How a template for documentation in Swedish preschool systematic quality work produces qualities

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

The self-archived postprint version of this journal article is available at Linköping University Institutional Repository (DiVA):

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-157169>

N.B.: When citing this work, cite the original publication.

Elfström Pettersson, K., (2019), How a template for documentation in Swedish preschool systematic quality work produces qualities, *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 20(2), 194-206.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949118758714>

Original publication available at:

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949118758714>

Copyright: SAGE Publications (UK and US)

<http://www.uk.sagepub.com/home.nav>

Security and water themes: How documentation produces rather than represents preschool quality

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

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

Abstract

This article explores how a template in documentation of preschool systematic quality development work acts to produce elements of quality. Assuming that documentation produces rather than represents preschool quality, and using the concept of spacetimemattering, the article shows how thematic work, care and education become elements of quality. But, turning care into a theme, education and care run the risk of being dichotomised, and care downplayed. The article concludes that, when producing rather than looking back and evaluating preschool quality, documentation has the potential to serve as a vantage point for preschool actors to discuss where they might be going.

Keywords

Preschool, children, documentation, early childhood education and care, spacetimemattering, preschool quality

Corresponding author:

Katarina Elfström Pettersson, Department of Social and Welfare Studies, Linköping University, Campus Norrköping, SE601 74 Norrköping, Sweden.

Email: katarina.elfstrom.pettersson@liu.se

Author

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Department of Social and Welfare studies, Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden

Katarina Elfström Pettersson is a lecturer at Linköping University, Sweden. She is a former preschool teacher who now teaches in preschool education. Her research includes documentation practices within systematic quality development work in preschools.

Security and water themes: How documentation produces rather than represents preschool quality

‘Educare’ and systematic quality development work

This article explores how a template used in documentation of systematic quality development work has a part in producing specific aspects of preschool activities as important elements of preschool quality. The article takes its departure in Swedish preschools as employing a pedagogy signified by combining education and care (*‘educare’*) (Kaga et al., 2011; Löfdahl and Folke-Fichtelius, 2015; Skolverket, 2016). In line with a general wish to provide and maintain an equal and high quality in Swedish preschools, there is a desire for methods that can capture, in order to develop, preschool quality. Unlike schools, Swedish preschools do not assess individual children’s learning outcomes, meaning that preschool quality needs to be evaluated otherwise. Thus, to foster and safeguard quality, Swedish preschool teachers are required to monitor, evaluate and develop preschool quality in documentation of *systematic quality development work* (Skolverket, 2016). However, research has found that in this kind of documentation, care is sometimes downplayed in favour of education (Löfdahl, 2014; Löfgren, 2015). Despite intentions to combine education and care, education is sometimes valued more highly (Vallberg Roth, 2016). This produces a divide between education and care, and may emphasise education methods commonly used in school, sometimes referred to as *‘schoolification’* (Kaga et al., 2011). To assist the preschools and schools, The National Agency for Education provides a *model* of how systematic quality development work is supposed to be done (Skolverket, 2015). This model is expected to be adapted to local school or preschool conditions. To facilitate this and to make documentation more effective, many Swedish preschools use additional ‘tools’ or *templates*.

The above creates difficulties for doing systematic quality development work, including the following: how to combine education and care in assessing preschool quality; whether quality has to do with what children learn, how they are cared for, or both; and how to use (or adapt) a model for systematic quality development not specifically adapted to preschool conditions, and what this means for preschool quality.

This article assumes that documentation *produces* rather than *represents* preschool practices, which also means that templates are not passive instruments (cf. Lager, 2010) but

that they contribute to creating what quality can become. In addition, in line with what Fenech (2011) asks for, the article moves away from a paradigm that sees quality as measurable and objective to a widened perspective on preschool quality. The question asked is: what is produced as quality when taking into account that templates are agentic and that documentation produces rather than represents notions of preschool quality?

With a posthumanist approach, this article challenges and disrupts the idea of representation and takes into account the agency of a template. Starting from documentation from one preschool group, the objective of the article is to explore what role a template plays in documentation of preschool systematic quality development work, and what it produces as important and inevitable elements of quality. Engaging with the concept *spacetime mattering* (Barad, 2007; Lenz Taguchi, 2010) enables taking into account the complexity of the entanglement of preschool practices and traditions. It enables studying how intra-actions of different entities produce preschool quality, considering documentation as enactment, rather than as representation. Using *spacetime mattering*, I discuss how the template and documentation connect and relate to previous preschool traditions, policy texts and different places, and what this produces.

The agency of the document(ation)

There are numerous ways in which the form of documentation becomes agentic. Individual education plans (IEPs) in early childhood education are found to be agentic (and also resisted) in teacher–parent conferences, structuring discussions and defining agendas (Alasuutari, 2015). Worksheets (instruments used for documentation) participate actively during observation and documentation of young children’s learning, producing, and presupposing, an institutionalised learning child in a case study by Schulz (2015). In a study of documentation for students in residential care Severinsson (2016) argues that forms, or templates, have strong agency in the documentation process. The presence or lack of different types of headings in the studied forms has a great impact on what the documents focus on. Somewhat unexpected by Lager (2010), documentation of preschool systematic quality development work was found to focus more on tools and methods than on content such as children’s learning. The teachers in her study are more occupied with ‘quality wheels/systems/templates/models’ (Lager, 2010: 162) and with doing the right thing at the right time than with documenting in order to develop a practice that supports children’s learning, which would be more in line with curriculum demands. Other research finds that templates direct the areas the preschool documentation focuses on (Vallberg Roth and Månsson, 2008) and that teachers sometimes adjust their documentation to fit the templates

(Löfdahl and Pérez Prieto, 2009). One method for documentation recommended by the authorities is pedagogical documentation. It is also mentioned as one basis, and tool, for systematic development work (Palmer, 2012; Skolverket, 2012; SOU 1997:157). As one part of, and intertwined with, preschool practice, pedagogical documentation is seen as actively producing a reality, as an active performative agent, rather than reflecting it (Lenz Taguchi, 2010). To sum up, several previous studies point out that methods, tools, forms and templates are active and agentic participants in documentation. Literature about preschool documentation evinces that not only forms and templates play a part in preschool documentation. Documentation has a long history in Swedish preschools (cf. Lenz Taguchi, 2000, 2010). Different aims and views on preschool practice from different times also influence present-day documentation. Furthermore, documentation is done in certain places and at certain times. It requires various kinds of materials and objects, such as cameras, papers and pencils, computers or tablets. All these factors are entangled in the documentation process, and from this, questions emerge about how space, time and matter are also entangled in preschool documentation and what this entanglement produces.

Space, time and matter

Exploration of preschool practices inevitably connects to space and time: preschool as a certain space at a certain time with and for children. Preschool is also a space of the present, the being 'here and now' of and with children. It is a space of and for a child in the process of becoming, of someone who will learn and become adult, 'there and then'. Thus, preschool practices are also constantly concerned with space and time: spaces and times for arrivals and leavings of children and teachers during the day. Spaces and times for snacks or circle time, for indoor or outdoor activity, for changing nappies or taking a nap. Space and materiality are also considered to be related to and entangled in children's well-being and learning (Løkken and Moser, 2012; Nordin-Hultman, 2004). For example, in Norway several researchers were involved in a research project inquiring into the intertwined relations between preschool children, kindergarten spaces and materials, highlighting the agency of children and materiality (Løkken and Moser, 2012). In a school environment Bodén (2016) has highlighted how school absences and presences were produced and destabilised in relation to spacetimematterings and digital registering software. Thus, in previous research, space, time and matter have been found to matter in different ways. In this section spacetimemattering (Barad, 2007: 179) is put forward as an analytical concept for studying systematic quality development documentation practices.

The Baradian concept spacetime-mattering emphasises phenomena as relations, rather than as ‘things’ (Barad, 2007). Spatiality and temporality are produced as something specific through intra-action, as are humans and materiality. The word intra-action, as opposed to *interaction*, means that entities are being constantly produced through entanglements, rather than pre-existing prior to any inter-action (Barad, 2007). Furthermore, neither humans nor non-humans are privileged; instead, they are produced as active (or not) agents through intra-action. Thus, in this article, documentation of systematic quality development work is seen as a relation between entities such as preschool teachers (writing it), children (participating in it), the Education Act (requiring it), cameras (recording it), computer software (saving it) and myself as researcher (studying it). Rather than representing a reality that already exists in the studied preschool, the documents are producing a reality *and* being produced, simultaneously, similar to the way this article is also producing a reality and being produced. The entities involved are produced together, in one ongoing movement through spacetime-mattering (Barad, 2007; Juelskjaer, 2013; Lenz Taguchi, 2010). This means that the entities are produced as something specific 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: 181). Neither space nor matter is static; instead, they are in a constant process of becoming. Similarly, 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: 181). This approach enables studying how the materiality of the template is entangled with previous thoughts and practices in preschool documentation and how quality can be produced through this entanglement.

This article shows how what documentation of preschool systematic quality work becomes has to do not only with previous practices, *but also* how preschools are thought of as producing education and care for a future generation, *and also* with the kinds of practices and things that are presently involved in its production. Past, present and future are enfolded, and produce and are produced, in the documentation (Lenz Taguchi, 2010).

Studying preschool documentation and documents

This article focuses on documentation from one preschool group (here referred to as the Lifebuoy group) out of a larger body of preschool documentation from two preschools (eight groups) in a small/medium-sized municipality in the southern part of Sweden. The documentation is produced within a digital template in PowerPoint (PPT) format, containing 340 slides in all. The Lifebuoy group documentation encompasses 37 slides, including 11

template slides. The template was produced by the head of these preschools and is an adaptation of a national model (Skolverket, 2015). The different documents were read as enactments, rather than as representations (Jackson and Mazzei, 2012); what can be known is based on what is produced through intra-actions of the researcher/research process and the documentation. This means that my reading of the documentation is an important part of the research apparatus, as is its digital format. The documentation was read through preschool policy texts and Swedish preschool documentation traditions (as described in previous research), focusing on what is produced through the reading rather than on the essence of the content. Also, what was produced by reading the design of the template was taken into account, as described further in the following section.

Next, the template from the studied preschools is presented. Thereafter, the template and the documentation from the Lifebuoy group play parts in a story of how thematic work is produced as an element of quality.

Presenting the template

The digital template consists of text and figures in a PPT file. When producing their systematic quality development documentation, the preschool groups bring their text, photos, and in some cases, figures into the template. The template encompasses an introduction with instructions (five slides), followed by the actual template slides (shown in Fig. 2 below). The introductory slides remain the same in the documentation from the different groups, while the template slides sometimes change place, text and figures are added and new slides are inserted. The first slide of the introduction presents how the template is supposed to work:

The model is based on the preschool team stopping and working on monitoring, evaluation and development five times/year. In between, thematic work and collecting documentation proceed. The documentation should then serve as a basis for evaluation at the five different stops and thus drive development forward (Introduction of template, slide 1; author's translation).

This introduction produces preschool practices as consisting of, on the one hand, monitoring, evaluating and developing (the pedagogical practice), and on the other, thematic work and collecting documentation. A distinction between two kinds of activities is obvious. These could be theorised as two different working spaces, one that evaluates and develops and another that does thematic work and collects documents. Time is also built into these spaces through the visualisation of the instruction as a 'year wheel' (Fig. 1, left), in which the five evaluation and development spaces, or stops, are marked with small circles, and the thematic work and collecting documentation spaces are marked with arrows. The working spaces are

related to and produce time in different ways: Evaluations should only be done at certain stops (circles), while thematic work and collecting documentation should be continuous (arrows) in between the stops. Preschool practices are produced as momentary (stops) and ongoing (proceeding) simultaneously. Different spaces where different activities are supposed to take place are produced, but these spaces are also connected, since (the ongoing) documentation is said to serve as a basis for the evaluation (at the stops). These working spaces also connect to different physical spaces: thematic work and collecting documentation is performed in classrooms or outdoors, while processing collected documentation and discussing and writing down evaluations often take place in offices. Thus, the agency of the template produces thematic work and collecting of documentation as preschool's main daily practices, as that which is going on continuously, whilst evaluation and development take place only at certain stops. These practices are of spacetime-matter, since they do not just happen in a specific time and place, but are both produced by, and produce preschool documentation. This cuts space, time and matter together, connecting the theorised and physical spaces with punctual and flowing time, and with the materiality of the template, all of which matter for what is produced through the documentation.

Another part of the introduction/instruction is the 'improvement wheel' (Fig. 1, right), a visualisation of the evaluation and development working space which produces the systematic quality development working space as a continuous process with certain marked phases. Reading these two wheels together produces a continuous process throughout the school year, disrupted by specified phases and stops. The three last phases of the improvement wheel (in ovals in Fig. 1, right) are supposed to be active at each stop, which produces movement also at the stops; the stops become stationary spaces where circular movement takes place. This cuts systematic quality development work together and apart (Barad, 2007) with the everyday preschool practice: it is performed in the ongoing practice (collecting documentation) *and* momentarily, at the stops.

[Insert Figure 1.]

Figure 1. Year wheel and improvement wheel in the template

The inevitable theme

Apart from being included in the improvement wheel, the four phases are also located on separate template slides, with an additional slide titled *Theme of the school year* (Fig. 2). Whilst the *Phase* slides have subtitles, instructions and questions, the *Theme* slide is empty,

except for the title and the word *date* in the lower left corner. This slide is produced as other, as different from the Phase slides in two ways: by not being included in or part of the improvement wheel, and by having a different physical appearance, almost blank.

The lack of subtitles, questions or further instructions produces the theme as obvious enough not to need further instruction. This could open up the possibility of several versions of what could be considered a 'theme'. The existence of a separate Theme slide and the way it is produced as different from the other slides, which makes it stand out in relation to the others, produces the theme as an inevitable part of the documentation. Working thematically is required by the curriculum, but instructions about thematic work could have been included on one of the other slides. Instead, in this template the theme is produced as compulsory, as something that could not be easily overlooked, which might have been the case if instructions about thematic work were located in any of the other slides. Thus, the theme is both included in (compulsory) and excluded from (not part of the improvement wheel) the other slides in the template. This reading enacts an agential cut, a cutting together and apart (Barad, 2007) of the theme in the template.

Reading the template as an enactment, the placement of the Theme slide, after the *Present* phase and before the three phases that are supposed to be active at each stop, could suggest that the theme should be determined once and for all. But it could also suggest that it might be revised at each stop. However, the term 'school year' on the Theme slide produces an instruction; the theme should last for one whole school year: a specified, limited period of time rather than something continuous or indefinite, and a whole school year rather than a couple of days, a week or a month.

[Insert Figure 2.]

Figure 2. Slides in the template

According to teachers in a study by Davidsson (1999), thematic work seems to be what distinguishes preschool practice from school, separating school and preschool spaces from each other. However, the term 'school year' in this template brings them together again. (The shifting of Swedish preschools into the school system, from a previous placement within the social services, may have resulted in adoption of school-like terms like 'school year'.)

Thematic organisation of preschool work has a long tradition in Sweden, originating in ideas from the late 1870s (Doverborg and Pramling, 1988). Thematic work is, in Sweden, considered suitable for preschool teaching and learning (Skolverket, 2016; Socialstyrelsen, 1987). It is supposed to take departure in children's interests and previous knowledge, and in

what teachers consider to be important for children. In the Educational Programme of 1987, which preceded the 1998 Swedish curriculum for preschool, knowledge-oriented topics related to nature, culture and society were seen as important for children to learn and develop through thematic work (Socialstyrelsen, 1987). The theme can start with some kind of problem or with an event that had occurred in the group. But not anything can become a theme; a theme is supposed to develop children's thinking and conceptualising, and it should be interesting for the children (Doverborg and Pramling, 1988). Thematic work can, depending on its focus and aims, last for a shorter or longer time, from a single hour up to a whole year (Doverborg and Pramling, 1988; Socialstyrelsen, 1987). However, sometimes longer themes seem to be preferred by teachers, and a year-long theme can actually consist of shorter ones, but with an overarching name (Doverborg and Pramling, 1988). The Theme slide's instruction folds back into this preference, leaving no option for the studied preschools to choose how long to work with one theme.

In contrast to thorough descriptions of thematic work in the Educational Programme, in the most recent curriculum for preschool, thematic work is mentioned only once: 'With a theme-oriented approach children's learning can broaden and be continuous' (Skolverket, 2016: 7). This produces the theme as connected to knowledge. Perhaps thematic work is currently obvious enough not to need further mention? This too folds into the lack of instructions on the Theme slide.

Putting the concept spacetime-mattering to work, the theme is produced as inevitable: the important thematic working space, the empty space of the Theme slide, its placement in the template and the instruction on its duration entangle and engage in this production. Also entangled are the previous and present notions and traditions around thematic work. Thematic work is supposed to be done at certain moments and at certain working spaces, and last for a certain time. All of these things matter to present practices around thematic work: 'matter carries within itself the sedimented historialities of the practices through which it is produced as part of its ongoing becoming' (Barad, 2007: 180).

Care and education

The digital template actively produces the theme as an important and inevitable part of documentation. None of the preschool groups omit presenting a theme, using the template slide. In most of the groups the theme remains the same during the school year. Two of the groups have knowledge-oriented themes, for example, learning about mushrooms or trees in the forest. In two of the groups the themes are connected to values and start from a social problem, such as the children sometimes not treating each other nicely, and so the chosen

themes are related to respect and to social atmosphere. Two groups have previously received criticism for not having enough creative materials; they choose themes in which creative materials are emphasised. In two of the groups the theme changes during the school year: one of them has knowledge-oriented themes but in the other, the Lifebuoy, the orientation of the theme also changes. The first theme relates to care, trying to make young newcomers feel secure and is titled, *Security*. In the English version the curriculum uses the terms *security* and *feeling of security* for the Swedish word 'trygghet', which is not easily translated into English. In this article the terms refer to a 'perceived feeling of being free of worrisome or threatening phenomena' (Norlander et al., 2015). The second theme is knowledge-oriented and is labelled, *Water*. Since the template points out that the theme should be chosen for one whole school year, this change prompted me to further engage with the Lifebuoy documentation.

Here and now – there and then

The Lifebuoy documentation relates freely to the template. Slides do not follow the order of the template, and subtitles or questions are left out or changed. This is not unusual for the groups of the larger study. Nevertheless, all of the parts of the template are included (to a greater or lesser degree). The first of the Lifebuoy themes, Security, is not presented on the theme slide, but is introduced in the Present phase:

Where are we now? August
Theme: Security
Our curiosity question: Does the environment create security?
We are starting out with a group of new children where we need to build a feeling of security between teacher-child, child-child and teacher-teacher. (slide 8)

The reading of the documentation merges the Security theme with the Present phase. The Security theme answers to a present situation: newcomers' need of security in order to benefit from preschool education (Commodari, 2013). A caring concern for young children's introduction into a new environment is the main focus. Thus, this moment in space and time, here and now, becomes agentic and shapes the choice of theme in the Lifebuoy group: space and time matter and materialise as the Security theme.

The second theme, Water, is knowledge-oriented. This connects to the Educational Programme, in which 'water' is suggested as one example of possible knowledge themes (Socialstyrelsen, 1987). Although the Programme is no longer in use, it is part of Swedish preschool traditions and therefore influences current practices, connecting past with present.

The Lifebuoy's objectives for the Water theme connect to different subjects, for example, 'develop their curiosity for natural sciences' (slide 27), which produces the theme as educational and future-oriented, as something for children to obtain there and then. The Water theme is entangled with space and time, in traditions from previous practices and policy documents, with present practices and future expectations of learning.

Turning to the first theme, security is highly important to many teachers in preschool and school (Persson and Tallberg Broman, 2002). It has been, and still is, presented in policy documents as a precondition that should shape preschool practice (Skolverket, 2016; Socialstyrelsen, 1987), meaning that security is not necessarily a topic to be taught. As a condition for learning, security is a way of caring. As mentioned above, care tends to be downplayed in favour of education in documentation of systematic quality development work (Löfdahl, 2014; Löfgren, 2015). Thus, caring activities become invisible, and pedagogical practices are foregrounded. This is argued to be a paradox when using common templates, since '[t]he accounts that are supposed to make the preschool more visible may in practice make them more opaque' (Löfdahl and Pérez Prieto, 2009: 267).

Ahrenkiel et al. (2013) discuss how demands for documentation might downplay what they term 'unnoticed professional competence' (Ahrenkiel et al, 2013: 82): the activities needed in everyday care, such as changing nappies, dressing and undressing, and activities around mealtime, which documentation might not take note of. Another aspect is considered by Alasuutari et al. (2014: 128) asking whether it is 'possible that the agency of documentation overcomes the agency of the educators and that documentalized practices start to follow the principle of "papers first"?', that is, whether documenting becomes more important than the practice it is supposed to document?

Reading theme as connected to knowledge (in accordance with the curriculum) and security as connected to care, the Security theme could be read as an educationalisation of care. This compares to what Löfdahl and Folke-Fichtelius (2015: 268) term 'transformation strategy'. Using security as a theme might mean that children should learn about security. This would then connect to the claims about documentation as favouring the education side of preschool practice. Still, the Security theme might also be a way of highlighting care in preschool practice, unlike previous research findings of documentation as favouring education. Thus, security, as a theme, is entangled in notions of a good start for young children here and now. It is also entangled in the divide and integration of care and education, and in difficulties or possibilities of emphasising care in documentation. Choosing security could be seen as an answer to the problem of familiarising newcomers to the preschool environment. In this case the new space and time for the newcomers matter for what is chosen as the initial theme.

In contrast to the Security theme, the Water theme is presented on a separate slide, with the words ‘Our new theme Water’ and a date: 1 January 2015 (Fig. 3). The design of this slide resembles a title or chapter page, indicating something new or other, maybe a new beginning or a different focus. The date strengthens this impression, indicating a new beginning on New Year’s Day. Also, being a national holiday, the date is probably not suggesting when this slide was written.

[Insert Figure 3.]

Figure 3. Water theme, slide 23

The space (emptiness), including the placement (on a singular slide), the time (date) and matter (layout of the slide) produce this theme as different, as a new beginning, focusing on knowledge, in line with the curriculum. The Water theme is produced as more important, as ‘the actual’ theme of the school year, being explicitly marked, in contrast to the Security theme’s more subtle appearance as a part of a phase.

While the Security theme is produced as here and now, the Water theme is produced as there and then. But most important is choosing, or producing, a theme at all. The theme itself becomes important and inevitable, not because someone decides it is, but because of intra-actions of different entities, of spacetime mattering. Writings about thematic work in past and present policy texts and research, the layout of the template and the documentation of the Lifebuoy group are enfolded and produce thematic work as inevitable, and two different themes as important in different ways, one at a specific point in time, here and now, the other for future development, there and then. Here and now becomes important in order to reach there and then. The care theme (Security) is needed to accomplish a knowledge theme (Water). They are cut together and apart simultaneously (Barad, 2007).

Representing or producing preschool quality?

Assuming that documentation is not about representation but that it instead is productive, this article has shown how a template for systematic quality development work participates in producing different aspects of preschool quality. This resonates with thoughts of preschool quality as ‘qualities’ (Ritchie, 2016: 79, italics in original), which goes against seeing quality as homogenous and universal. In line with Vallberg Roth and Månsson (2008) and Severinsson (2016), the template was found to be agentic, directing the documentation towards certain aspects. By using the concept spacetime mattering, I presented the ways the

template and the documentation intra-act with previous traditions (and so on) producing certain elements as quality. However, systematic quality development documentation is, according to the National Agency for Education, supposed to evaluate and develop preschool quality (Skolverket, 2012, 2015). Using a tool, such as the template used in the studied preschool, may be one way of trying to facilitate and make documentation more efficient. In contrast to the assumptions of this article, this kind of tool is generally seen as passive, and the documentation is considered to represent reality. The representations are supposed to be analysable to find out what actions are needed to fulfil the curriculum goals and to ensure and improve preschool quality, which means that quality is about fulfilling goals (Skolverket, 2015).

Thus, a tension between these different ways of relating to documentation is produced. Through the present study quality becomes something different from fulfilling curriculum goals. This is expressed through the emergence of thematic work as an important element of quality, and by the different ways that care and education are highlighted. Education becomes important in connection to the curriculum and to previous preschool traditions. Care becomes important through an urgent need for teachers to make newcomers feel safe and secure. However, when the teachers discern that children feel secure, a knowledge theme emerges as the main quality. This both confirms and contradicts the findings by Löfdahl and Pérez Prieto (2009), Löfdahl (2014) and Löfgren (2015), about care being downplayed and invisible in documentation of systematic quality development work. Whilst the template was agentic in producing thematic work as an element of quality, spacetimematterings of the practice (such as newcomers' needs for security, entering a new space for the first time) also had an impact on the content of the theme, shifting it towards care. Thus, despite the focus on knowledge, and, maybe, thanks to the inevitability of the theme, care is still forwarded as quality. Care and education are cut together—apart (Barad, 2007). By this, the question posed by Alasuutari et al. (2014) is answered with yes and no: the agency of the documentation sometimes does and sometimes does not overcome the agency of the educators. That is, in the present study the agency of the documentation in intra-action with the agency of the practice (including educators) produces the theme and its content as care (and education). But when care becomes a theme, it also becomes temporary. All themes are signified by a salient beginning and an endpoint. In that way care, in this context, differs from the preschool's permanent mission of caring for children. Making care into a theme risks relegating to the background the everyday care that is still needed. This makes turning care into a theme highly problematic, as it risks making the relation between education and care dichotomous instead of entangled, further separating education and care, in contradiction to

research findings that emphasise the importance of their entanglement for children's development and learning (cf. Kaga et al., 2011).

When documentation produces rather than represents preschool quality, it cannot be used to look back and evaluate what has been done or to evaluate the degree to which the curriculum goals have been fulfilled. However, if certain elements of quality are produced, it is possible to discern where the practice presently is, which means that it also can be possible to discuss where it might be going.

Figures

Figure 1. Year wheel and improvement wheel in the template	6
Figure 2. Slides in the template	7
Figure 3. Water theme, slide 23.....	11

References

- Ahrenkiel A, Schmidt C, Steen Nielsen B, Sommer F and Warring N (2013) Unnoticed professional competence in day care work. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies* 3(2): 79–95.
- Alasuutari M (2015) Documenting napping: the agentic force of documents and human action. *Children & Society* 29: 219–230.
- Alasuutari M, Markström A-M and Vallberg-Roth A-C (2014) *Assessment and Documentation in Early Childhood Education*. Routledge: New York.
- Barad K (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press: London.
- Bodén L (2016) Dexter time: the space, time, and matterings of school absence registration. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 37(2): 245–255. 3
- Commodari E (2013) Preschool teacher attachment, school readiness and risk of learning difficulties. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 28(1): 123–133.
- Davidsson B (1999) Skilda och gemensamma världar. Två lärares perspektiv på integrerad förskola-skolaverksamhet. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige* 4(2): 181–197.
- Doverborg E and Pramling I (1988) *Temaarbete. Lärarens metodik och barnens förståelse*. Utbildningsförlaget: Stockholm.

- Fenech M (2011) An analysis of the conceptualisation of 'quality' in early childhood education and care empirical research: promoting 'blind spots' as foci for future research. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 12(2):102-116.
- Jackson AY and Mazzei LA (2012) *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research*. Routledge: London.
- Juelskjaer M (2013) Gendered subjectivities of spacetime matter. *Gender and Education* 25: 754–768.
- Kaga Y, Bennett J and Moss P (2011) *Caring and Learning Together. A Cross-national Study of Integration of Early Childhood Care and Education within Education*. Unesco: Paris.
- Lager K (2010) *Att organisera för kvalitet. En studie om kvalitetsarbete i kommunen och förskolan*. Licentiate thesis. Göteborgs universitet: Göteborg.
- Lenz Taguchi H (2000) *Emancipation och motstånd*. PhD dissertation. HLS: Stockholm.
- Lenz Taguchi H (2010) *Going Beyond the Theory/Practice Divide in Early Childhood Education*. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Löfdahl A (2014) Förändrade relationer mellan lärare och föräldrar i förskolan - aspekter av en förändrad lärarprofession. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige* 89(4-5): 246–267.
- Löfdahl A and Folke-Fichtelius M (2015) Preschool's new suit: care in terms of learning and knowledge. *Early Years* 35(3): 260–272.
- Löfdahl A and Pérez Prieto H (2009) Institutional narratives within the performative preschool in Sweden: 'If we write that we're no good, that's not good publicity'. *Early Years* 29(3): 261–270.
- Löfgren H (2015) A noisy silence about care: Swedish preschool teachers' talk about documentation. *Early Years* 36(1): 4–16.
- Løkken G and Moser T (2012) Space and materiality in early childhood pedagogy – introductory notes. *Education Inquiry* 3(3): 303–315.
- Nordin-Hultman E (2004) *Pedagogiska miljöer och barns subjektskapande*. PhD dissertation. Liber: Stockholm.
- Norlander T, Ernestad E, Moradiani Z and Nordén T (2015) Perceived feeling of security: a candidate for assessing remission in borderline patients? *The Open Psychology Journal* 8: 146–152.
- Palmer A (2012) *Uppföljning, utvärdering och utveckling*. Skolverket: Stockholm.
- Persson S and Tallberg Broman I (2002) 'Det är ju ett annat jobb' Förskollärare, grundskollärare och lärarstuderande om professionell identitet i konflikt och förändring. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige* 7(4): 257–278.

- Ritchie J (2016) Qualities for early childhood care and education in an age of increasing superdiversity and decreasing biodiversity. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood Education* 17(1): 78-91.
- 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.
- Skolverket (2012) *Systematiskt kvalitetsarbete - för skolväsendet*. Skolverket: Stockholm.
- Skolverket (2015) *Kvalitetsarbete i praktiken*. Skolverket: Stockholm.
- Skolverket (2016) *Läroplan för förskolan, Lpfö98. Reviderad 2016*. Skolverket: Stockholm.
- Socialstyrelsen (1987) *Pedagogiskt program för förskolan*. Socialstyrelsen: Stockholm.
- SOU 1997:157 (1997) *Att erövra omvärlden*. Utbildningsdepartementet: Stockholm.
- Vallberg Roth A-C and 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 (2016) Nordisk komparativ analys av riktlinjer gällande innehåll och kvalitet i förskolan. *CEPRA-sriben* 20: 4–13.

Improvement wheel

Improvement wheel

Present— Where are we?

Use after survey phase

- What are the children interested in and which learning processes are they in? Explain: How can we see this?
- Together with the children; formulate a curiosity question.

Theme of the School year

Date:

GOAL-Where are we going?

Use at each stop

- The group's goals and objectives, explain why. Concrete objectives linked to curriculum goals, explain why, from a child's perspective and a teacher's perspective.

METHOD- How do we do it?

Use at each stop

- How do we proceed? Organization
- How do we shape our indoor/outdoor environment for example places with materials for play.
- What do we need?
- Who is responsible for what?
- Approach, (commitment, respect and development)
- Which reflection tools do we use? Observations, photographs, film, sound recording, children's learning wheels.
- Reflect and evaluate together with the children whenever possible.
- When do we evaluate? (At the stops, set a date)

EVALUATION - How was it ?

Use at each stop

Connect the evaluation with the chosen goals.

- 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?

Our new theme Water

20150101