvalitet innebär det att den inte samtidigt kan utvärdera kvalitet. Däremot kan olika aspekter av kvalitet bli synliggjorda. De kvalitetsaspekter som producerades i denna studie var temaarbete, förskollärares aktivitet och barns intresse. Däremot rymdes inte faktorer som, till exempel, gruppstorlek i den studerade dokumentationen. Detta skulle kunna förklaras med att det inte var aktuellt att synliggöra gruppstorlek på de studerade förskolorna, men det skulle också kunna relateras till forskning som menar att dokumentation synliggör det som passar in i de mallar som används (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009b; Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2008). Eftersom mallen som användes i de studerade förskolorna inte innehöll något om gruppstorlek blev detta inte heller möjligt att synliggöra. Vikten av att beakta till exempel gruppstorlek framhålls i Skolverkets allmänna råd (Skolinspektionen, 2017; Skolverket, 2016b). Gruppstorlek har också debatterats i media (se Ramirez, 2016; Williams, Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2016). Det finns alltså en uppenbar risk att både mallar och skolinspektionens mätningar kan fungera som styrande genom att det blir viktigare att följa mallen eller att nå ett bra resultat i skolinspektionens mätningar än att utveckla verksamheten. Detta har även uppmärksammats av Skolinspektionen (2017).

Dokumentation som producerar snarare än representerar kvalitet skapar möjligheter snarare än utvärderar. Den skapar däremot inte underlag för bedömning av tidigare aktiviteter, utan snarare berättelser som kan tjäna som utgångspunkt för den kommande verksamheten. Detta avviker från hur dokumentation föreskrivs i vissa officiella dokument. I dessa förordas bland annat att strukturella förutsättningar och enskilda barns utveckling och lärande bör dokumenteras (Skolverket, 2015). I föreliggande studie saknas helt dokumentation över förskolornas förutsättningar, i form av t.ex. socioekonomiska villkor. En diffraktiv läsning av det empiriska materialet genom dessa officiella dokument skapar en möjlighet att fokusera på frågan om det finns andra typer av förutsättningar. I materialet framträder då barns intresse som en förutsättning för vad verksamheten kan fokusera på. Barns intresse fokuseras även i en av Skolinspektionens rapporter (Skolinspektionen, 2017). Där påpekas att trots att barns intresse ses som viktig för deras lärande anses förskollärarna vara alltför passiva. Det vill säga, förskollärarna utgår från barns intresse, men tar inte vara på, utmanar eller utvecklar detta. I artikel 3 har jag lekt med begreppet in(tra)esse, kanske detta begrepp skulle kunna möjliggöra att intresse kan förstås som något som finns mellan barn och omgivning, snarare än som något som finns inneboende i barnen?

Olsson (2008) och Lenz Taguchi (2010, 2013a) diskuterar hur pedagogisk dokumentation kan gå steget vidare mot att skapa potential att producera något nytt samt utmana den typ av doku-

mentation som förstås som representation. I likhet med detta visar mina resultat att dokumentation kan ses som en utgångspunkt snarare än som (ut)värdering. I kontrast till forskning som förordar pedagogisk dokumentation som ett sätt att göra barn delaktiga (t.ex. (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000) visar dock mina resultat att detta samband inte är entydigt. Barn, och även materiella agenter, såsom datorer, fotografier och mallar, är delaktiga i och skapar (samt skapas av) dokumentation på en mängd olika sätt. I och med detta producerar dokumentationen aspekter av kvalitet, snarare än representerar olika aktiviteter i förskolan. Detta skapar nya möjligheter för vad förskolans verksamhet och kvalitet kan bli. I likhet med vissa tidigare studier (Löfdahl & Pérez Prieto, 2009a; Sheridan et al., 2013) visar också denna studie att dokumentationens fokus förflyttas från barnen till förskollärares aktivitet.

Detta skapar frågor om vad som händer när icke-represterande dokumentation möter de krav på redovisning av kvalitet som ställs på förskolorna idag (jfr Vallberg Roth, 2017). Är det möjligt att redovisa kvalitet med hjälp av dokumentation? Kanske går det inte att prata om kvalitet som en enda övergripande entitet. Kanske behöver kvaliteter förstås som multipla, som bestående av olika delar? Kanske behöver också vad som anses vara kvalitet i förskolan diskuteras och problematiseras ytterligare? Denna studie fokuserar huvudsakligen på relationen mellan de olika aktiva agenter (människa såväl som icke-människa) som är involverade i förskolans dokumentationspraktik.

Genom att fokusera på hur dokumentation produceras mellan människor och materialitet och hur detta i sin tur producerar olika kvalitetsaspekter har jag visat, för det första, hur barns delaktighet i dokumentationsprocessen inte nödvändigtvis hänger samman med vilken dokumentationsmetod som används. För det andra visar mina resultat hur dokumentationsprocessen är sammanflätad med en mängd olika entiteter, i det här fallet med en lokal mall, och med tidigare och nuvarande förskoletraditioner och styrdokument. Dessa sammanflätningar har del i hur dokumentationen producerar kvalitetsaspekter, snarare än representerar eller granskar det som tidigare hänt. För det tredje visar resultaten att när barn och mallar är aktivt delaktiga i dokumentationsprocessen förskjuts dokumentationens fokus mot att fokusera på lärares aktivitet snarare än på enskilda barn. För det fjärde, när dokumentationen producerar, snarare än representerar något innebär det att den, snarare än att utvärdera vad som gjorts, istället skapar möjligheter att föra förskolans verksamhet framåt.

References

- Alasuutari, M. (2015). Documenting napping: The agentic force of documents and human action. *Children & Society*, 29, 219–230.
- Alasuutari, M., Markström, A.-M., & Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2014). *Assessment and documentation in early childhood education*. New York: Routledge.
- Alnervik, K. (2013). 'Men så kan man ju också tänka!' *Pedagogisk dokumentation som förändringsverktyg i förskolan*. PhD diss., Jönköping: Högskolan för lärande och kommunikation.
- Barad, K. (1996). Meeting the universe halfway: Realism and social constructivism without contradiction. In L. Hankinson Nelson & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Feminism, science and the philosophy of science* (pp. 161–194). Dordrecht: Kluwer Press.
- Barad, K. (1999). Agential realism: Feminist interventions in understanding scientific practices. In M. Biagioli (Ed.), *The science studies reader* (pp. 1–11). London: Routledge.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), 801–831.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. London: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2012). Intra-actions [Interview with Adam Kleinman]. *Mousse Magazine*, 34, 76–81.
- Bath, C. (2012). 'I can't read it; I don't know': Young children's participation in the pedagogical documentation of English early childhood education and care settings. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 20(2), 190–201.
- Baustad, A.-G. (2012). Using the infant/toddler environment rating scale for examining the quality of care for infants and toddlers in Norwegian day care centers. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 5(2), 1–21.
- Bergh, A. (2010). *Vad gör kvalitet med utbildning? Om kvalitetsbegreppets skilda innebörder och dess konsekvenser för utbildning*. PhD diss., Örebro: Örebro Universitet.
- Bergh, A. (2011). Why quality in education – And what quality? A linguistic analysis of the concept of quality in Swedish government texts. *Education Inquiry*, 2(4), 709–723.
- Bjervås, L.-L. (2011). *Samtal om barn och pedagogisk dokumentation som bedömningspraktik i förskolan*. PhD diss., Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Blaise, M., Hamm, C., & Iorio, J. M. (2016). Modest witness(ing) and lively stories: Paying attention to matters of concern in early childhood. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 25(1), 31–42.
- Bodén, L. (2016). *Present absences: Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism*. PhD diss., Linköping: Linköping University.

- Boréus, K. (2011). Texter i vardag och samhälle. In G. Ahrne & P. Svensson (Eds.), *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder* (pp. 132–149). Malmö: Liber.
- Brodin, J., Hollerer, L., Renblad, K., & Stancheva-Popkostadinova, V. (2014). Preschool teachers' understanding of quality in preschool: A comparative study in three European countries. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(6), 968–981.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Cannella, G. S. (2016). Introduction. Quality in early childhood education and care (ECEC): Ratings and systems performances of global erasure and governmentality. In G. S. Cannella, M. Salazar Pérez, & I.-F. Lee (Eds.), *Critical examinations of quality in early education and care: Regulation, disqualification, and erasure* (pp. 1–8). New York: Peter Lang.
- Cecconi, L., Stegelin, D. A., Pintus, A., & Allegri, R. (2014). Utilizing a global environmental assessment tool to facilitate professional development: The voices of kindergarten teachers in Italy. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 46(2), 205–229.
- Ceder, S. (2016). *Cutting through water: Towards a posthuman theory of educational relationality*. PhD diss., Lund: Lund University.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Corsaro, W. A. (2011). *The sociology of childhood* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Dahlbeck, J. (2014). Svensk förskola mellan universell moral och relationell ontologi. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 19(2–3), 173–192.
- Dahlberg, G., & Elfström, I. (2014). Pedagogisk dokumentation i tillblivelse. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 19(4–5), 268–296.
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Davies, B. (2011). Open listening: Creative evolution in early childhood settings. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 43, 119–132.
- Davies, B. (2014). Reading anger in early childhood intra-actions: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 734–741.
- DeMarie, D., & Ethridge, E. A. (2006). Children's images of preschool: The power of photography. *Young Children*, 61(1), 101–104.
- Dir. 2008:3. (2008). *Kommittédirektiv. Bildandet av Statens skolinspektion*. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.
- Dockett, S., Einarsdottir, J., & Perry, B. (2009). Researching with children: Ethical tensions. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 7(3), 283–298.
- Dolphijn, R., & van der Tuin, I. (2012). *New materialisms: Interviews and cartographies*. Ann Arbor: Open Humanities Press.
- Eidevald, C. (2013). *Systematiska analyser för utvärdering och utveckling i förskolan: Hallå, hur gör man?* Stockholm: Liber.

- Einarsdóttir, J. (2005). Playschool in pictures: Children's photographs as a research method. *Early Child Development and Care*, 175(6), 523–541.
- Elfström Pettersson, K. (2014). *Playing a part in preschool documentation: A study of how participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents*. Lic. diss., Linköping: Linköpings Universitet.
- Elfström, I. (2013). *Uppföljning och utvärdering för förändring: Pedagogisk dokumentation som grund för kontinuerlig verksamhetsutveckling och systematiskt kvalitetsarbete i förskolan*. PhD diss., Stockholm: Department of Child and Youth Studies, Stockholm University.
- Ellmin, B., & Ellmin Cederholm, U. (2012). *Portfolio i förskolan* (1st ed.). Stockholm: Liber.
- Emilson, A., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2012). Jakten på det kompetenta barnet. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 5(21), 1–16.
- Emmoth, K. (2014). *Grunden läggs i förskolan: Förskolepedagogers tankar om utveckling, lärande och dokumentation*. Lic. diss., Umeå: Institutionen för tillämpad utbildningsvetenskap, Umeå Universitet.
- Erikson, E. H. (1977). *Childhood and society*. London: Paladin.
- Ferrando, F. (2013). Posthumanism, transhumanism, antihumanism, metahumanism and new materialisms: Differences and relations. *Existenz*, 8(2), 26–32.
- Flewitt, R. (2006). Using video to investigate preschool classroom interaction: Education research assumptions and methodological practices. *Visual Communication*, 5(1), 25–50.
- Folke-Fichtelius, M. (2008). *Förskolans formande: Statlig reglering 1944–2008*. PhD diss., Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Folke-Fichtelius, M., & Lundahl, C. (2015). Förekoledarns lärande som mått på kvalitet: Statliga krav på dokumentation i förskolan. In G. Åsén (Ed.), *Utvärdering & pedagogisk bedömning i förskolan* (pp. 38–50). Stockholm: Liber.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Franck, K., & Nilsen, R. D. (2015). The (in)competent child: Subject positions of deviance in Norwegian day-care centers. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 16(3), 230–240.
- Garrick, R., Bath, C., Dunn, K., Maconochie, H., Willis, B., & Wolstenholme, C. (2010). *Children's experiences of the early years foundation stage*. Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University Centre for Education and Inclusion Research.
- Giamminuti, S. (2009). *Pedagogical documentation in the Reggio Emilia educational project: Values, quality and community in early childhood settings*. PhD diss., Perth: University of Western Australia.
- Given, H., Kuh, L., LeeKeenan, D., Mardell, B., Redditt, S., & Twombly, S. (2010). Changing school culture: Using documentation to support collaborative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 49, 36–46.

- Gunnarsson, K. (2015). *Med önskan om kontroll: Figurationer av hälsa i skolors hälsofrämjande arbete*. PhD diss., Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet, Barn- och ungdomsvetenskapliga institutionen.
- Halldén, G., & Simonsson, M. (2000). Omsorg, kroppslighet och en traditionstygnd förskolepraktik. In *Omsorgsbegreppet i förskolan: Olika infallsvinklar på ett begrepp och dess relation till en verksamhet*. (pp. 52–61). Linköping: Department of Child Studies/Tema Barn, University of Linköping.
- Hanspers, K., & Mörk, E. (2011). Förskola. In L. Hartman (Ed.), *Konkurrensens konsekvenser: Vad händer med svensk välfärd?* (pp. 32–65). Stockholm: SNS förlag.
- Hatje, A.-K. (1999). *Från trekläng till triangelndrama: Barnträdgården som ett kvinnligt samhällsprojekt under 1880-1940-talen*. Lund: Historiska media.
- Haug, P. (2003). *Om kvalitet i förskolan: Forskning om och utvärdering av förskolan 1998–2001*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Hermerén, G. (2011). *Good research practice*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Holle, B. (1987). *Normala och utvecklingshämmande barns motoriska utveckling: Praktisk vägledning med utvecklingsschema och övningsexempel*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Holmlund, K. (1996). *Låt barnen komma till oss: Förskollärarna och kampen om småbarnsinstitutionerna 1854–1968*. PhD diss., Umeå: Pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå Universitet.
- Honan, E. (2014). Disrupting the habit of interviewing. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 5(1), 1–16.
- Hultman, K. (2011). *Barn, linjaler och andra aktörer*. PhD diss., Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet.
- Hultman, K., & Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). Challenging anthropocentric analysis of visual data: A relational materialist methodological approach to educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 525–542.
- Insulander, E., & Svärden Åberg, E. (2014). Vilken kunskap erkänns i det systematiska kvalitetsarbetet? Om oförenliga tankestilar i dagens förskola. *Journal of Nordic Early Childhood Education Research*, 7(12), 1–18.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research*. London: Routledge.
- James, A., & Prout, A. (1990). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. London: Falmer.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Johansson, B., & Oljemark, N. (2001). *BRUK - för kvalitetsarbete i förskola och skola*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Johansson, E. M. (2016). *Det motsägelsefulla bedömningsuppdraget: En etnografisk studie om bedömning i förskolekontext*. PhD diss., Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.

- Johansson, J.-E. (1994). *Svensk förskolepedagogik under 1900-talet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Jones, A., & Hoskins, T. K. (2016). A mark on paper: The matter of indigenous-settler history. In C. A. Taylor & C. Hughes (Eds.), *Posthuman research practices in education* (pp. 75–92). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Juelskjaer, M. (2013). Gendered subjectivities of spacetime-matter. *Gender and Education*, 25(6), 754–768.
- Kaga, Y., Bennett, J., & Moss, P. (2011). *Caring and learning together: A cross-national study of integration of early childhood care and education within education*. Paris: Unesco.
- Kjørholt, A. T. (2005). The competent child and ‘the right to be oneself’: Reflections on children as fellow citizens in an early childhood centre. In A. Clark, A. T. Kjørholt, & P. Moss (Eds.), *Beyond listening: Children’s perspectives on early childhood services* (pp. 151–173). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Knight, L. (2015). *MMU - ESRI - SIQR 2015 - Linda Knight*. Retrieved 10 May 2016, from Youtube: https://youtu.be/Z-S5trAGpME?list=PLCJ1WUUa1Dc83NTGdAtb9GyouOjl_30_y
- Knight, L., McArdle, F., Cumming, T., Bone, J., Li, L., Peterken, C., & Ridgway, A. (2015). Intergenerational collaborative drawing: A research method for researching with/about young children. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 40(4), 21–29.
- Knight, L., Zollo, L., McArdle, F., Cumming, T., Bone, J., Ridgway, A. P., & Li, L. (2016). Drawing out critical thinking: Testing the methodological value of drawing collaboratively. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 24(2), 321–337.
- Kummen, K. (2014). When matter in the classroom matters: Encounters with race in pedagogical conversations. *International Journal of Child, Youth, and Family Studies*, 5(4.2), 808–825.
- Kågeström, A. (2017, February 5). Små grupper i förskolan är inte det viktigaste. *Svenska Dagbladet*.
- Lager, K. (2010). *Att organisera för kvalitet: En studie om kvalitetsarbete i kommunen och förskolan*. Lic. diss., Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 629–633.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (1997). *Varför pedagogisk dokumentation? Om barnsyn, kunskapssyn och ett förändrat förhållningssätt till förskolans arbete*. Stockholm: HLS förlag.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2000). *Emancipation och motstånd: Dokumentation och kooperativa läroprocesser i förskolan*. PhD diss., Stockholm: HLS.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). *Going beyond the theory/practice divide in Early childhood education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2012). A diffractive and Deleuzian approach to analysing interview data. *Feminist Theory*, 13(3), 265–281.

- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2013a). *Pedagogisk dokumentation som aktiv agent: Introduktion till intra-aktiv pedagogik*. Malmö: Gleerups.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2013b). *Varför pedagogisk dockumentation? Verktyg för lärande och förändring i förskolan och skolan*. Malmö: Gleerups.
- Lenz Taguchi, H., & Palmer, A. (2013). A more 'livable' school? A diffractive analysis of the performative enactments of girls' ill-/well-being with(in) school environments. *Gender and Education*, 25(6), 671–687.
- Lidholt, B. (2000). EDUcare eller eduCARE - förskolepersonalens dilemma. In *Omsorgsbegreppet i förskolan: Olika infallsvinklar på ett begrepp och dess relation till en verksamhet* (pp. 62–70). Linköping: Department of ChildStudies/Tema Barn, University of Linköping.
- Liljestrand, J., & Hammarberg, A. (2017). The social construction of the competent, self-governed child in documentation: Panels in the Swedish preschool. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 18 (1), 39–54.
- Lindgren Eneflo, E. (2014). *Dokumentationens dilemman: Förskollärare samtalar om pedagogisk dokumentation*. Lic. diss., Umeå: Umeå Universitet.
- Lindgren, A.-L. (2000). Begreppet omsorg i förskolans pedagogiska program: Ett tentativt resonemang. In *Omsorgsbegreppet i förskolan: Olika infallsvinklar på ett begrepp och dess relation till en verksamhet* (pp. 21–29). Linköping: Department of ChildStudies/Tema Barn, University of Linköping.
- Lindgren, A.-L. (2012). Ethical issues in pedagogical documentation: Representations of children through digital technology. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(3), 327–340.
- Lindgren, A.-L., & Sparrman, A. (2003). Om att bli dokumenterad: Etiska aspekter på förskolans arbete med dokumentation. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 8(1–2), 58–69.
- Luttrell, W. (2010). 'A camera is a big responsibility': A lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, 25(3), 224–237.
- Lutz, K. (2006). *Konstruktionen av det avvikande förskolebarnet: En kritisk fallstudie angående utvecklingsbedömningar av yngre barn*. Lic. diss., Malmö: Malmö Högskola, Lärarutbildningen.
- Läraryrket. (2014). *Förskolan framgångsfaktor enligt OECD - ger bättre Pisa-resultat i matematik och läsning*. Stockholm: Läraryrket.
- Löfdahl, A., & Folke-Fichtelius, M. (2015). Preschool's new suit: Care in terms of learning and knowledge. *Early Years*, 35(3), 260–272.
- Löfdahl, A., & Pérez Prieto, H. (2009a). Between control and resistance: Planning and evaluation texts in the Swedish preschool. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(4), 393–408.
- Löfdahl, A., & Pérez Prieto, H. (2009b). Institutional narratives within the performative preschool in Sweden: 'If we write that we're no good, that's not good publicity'. *Early Years: An International Research Journal*, 29(3), 261–270.

- Löfgren, H. (2015). A noisy silence about care: Swedish preschool teachers' talk about documentation. *Early Years*, DOI:10.1080/09575146.2015.1062744
- MacLure, M. (2013). Classification or wonder? Coding as an analytic practice in qualitative research. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and research methodologies* (pp. 164–183). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mayne, F., & Howitt, C. (2015). How far have we come in respecting young children in our research? A meta-analysis of reported early childhood research practice from 2009 to 2012. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 40(4), 30–38.
- Mazzei, L. A. (2014). Beyond an easy Sense: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 742–746.
- McNiff, S. (2008). Arts-based research. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues* (pp. 29–40). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Moen, R. D., & Norman, C. L. (2011). Circling back: Clearing up myths about the Deming cycle and seeing how it keeps evolving. *Quality Progress*, 43(11), 22–28.
- Moss, P. (2016). Why can't we get beyond quality? *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(1), 8–15.
- Myndigheten för skolutveckling. (2007). *Kvalitetsarbete i förskola och skola: Handbok i kvalitetsredovisning*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Nordtømme, S. (2012). Place, space and materiality for pedagogy in a kindergarten. *Education Inquiry*, 3(3), 317–333.
- Oliver, P. (2010). *The student's guide to research ethics*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Olsson, L. M. (2008). *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood education*. PhD diss., Umeå: Umeå Universitet.
- Olsson, L. M. (2012). Eventicizing curriculum: Learning to read and write through becoming a citizen of the world. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 28(1), 88–107.
- Otterstad, A. M., & Nordbrønd, B. (2015). Posthumanisme/nymaterialisme og nomadisme: Affektive brytninger av barnehagens observasjonspraksiser. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 11(1), 1–17.
- Palmer, A. (2010a). *Att bli matematisk: Matematisk subjektivitet och genus i lärarutbildningen för de yngre åldrarna*. PhD diss., Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet.
- Palmer, A. (2010b). 'Let's dance!' Theorising alternative mathematical practices in early childhood teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 11(2), 130–143.
- Palmer, A. (2012). *Uppföljning, utvärdering och utveckling*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Pedersen, H. (2014). Posthumanistisk forskning: Några ingångar. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 19(2–3), 83–89.
- Persson, S. (2015). Pedagogiska relationer i förskolan. In I. Tallberg Broman, A.-C. Vallberg Roth, L. Palla, & S. Persson (Eds.), *Förskola*

- tidig intervention* (pp. 121–140). Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådets rapportserie.
- Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. London: Routledge & Keagan.
- Piaget, J. (1972). *Psykologi och undervisning*. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers.
- Power, M. (1999). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pramling Samuelsson, I., & Asplund Carlsson, M. (2003). *Det lekande lärande barnet i en utvecklingspedagogisk teori*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Pramling Samuelsson, I., & Sheridan, S. (2003). Delaktighet som värdering och pedagogik. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 8 (1–2), 70–84.
- Prop. (2009/10:165). *Den nya skollagen – för kunskap, valfrihet och trygghet*. Retrieved from <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/142368>
- Prout, A. (2005). *The future of childhood: Towards the interdisciplinary study of children*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Ramirez, S. (2016, February 22). Sebastian Ramirez: Lagstifta om mindre barngrupper i förskolan. *Dagens Nyheter*. Retrieved 13 February, 2017, from <http://asikt.dn.se/asikt/debatt/lagstifta-om-mindre-barngrupper-i-forskolan/>
- Rinaldi, C. (2006). *In dialogue with Reggio Emilia: Listening, researching and learning*. London: Routledge.
- Ritchie, J. (2016). Qualities for early childhood care and education in an age of increasing superdiversity and decreasing biodiversity. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(1), 78–91.
- Rolfe, S. A., & Emmet, S. (2010). Direct observation. In G. MacNaughton, S. A. Rolfe, & I. Siraj-Blatchford (Eds.), *Doing early childhood research: International perspectives on theory and practice* (pp. 309–325). Buckingham, UK.: Open University Press.
- Rubinstein Reich, L., & Wesén, B. (1986). *Observera mera!* Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Rubinstein Reich, L., & Wesén, B. (1992). *Utveckla mera! Självvärdering och egen utveckling i barnomsorgen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Salazar Pérez, M., & Cahill, B. (2016). 'Readiness' as central to the (re)production of quality discourses in the United States. In G. S. Canella, M. Salazar Pérez, & I.-F. Lee (Eds.), *Critical examinations of quality in early education and care: Regulation, disqualification, and erasure* (pp. 11–25). New York: Peter Lang.
- Samuelsson, T., Sparrman, A., Cardell, D., & Lindgren, A.-L. (2015). The active competent child, capable of autonomous action: An inherent quality or the outcome of a research process? *AnthropoChildren*, 5.
- Schulz, M. (2015). The documentation of children's learning in early childhood education. *Children & Society*, 29, 209–218.
- Severinsson, S. (2016). Documentation for students in residential care: Network of relations of human and non-human actants. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(9), 921–933.

- SFS 2010:800. (2010). *Svensk författningssamling 2010:800, Skollag*. Retrieved from Sveriges Riksdag: <http://rkrattsd.b.gov.se/SFSdoc/10/100800.PDF>
- Sheets Johnstone, M. (2011). *Primacy of movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sheridan, S. (2001). *Pedagogical quality in preschool. An issue of perspectives*. PhD diss., Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Sheridan, S. (2009a). Discerning pedagogical quality in preschool. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 245–261.
- Sheridan, S. (2009b). Förskolornas pedagogiska kvalitet. In S. Sheridan, I. Pramling Samuelsson, & E. Johansson (Eds.), *Barns tidiga lärande: En tvärsnittsstudie om förskolan som miljö för barns lärande* (pp. 75–92). Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Sheridan, S., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2009). *Barns lärande - fokus i kvalitetsarbetet*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Sheridan, S., Pramling Samuelsson, I., & Johansson, E. (2009). *Barns tidiga lärande: En tvärsnittsstudie om förskolan som miljö för barns lärande*. Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Sheridan, S., Williams, P., & Sandberg, A. (2013). Systematic quality work in preschool. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 45(1), 123–150.
- Simonsson, M. (2004). *Bilderboken i förskolan - en utgångspunkt för samspel*. PhD diss., Linköping: Linköpings universitet, Tema Barn.
- Skolinspektionen. (2016a). *Förskolans kvalitet och måluppfyllelse 2015–2017. Delrapport 1*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolinspektionen. (2016b). *Förskolans pedagogiska uppdrag: Om undervining, lärande och förskollärares ansvar*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolinspektionen. (2017). *Förskolans kvalitet och måluppfyllelse. Delrapport 2*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (1998). *Läroplan för förskolan, Lpfö 98*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2004). *Förskola i brytningstid: Nationell utvärdering av förskolan*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2005). *Kvalitet i förskolan: Allmänna råd och kommentarer*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2008). *Tio år efter förskolereformen: Nationell utvärdering av förskolan*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2010). *Läroplan för förskolan Lpfö 98, reviderad 2010*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2012). *Systematiskt kvalitetsarbete - för skolväsendet: Allmänna råd med kommentarer*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2014, September 5). *BRUK - verktyg för självskattning*. Retrieved 25 May 2016, from Skolverket: <http://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/kvalitetsarbete/bruk>
- Skolverket. (2015). *Kvalitetsarbete i praktiken*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2016a). *Barngrupper storlek i förskolan: En kartläggning av aktuell pedagogisk, utvecklingspsykologisk och socialpsykologisk forskning*. Stockholm: Author.

- Skolverket. (2016b). *Förskolan: reviderad 2016. Allmänna råd med kommentarer*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2016c). *Läroplan för förskolan, Lpfö 98. Reviderad 2016*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2016d). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011. Reviderad 2016*. Stockholm: Author.
- Skolverket. (2017). *Måluppfyllelse i förskolan: Skolverkets allmänna råd med kommentarer*. Stockholm: Author.
- Socialstyrelsen. (1987). *Pedagogiskt program för förskolan*. Stockholm: Author.
- Sokovic, M., Pavletic, D., & Pipan, K. K. (2010). Quality improvement methodologies – PDCA cycle, RADAR matrix, DMAIC and DFSS. *Journal of Achievements in Materials and Manufacturing Engineering*, 43(1), 476–483.
- SOU 1972:26. (1972). *Förskolan del 1*. Stockholm: Liber.
- SOU 1997:157. (1997). *Att erövra omvärlden*. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.
- SOU 2007:79. (2007). *Tre nya skolmyndigheter: Betänkande av Skolmyndighetsutredningen*. Stockholm: Fritzes offentliga publikationer.
- Sparman, A. (2005). Video recording as interaction: Participant observation of children's everyday life. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(3), 241–255.
- Sparman, A., & Lindgren, A.-L. (2003). Om att bli dokumenterad: Etiska aspekter på förskolans arbete med dokumentation. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 8(1–2), 58–69.
- Sparman, A., & Lindgren, A.-L. (2010). Visual documentation as a normalizing practice: A new discourse of visibility in preschool. *Surveillance & Society*, 7(3/4), 248–261.
- Staunaes, D., & Kofoed, J. (2015). Producing curious affects: Visual methodology as an affecting and conflictual wunderkammer. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(10), 1229–1248.
- Steyerl, H. (2003). *Documentarism as politics of truth*. Retrieved 24 April 2012, from http://republicart.net/disc/representations/steyerl03_en.pdf
- Sverrisson, Á. (2011). Visuellt metodik. In G. Ahrne & P. Svensson (Eds.), *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder* (pp. 165–179). Malmö: Liber.
- Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Taggart, B. (2011). Pre-school quality and educational outcomes at age 11: Low quality has little benefit. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 9(2), 109–124.
- Söderlind, I., & Engwall, K. (2005). *Var kommer barnen in? Barn i politik, vetenskap och dagspress*. Stockholm: Institutet för Framtidsstudier.
- Sørensen, E. (2013). Human presence: Towards a posthumanist approach to experience. *Subjectivity*, 6(1), 112–129.
- Tallberg Broman, I. (2015). Delstudie 1. Förskola till stöd för barns utveckling och lärande. In I. Tallberg Broman, A.-C. Vallberg Roth,

- L. Palla, & S. Persson (Eds.), *Förskola tidig intervention: Delrapport från SKOLFORSK-projektet* (pp. 14–58). Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Taylor, C. A. (2016). Edu-crafting a cacophonous ecology: Posthumanist research practices for education. In C. A. Taylor & C. Hughes (Eds.), *Posthuman Research Practices in Education* (pp. 5–24). Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tellgren, B. (2008). *Från samhällsmoder till forskarbehörig lärare: Kontinuitet och förändring i en lokal förskolläraryrkesutbildning*. PhD diss., Örebro: Örebro Universitet.
- Thiele, K. (2014). Ethos of diffraction: New paradigms for a (post)humanist ethics. *Parallax*, 20(3), 202–216.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2012). Different forms of assessment and documentation in Swedish preschools. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 5(23), 1–18.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2015). Bedömning och dokumentation i förskola. In I. Tallberg Broman, A.-C. Vallberg Roth, L. Palla, & S. Persson (Eds.), *Förskola tidig intervention* (pp. 59–93). Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådets rapportserie.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C., & Månsson, A. (2008). Individuella utvecklingsplaner som uttryck för reglerad barndom: Likriktning med variation. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 13(2), 81–102.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C., & Månsson, A. (2011). Individual development plans from a critical didactic perspective: Focusing on Montessori- and Reggio Emilia-profiled preschools in Sweden. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 9(3), 247–261.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2017). (Meta)theoretical gateways in studies on assessment and documentation in preschool: A research review with a Scandinavian focus. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 14(3), 1–16.
- Watterson, B. (2005). *The Complete Calvin and Hobbes*. Kansas City, MO: Andrews McMeel.
- Wehner-Godée, C. (2000). *Att fånga lärandet: Pedagogisk dokumentation med hjälp av olika medier*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Vermeer, H. J., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Cárcamo, R. A., & Harrison, L. J. (2016). Quality of child care using the environment rating scales: A meta-analysis of international studies. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 48(1), 33–60.
- Westberg, J. (2008). *Förskolepedagogikens framväxt: Pedagogisk förändring och dess förutsättningar, ca 1835–1945*. PhD diss., Uppsala: Historiska institutionen vid Uppsala Universitet.
- Vetenskapsrådet. (2002). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Williams, P., Sheridan, S., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2015). Gruppstorlekens betydelse för barns möjligheter att lära och utvecklas i förskolan. In *Vetenskapsrådets resultatdialog 2015* (pp. 261–270). Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Williams, P., Sheridan, S., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2016, January 20). Forskare: Då vet man att barngruppen är för stor. *Göteborgs Posten*. Retrieved 13 February, 2017, from

- <http://www.gp.se/nyheter/debatt/forskare-d%C3%A5-vet-man-att-barngruppen-%C3%A4r-f%C3%B6r-stor-1.15532>
- Von Greiff, C., Sjögren, A., & Wieselgren, I.-M. (2012). *En god start – en ESO-rapport om tidigt stöd i skolan: Rapport till Expertgruppen för studier i offentlig ekonomi 2012:2*. Stockholm: Finansdepartementet.
- Åsberg, C. (2012). Läskunnighet bortom humanioras bekvämlighetszoner. In C. Åsberg, M. Hultman, & F. Lee (Eds.), *Posthumanistiska nyckeltexter* (pp. 7–21). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Åsén, G. (2002). *Utvärdering i förskolan - frågor och exempel*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Åsén, G. (2015). Tio grundläggande frågor i samband med utvärdering. In G. Åsén (Ed.), *Utvärdering & pedagogisk bedömning i förskolan* (pp. 74–98). Stockholm: Liber.
- Åsén, G., & Moberg, E. (2015). Den statliga synen på och styrningen av utvärdering i förskolan. In G. Åsén (Ed.), *Utvärdering & pedagogisk bedömning i förskolan* (pp. 18–37). Stockholm: Liber.
- Åsén, G., & Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2012). *Utvärdering i förskolan - en forskningsöversikt*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Änggård, E. (2015). Digital cameras: Agents in research with children. *Children's Geographies*, 13(1), 1–13.
- Änggård, E. (2016). How matter comes to matter in children's nature play: Posthumanist approaches and children's geographies. *Children's Geographies*, 14(1), 77–90.

Research Papers Included in the Thesis

Research Papers

The articles associated with this thesis have been removed for copyright reasons. For more details about these see:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-136694>

Appendices

Appendix 1

Production of documentation

Preschool A (time duration of video recordings)

Group	Giraffe	Zebra
18 apr 2011	08:08	
	02:20	
	14:11	
12 dec 2011 Problems transferring the video recordings resulted in most parts of the recordings being lost, therefore these are not used.	00:20	
	00:29	
	00:29	
	00:29	
	00:29	
24 jan 2012		14:50
		22:48
		10:57
		03:29
		14:37
25 jan 2012	02:46	
	08:45	
	02:09	
	00:23	
26 jan 2012		09:43
		31:54
14 feb 2012		13:46
		00:06
		22:11
		31:43
20 feb 2012	08:33	
	06:57	
	16:46	
	01:26	
21 feb 2012		03:54
22 feb 2012	31:38	
Sum:	01:46:47	2:59:58

Appendix 2

Products of documentation

Preschools B-E (number of pages/slides of documentation)

	Unit One		Unit Two							
Documents	Printed or handwritten papers		Power point files							
Preschool	B	C	D				E			
Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pages*	32	90								
Slides*			65	24	59	77	59	37	29	37
Sum:	122		225				162			

*Pages and slides also include the template

Appendix 3

Norrköping den 4 november 2011

Linköping University

Informationsbrev till personal och rektor

Hej!

Jag heter Katarina Elfström Pettersson och är förskollärare, som håller på med forskarutbildning i Pedagogiskt Arbete vid Linköpings universitet. Jag skriver till dig därför att jag (för min licentiat-avhandling) planerar att göra en studie om dokumentation på er förskola.

I den nya läroplanen för förskolan står det att personalen ska dokumentera det som sker i förskolan. Det finns inte så mycket forskning om just dokumentation i förskolan, därför är det intressant att studera. Delaktighet och inflytande är också viktiga enligt läroplanen. När man dokumenterar och använder datorn går det fort att ta fram och titta på fotografier och fundera kring det som händer på dem. Det jag vill undersöka i den här studien är hur det går till när barnen och förskolläraren gör dokumentationer tillsammans.

Jag är intresserad av hur det går till när dokumentationer görs på er förskola. Jag valde ut er förskola efter att ha sett på förskolans hemsida att dokumentation, datorer och barns delaktighet är viktiga områden. Jag vill också studera hur barnen och personalen pratar om dokumentationerna och hur barnen får vara med och beskriva det de är med om. För att kunna få syn på det vill jag vara med i förskolan under några veckor. För att komma ihåg det som händer kommer jag att videofilma och skriva anteckningar.

Jag kommer inte att använda barnens, de vuxnas eller förskolans riktiga namn vid publicering i olika sammanhang. Det insamlade materialet (videofilm och mina anteckningar) kommer bara att användas i forskningssammanhang. Anteckningarna, videofilmerna och resultatet kommer att behandlas så att inte obehöriga kan ta del av dem. Resultatet kommer att publiceras i en licentiatavhandling men kan också komma att publiceras i tidskrifter eller böcker. Även om ni säger ja till att delta nu så har ni och barnet rätt att avbryta deltagandet i studien utan anledning. Om ni väljer att inte delta eller vill avbryta deltagande så kommer jag inte att använda någon information om den enskilda personen. Jag kommer även att fråga barnen om de vill delta och vara lyhörd för om något barn inte verkar vilja bli filmat. Även om föräldrarna godkänner att deras barn får delta kommer jag inte att filma barn som jag märker inte vill vara med.

Har ni några frågor eller undringar är ni välkomna att kontakta mig. Vill ni ringa är telefonnumret 011-36 36 23 (måndag-torsdag,

dagtid). Vill ni maila är adressen katarina.elfstrom.pettersson@liu.se och brev skickas till:

Katarina Elfström Pettersson
Linköping Universitet,
Institutionen för Samhälls- och Välfärdsstudier (ISV)
601 74 Norrköping

Ni kan också kontakta min handledare, professor Eva Reimers 011-36 31 52

Med vänliga hälsningar
Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Svarskupong

Jag intygar att jag har fått information om Katarina Elfström Petterssons studie om barns delaktighet i dokumentation i förskolan och har haft tillfälle att ställa frågor innan jag tagit ställning till att ge samtycke till att delta i studien. Jag vet också att jag får avbryta deltagandet utan att ange skäl.

☐ **JA**, jag kan tänka mig att delta ☐ **NEJ**, jag kan inte tänka mig att delta

Namn: _____

Underskrift: _____

Appendix 4

Norrköping den 4 november 2011

Linköping University

Informationsbrev till målsmän

Hej!

Jag heter Katarina Elfström Pettersson och är förskollärare, som håller på med forskarutbildning i Pedagogiskt Arbete vid Linköpings universitet. Jag skriver till er/dig därför att jag (för min licentiatavhandling) planerar att göra en studie om dokumentation på ert/ditt barns förskola.

I den nya läroplanen för förskolan står det att personalen ska dokumentera det som sker i förskolan. Det finns inte så mycket forskning om just dokumentation i förskolan, därför är det intressant att studera. Delaktighet och inflytande är också viktiga enligt läroplanen. När man dokumenterar och använder datorn går det fort att ta fram och titta på fotografier och fundera kring det som händer på dem. Det jag vill undersöka i den här studien är hur det går till när barnen och förskolläraren gör dokumentationer tillsammans.

Jag är intresserad av hur det går till när dokumentationer görs på ert/ditt barns förskola. Jag valde ut ert/ditt barns förskola efter att ha sett på förskolans hemsida att dokumentation, datorer och barns delaktighet är viktiga områden. Jag vill också studera hur barnen och personalen pratar om dokumentationerna och hur barnen får vara med och beskriva det de är med om. För att kunna få syn på det vill jag vara med i förskolan under några veckor. För att komma ihåg det som händer kommer jag att videofilma och skriva anteckningar.

Jag kommer inte att använda barnens, de vuxnas eller förskolans riktiga namn vid publicering i olika sammanhang. Det insamlade materialet (videofilm och mina anteckningar) kommer bara att användas i forskningssammanhang. Anteckningarna, videofilmerna och resultatet kommer att behandlas så att inte obehöriga kan ta del av dem. Resultatet kommer att publiceras i en licentiatavhandling men kan också komma att publiceras i tidskrifter eller böcker. Även om ni säger ja till att delta nu så har ni och barnet rätt att avbryta deltagandet i studien utan anledning. Om ni väljer att inte delta eller vill avbryta deltagande så kommer jag inte att använda någon information om det enskilda barnet. Jag kommer även att fråga barnen om de vill delta och vara lyhörd för om något barn inte verkar vilja bli filmat. Även om ni/du godkänner att ert/ditt barn får delta kommer jag inte att filma barn som jag märker inte vill vara med.

Har ni några frågor eller undringar är ni välkomna att kontakta mig. Vill ni ringa är telefonnumret 011-36 36 23 (måndag-torsdag,

dagtid). Vill ni maila är adressen
katarina.elfstrom.pettersson@liu.se och brev skickas till:

Katarina Elfström Pettersson
Linköping Universitet,
Institutionen för Samhälls- och Välfärdsstudier (ISV)
601 74 Norrköping

Ni kan också kontakta min handledare, professor Eva Reimers 011-
36 31 52

Med vänliga hälsningar
Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Svarskupong

Jag intygar att jag har fått information om Katarina Elfström Petterssons studie om barns delaktighet i dokumentation i förskolan och har haft tillfälle att ställa frågor innan jag tagit ställning till att ge samtycke till att mitt barn får delta i studien. Jag vet också att jag får avbryta deltagandet utan att ange skäl.

☐ **JA**, vårt/mitt barn får delta.
vårt/mitt barn får inte delta.

☐ **NEJ**,

Barnets namn: _____

Målsmans/-mäns
underskrift: _____

Appendix 5

TILL FÖRSKOLEPERSONAL
OCH MAMMOR OCH PAPPOR
OCH ANDRA SOM KÄNNER
BARNET

Jag har skrivit den här lilla foldern
för att jag tycker det är viktigt att
barnen (som ju är de viktigaste av
alla i min studie!) också ska få in-
formation och få möjlighet att tala
om ifall de vill vara med i min studie
eller inte.

Katarina

EN FORSKARE PÅ
FÖRSKOLAN

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Telefon: 011-36 36 23
E-post: katarina.elfstrom.pettersson@liu.se

VAD GÖR EN FORSKARE?

Har jag var liten ville
jag bli forskare. Jag
ville ha en vit rock på
mig och blanda olika
vätskor för att se vad
som händer!

Jag ville titta i ett mikroskop på små, små

saker för att se
hur de egentlig-
en såg ut. Det
var det jag
trodde att alla
forskare gjorde!

Men jag blev forskare istället och jobbar
på en forskola i många

många år. Jag tyckte det
var jätteskul! Men jag var
nyfiken: Hela tiden och ville
lära mig mer och mer. Då
blev jag forskare i alla fall.

Jag blev inte en forskare som
blandar vätskor och jag har
inget mikroskop att titta i. Jag
har bara en dator och en
massa böcker! Istället känner
jag mig säker.

Det finns faktiskt forskare som blandar väts-
kor och tittar i mikro-

skop. Men det finns
andra forskare som
tittar och frågar eller
filmar och spelar in vad
människor säger. Och
sen skriver de om det i
en bok.

En sån forskare är jag.

Jag tittar och skriver i
en liten bok och filmar
och pratar och sen skriv-
er jag på datorn. Det
jag skriver kanske blir
en bok, eller så kon det
hända i en tidning.

Istället vill fors-
kare veta vad
andra forskare
gör. Då kan vi
testas och pröva med varandra om vad vi gör.
Nästan som en samling i forskolan!

Jag vill gärna lära mig mer om vad du gör i din

forskola. Då måste jag fråga
alla som är där om de vill
vara med. Jag måste fråga
rektorn och föräldrarna och
mammorna och papporna.
Och så måste jag ju fråga
dig och de andra barnen!

Alla som jag frågar måste svara om de vill
vara med eller inte vill vara med. Du kanske

säger: Ja först och vill vara
med, men ångar dig sen och
inte vill längre. Då får du säga
NEJ och då behöver du inte
vara med mer!

Katarina

Appendix 6

Norrköping den 28 januari 2015

Informationsbrev till personal och förskolechef

Hej!

Jag heter Katarina Elfström Pettersson och är doktorand i Pedagogiskt Arbete vid Linköpings universitet. Jag skriver till dig därför att jag planerar att göra en studie om systematiskt kvalitetsarbete på er förskola för min doktorsavhandling.

Systematiskt kvalitetsarbete är något som alla förskolor ska göra enligt skollagen. Skolverket har utgivit allmänna råd där de presenterar det systematiska kvalitetsarbetet som en cyklisk process: Var är vi? Vart ska vi? Hur gör vi? I denna process ska de olika faserna dokumenteras. Jag är intresserad av hur denna dokumentation produceras. Det jag har tänkt studera är vad som händer när man använder något verktyg såsom frågeformulär, förlagor eller modeller för systematiskt kvalitetsarbete. När man bestämmer sig för att använda en speciell modell så kan man säga att den på något sätt styr som blir möjligt att göra. För att få syn på det skulle jag vilja få tillgång till och läsa er dokumentation av det systematiska kvalitetsarbetet.

Jag kommer inte att använda personalens eller förskolans riktiga namn vid publicering i olika sammanhang. Skulle det förekomma uppgifter om enskilda barn i delar av materialet kommer jag inte att använda dessa delar. Det insamlade materialet (dokumenten) kommer bara att användas i forskningssammanhang. Dokumenten och resultatet kommer att behandlas så att inte obehöriga kan ta del av dem. Resultatet kommer att publiceras i en doktorsavhandling och i vetenskapliga tidskrifter men kan också komma att publiceras i andra tidskrifter eller böcker. Även om ni säger ja till att delta nu så har ni rätt att avbryta deltagandet i studien utan att uppge anledning. Om ni väljer att inte delta eller vill avbryta deltagande så kommer jag inte att använda er dokumentation.

Har ni några frågor eller undringar är ni välkomna att kontakta mig. Vill ni ringa är telefonnumret 011-36 36 23 (tisdag-torsdag, dagtid). Vill ni maila är adressen katarina.elfstrom.pettersson@liu.se och brev skickas till:

Katarina Elfström Pettersson
Linköping Universitet,
Institutionen för Samhälls- och Välfärdsstudier (ISV)
601 74 Norrköping

Ni kan också kontakta min handledare, professor Eva Reimers 011-36 31 52

Med vänliga hälsningar

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Svarskupong

Jag intygar att jag har fått information om Katarina Elfström Petterssons studie om systematiskt kvalitetsarbete i förskolan och har haft tillfälle att ställa frågor innan jag tagit ställning till att ge samtycke till att delta i studien. Jag vet också att jag får avbryta deltagandet utan att ange skäl.

☐ **JA**, jag kan tänka mig att delta ☐ **NEJ**, jag kan inte tänka mig att delta

Namn: _____

Underskrift: _____

LINKÖPING STUDIES IN PEDAGOGIC PRACTICES

1. MARKSTRÖM, ANNE-MARIE. Förskolan som normaliseringspraktik. En etnografisk studie. 2005. ISBN 91-85297-70-4.
2. WEDIN ANN-SOFI, Lärares arbete och kunskapsbildning. Utmaningar och inviter i den vardagliga praktiken. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-63-3.
3. BRÜDE SUNDIN, JOSEFIN. En riktig rektor. Om ledarskap, genus och skolkulturer. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85715-62-6.
4. HELLBERG, KRISTINA. Elever på ett anpassat individuellt gymnasieprogram: skolvardag och vändpunkter. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-92-0.
5. SPARRLÖF, GÖRAN. Vi manliga lärare Folkskolans lärare och lärarinnor i kamp om löner och arbetsvillkor 1920-1963. 2007. ISBN 978-91-85831-38-8.
6. KARLSSON, YVONNE. Att inte vilja vara problem - social organisering och utvärdering av elever i en särskild undervisningsgrupp. 2008. ISBN 978-91-85895-28-1.
7. OLSON, MARIA. Från nationsbyggare till global marknadsnomad. Om medborgarskapet i svensk utbildningspolitik under 1990-talet. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-890-7.
8. AYTON, KATARINA. An ordinary school child: Agency and authority in children's schooling. 2008. ISBN 978-91-7393-834-1.
9. BOLANDER, EVA. Risk och bejakande. Sexualitet och genus i sexualupplysning och undervisning i TV. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-685-9.
10. JOHNSON HARRIE, ANNA. Staten och läromedlen. En studie av den svenska statliga förhandsgranskningen av läromedel 1938-1991. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-616-3.
11. HÖGBERG, RONNY. Motstånd och konformitet. Om manliga yrkeslevers liv och identitetsskapande i relation till kärnämnen. 2009. ISBN 978-91-7393-543-2.
12. HEGENDER, HENRIK. Mellan akademi och profession. Hur lärarkunskap formuleras och bedöms i verksamhetsförlagd lärarutbildning. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-526-5.
13. SEVERINSSON, SUSANNE. Unga i normalitetens gränsland: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-402-2.
14. WIDÉN, PÅR. Bedömningsmakten. Berättelser om stat, lärare och elev, 1960-1995. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-372-8.
15. SANDLUND, MONICA. Lärare med utländsk bakgrund. Sju yrkeslivsberättelser om möten med nya skolsammanhang. 2010. ISBN 978-91-7393-371-1.
16. LILJA, PATRIK. Contextualizing inquiry. Negotiations of tasks, tools and actions in an upper secondary classroom. 2012. ISBN 978-91-7346-735-3
17. FREDRIKSSON, KRISTINA (Licentiatavhandling). Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-613-8

18. BENGTSSON, JENNY. Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år. 2013. ISBN 978-91-7519-560-5
19. SÖDERMAN LAGO, LINA. "Mellanklass kan man kalla det": Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett. 2014. ISBN 978-91-7519-349-6
20. STENLIDEN, LINNÉA. Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0
21. ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON, KATARINA (Licentiatavhandling). Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7
22. DALGREN, SARA (Licentiatavhandling). Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8
23. HJORT, SIMON (Licentiatavhandling). Kritiskt tänkande i klassrummet. En studie av didaktiska val och manifesterat kritiskt tänkande i samhällskunskaps- och filosofiundervisning. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-166-9
24. BOO, SOFIA (Licentiatavhandling). Lärares arbete med individanpassning. Strategier och dilemman i Klassrummet. 2014. ISBN: 978-91-7519-157-7
25. JOHANSSON, MARITHA. Läsa, förstå, analysera. En komparativ studie om svenska och franska gymnasieelevers reception av en narrativ text. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685-964-3
26. NORBURG, ULRICA. Fängelse, skola uppfostringsanstalt eller skyddshem? Åkerbrukskolonien Hall för pojkar år 1876-1940. 2015. ISBN: 978-91-7685980-3
27. ALBINSSON, ANDERS. "De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo". Förskolebarns mätande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8
28. WINZELL, HELEN (Licentiatavhandling). Svensklärares skrivdidaktiska kunskapsbildning: Blivande och tidigt verksamma gymnasielärare i svenska talar om skrivundervisning. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-788-5
29. BODÉN, LINNEA. Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism. 2016. ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9
30. DALGREN, SARA. Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag. 2017. ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5

1. SUSANNE, SEVERINSSON. (2010) *Unga i normalitetens gränsland: Undervisning och behandling i särskilda undervisningsgrupper och hem för vård eller boende.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN 978-91-7393-402-2
2. KRISTINA, FREDRIKSSON. (2013) *Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet. En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan.* (Lic) ISBN 978-91-7519-613-8
3. JENNY, BENGTSSON. (2013) *Jag sa att jag älskade han men jag har redan sagt förlåt för det. Ålder, genus och sexualitet i skolans tidigare år.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN 978-91-7519-560-5
4. KATARINA, ELFSTRÖM PETERSSON. (2013) *Playing a part in preschool documentation – A study of how participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices and how it is affected by material agents.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7
5. LINA, LAGO. (2014) *"Mellanklass kan man kalla det": Om tid och meningsskapande vid övergången från förskoleklass till årskurs ett.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-349-6
6. LINNEA, STENLIDEN. (2014) *Visual Storytelling Interacting in School. Learning Conditions in the Social Science Classroom* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7519-338-0
7. SARA, DALGREN. (2014) *"Förskolans pedagogiska praktik som interaktion. Frågor och svar i vardagliga förskoleaktiviteter.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-262-8
8. MATS, BEVEMYR (2014) *Potentiella lärandesituationer och vardagliga matematiska begrepp. 4-5 åriga barns interaktion vid datorn under fri lek i förskolan* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7519-259-8
9. ANDERS ALBINSSON (2015) *"De var svinhögt typ 250 kilo" Förskolebarns mätande av längd, volym och tid i legoleken.* (Lic) ISBN: 978-91-7685-828-8
10. LINNEA BODÉN (2016). *Present absences. Exploring the posthumanist entanglements of school absenteeism.* (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-722-9.

11. SARA, DALGREN (2017). *Att göra pedagogisk praktik tillsammans: Socialt samspel i förskolans vardag*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-593-5
12. KATARINA ELFSTRÖM PETTERSSON (2017). *Production and Products of Preschool Documentation. Entanglements of children, things, and templates*. (Doktorsavhandling) ISBN: 978-91-7685-553-9