Linköping Studies in Pedagogic Practices No. 21
Linköping Studies in Education and Social Sciences No. 4

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.

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

Linköping University

Department of Social and Welfare Studies
Linköping University, Sweden
Linköping 2014

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

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.

© Katarina Elfström Pettersson, 2014

Cover: Olle Elfström (photo),
Katarina Elfström Pettersson (design)

Printed in Sweden by LiU-Tryck, Linköping, Sweden, 2014

ISBN: 978-91-7519-339-7

ISSN: 1653-0101

Distribueras av:

Institutionen för samhälls-och välfärdsstudier

Linköpings universitet

SE-581 83 Linköping

This research has been funded by The Swedish Research Council /Educational sciences, Dnr 2010-200 and by the municipality of Mjölby.

Abstract

The aim of the present study is to explore how children's participation is constructed and enacted in preschool documentation and what kinds of activities evolve between teachers, children and material objects in preschool documentation practices. The study is based on video-recorded observations of teachers and children documenting different preschool activities in two preschool groups. The video observations are analysed using theoretical perspectives on power relations, governmentality, documentality and agentic realism. The results are presented in two research articles. The results show the complexity of children's participation in preschool documentation practice. In the first article two different documentation methods, with different theoretical underpinnings, were used in the preschool: portfolio and pedagogical documentation. The results show that, regardless of documentation method, children's participation varied from attendance to involvement and influence, which can be seen as two ends of a power relation. Power relations between teachers and children also varied between situations as well as within individual situations. The result of the second article shows that children's participation in preschool documentation practices, as well as the documentation itself, was affected and controlled not only by the humans present, but also by different material agents, such as photos and colour-coded labels. Taking material agents into account allows for a broader understanding of documentation practices, which in turn could open up for new forms of children's participation in preschool documentation.

Keywords: early childhood education, children's participation, pedagogical documentation, preschool practice, power relations, agential realism.

Sammanfattning

Syftet med studien som utgör grunden för uppsatsen var att undersöka hur barns delaktighet i förskolans dokumentation är konstruerad och ”görs” och vilken typ av aktivitet som utvecklas mellan lärare, barn och materiella objekt inom förskolans dokumentationspraktik. Studien är baserad på videoinspelade observationer av lärare och barn som dokumenterar olika aktiviteter i förskolan på två förskoleavdelningar. Videoobservationerna analyserades med hjälp av teoretiska perspektiv på maktrelationer, governmentality, documentality och agentic realism. Resultatet presenteras i två vetenskapliga artiklar. Resultaten visar komplexiteten i barns delaktighet i förskolans dokumentationspraktik. I den första artikeln studerades användningen av två olika dokumentationsmetoder, med olika teoretiska underbyggnad, nämligen portfolio och pedagogisk dokumentation. Resultatet visar att barns delaktighet varierade från deltagande till medverkan och inflytande oavsett vilken dokumentationsmetod som användes. Detta kan ses som två ändpunkter av en maktrelation. Maktrelationer mellan lärare och barn varierade också mellan situationer och inom en situation. Resultatet av den andra artikeln visar att barns deltagande i förskolans dokumentationspraktik samt också dokumentationen i sig, påverkades och styrdes, inte enbart av de deltagande personerna, men också av olika materiella agenter, till exempel foton och färgade etiketter. Att även beakta materiella agenter innebär att förståelsen av dokumentationspraktiken kan vidgas, vilket i sin tur skulle kunna öppna upp för nya sätt för barn att vara delaktiga i förskolans dokumentationspraktik.

Nyckelord: förskola, barns delaktighet, pedagogisk dokumentation, förskolepraktik, maktrelationer, agentisk realism.

Acknowledgement

Even though I wanted to become a scientist from an early age I never would have thought that I would end up doing research. As a child I saw my future self as a scientist, dressed in a white lab coat, pouring liquids between test tubes. To be sitting at a desk, typing away at a computer keyboard (which at that point of time did not even exist) was not my idea of doing research. This might have something to do with my mother being a chemistry teacher. Moreover, as a child, I never would have thought that I would be working with children, let alone with people in general. To me it seemed just perfect to work with things or animals. Would I not become a scientist I could always become a veterinarian or an artist. But here I am now, having written a licentiate thesis. I am sure my parents would have been very proud. I know my husband is very proud. I suppose our children are proud too. The grandchildren are too young to know what to be proud of. I suppose that the cat and the horses simply could not care less, they are happy just being fed and cuddled, as usual.

Achieving the licentiate degree is not entirely to my own merit. Had it not been for a number of people this thesis would never have been written. Therefore I would like to give my honest and sincere appreciation to all of them. I will mention some: thank you supervisors, Eva Reimers and Mathias Martinsson for your support and encouragement. Thank you Ann-Marie Markström for reading my preliminary text at the very first seminar and encouraging me to continue. Thank you Anne-Li Lindgren for reading my text at the 70% seminar and inspiring me to go on. Thank you Ann Christine Vallberg Roth for your thorough reading and useful advice at the licentiate seminar. Thank you Maria Simonsson, Eva Änggård, and again, Ann-Marie and Anne-Li for also examining my texts at the above mentioned seminars.

I would also like to thank the senior researchers in the research school for preschool teachers, FöFoBa: Eva Reimers, Polly Björk Willén, Ingrid Pramling Samuelsson, Ingegerd Tallberg Broman and Sven Persson to name a few. Thank you also fellow licentiate students: Åsa Ljunggren, Laurence Delacour, Jonna Larsson, Pernilla Lagerlöf, Hanna Thuresson, Ebba Hildén (Norling Andersen) and Ylva Holmberg. I will never forget the evenings in Gothenburg when we compared experiences of our respective accommodations!

I also want to thank my fellow PhD and licentiate students in the Section for Educational Practice at Campus Norrköping: Lina Söderman Lago, Linnéa Stenliden, Mats Bevemyr, Anna Bylund, Linda Häll, Linnéa Bodén, Lars Wallner, Kirsten Stoewer, Rizwan-ul Huq, Daniel Björklund, Sara Dalgren, Anders Albinsson and Josefine Rostedt. Thank you for coffee breaks and lunches, and also for being creative, having a great sense of humour, and being interested in and open to all kinds of thoughts and experiences.

My office companions/roommates deserve special thanks: thank you Kicki Karlsson for showing me around on my first day, thank you Anna Bylund for inspiring me, thank you Josefine Rostedt for our horsey talks and pedagogic discussions.

I would not have been able to apply to the research school without the support of the head of school in Mjölby municipality, Lotta Gylling, and of the head of Tallgården's preschool, Linda Hedlund. Thank you for supporting my application. And thank you children and pedagogues at Tallgården's preschool, one and all, for making me feel 'at home', even though I was present only on Fridays the last years.

My dear friend and neighbor Linda Rhodes also deserves special thanks for helping me out with my horses a couple of times when I attended conferences.

Last but not least I want to thank my family, first and foremost my husband Ove, for listening to me trying to explain posthuman theories and for making it possible to keep, ride and train my horses. Thank you also, children and grandchildren, Magnus, Olle, Theodor, Emma, Claes, Jonna, for being the most important persons.

Contents

PART I	9
PLAYING A PART IN PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION.	9
1 INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 AIM AND KEY QUESTIONS	14
2 PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION	17
2.1 OBSERVATION, DOCUMENTATION AND PEDAGOGICAL DOCUMENTATION	20
3 RESEARCH ON (PRESCHOOL) DOCUMENTATION	25
3.1 DOCUMENTATION AND PARTICIPATION	27
3.2 DOCUMENTATION AND VISIBILITY	28
3.3 DOCUMENTATION AND (DIGITAL) TOOLS	30
3.4 SUMMARISING PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION	31
4 CHILDREN AND PARTICIPATION	33
4.1 PARTICIPATION, RIGHTS AND (POWER) RELATIONS	34
5 RESEARCH ON PARTICIPATION IN A PRESCHOOL CONTEXT	39
5.1 ADULTS' OR TEACHERS' ROLES FOR CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION	40
5.2 ACCOUNTING FOR CHILDREN'S PERSPECTIVE	42
5.3 SUMMARISING CHILDREN AND PARTICIPATION	43
6 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	45
6.1 POWER RELATIONS AND GOVERNMENTALITY	49
6.2 DOCUMENTALITY	52
6.3 AGENCY	54
6.4 AGENTIAL REALISM	57
6.5 SUMMARISING THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	62
7 METHOD	65
7.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE CHOSEN PRESCHOOL	65
7.2 VIDEO-RECORDING	66
7.3 TRANSCRIPTION PRINCIPLES	68

7.4	REFLECTIVE CONSIDERATIONS ON ETHICS AND METHOD	70
7.5	ANALYSIS	73
8	PRESENTATION/SUMMARY OF ARTICLES.....	77
8.1	ARTICLE 1 - CHILDREN’S PARTICIPATION IN PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION PRACTICES.....	77
8.2	ARTICLE 2 - PAPERS, STICKY DOTS AND LION ADVENTURES PLAYING A PART IN PRESCHOOL DOCUMENTATION PRACTICES.....	79
9	DISCUSSION.....	81
9.1	CHILDREN’S PARTICIPATION IN DOCUMENTATION IS A COMPLEX PURSUIT ...	82
9.2	DOCUMENTS AND DOCUMENTALITY– HOW MATERIALITY MATTERS AND HOW POWER RELATIONS AFFECT CHILDREN’S PARTICIPATION	85
9.3	DOCUMENTATION IN RELATION TO THE CURRICULUM	86
9.4	FURTHER RESEARCH.....	89
	REFERENCES.....	91
	APPENDICES	101
	APPENDIX 1.....	101
	APPENDIX 2.....	104
	APPENDIX 3.....	107
	PART II.....	109
	PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED	109

Figures

Figure 1	Teacher and child documenting at a computer	47
Figure 2	Power relations	51
Figure 3	Documentality.....	53
Figure 4	Agents present in documentation.....	56
Figure 5	Intra-actions in documentation	61
Figure 6	Schematic overview of documentation situation	70

Part I

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

1 Introduction

The point of departure of this study is that documentation and children's participation are required in Swedish preschools, as prescribed by the Swedish preschool curriculum (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). However, documentation in preschool can serve different, highly contrasting purposes and function in many ways. Documentation can be used as a way of following up, evaluating and developing preschool quality (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011) as well as individual children's development and learning (Vallberg Roth, 2012), and it can also be used to inform parents and politicians about everyday preschool practices (SOU 1997:157, 1997). It can also be used to reflect on and challenge prevalent views on children, teachers and pedagogical practice (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999). The different functions of documentation contain contrasting views on why and how to accomplish preschool documentation, and also on who or what can *participate* in preschool documentation practice and in what ways. Documentation and participation are both complex pursuits in preschool, as will be further explained in this section and also in the following chapters.

Two main contrasting views on preschool documentation, with very different theoretical underpinnings, originate in current views on education and children as well as in Swedish preschool traditions. On the one hand there is documentation as a means to evaluate preschool quality (quality control of a goal-oriented educational practice), and on the other hand there is documentation as a means to develop and challenge pedagogical processes (Karlsson, 2000).

The first view, documentation as a means to evaluate preschool quality, is of great interest due to a general interest in evaluation and assessment in and of schools and preschools in Sweden. The PISA survey results showing that Swedish students are falling behind in some areas have echoed all the way to preschool. But a report by the preschool teachers union, Lärarförbundet (2014), concludes that children attending preschool show higher PISA results in maths and literacy. However, according to Sylva et al. (2011), this is also

connected to the quality of the preschool. High-quality¹ preschools show better results than low-quality preschools. Thus, preschool quality and the ability to measure preschool quality are of high interest.

The second view, documentation as a means to develop and challenge pedagogical processes, can be seen in relation to pedagogical documentation.² Assessment as a means for evaluation (summative assessment) and as a means for development (formative assessment)³ are thus two contrasting ways of looking at documentation. Moreover, some researchers have suggested that using pedagogical documentation is, in itself, one way of endeavouring to increase children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Wehner-Godée, 2012). Thus the purpose of documentation can be seen as twofold – as a way to assess and develop preschool quality and as a way to increase children's participation.

According to the 2010 revised Swedish preschool curriculum, not only should the quality of the preschool be documented, but also, 'children and parents should participate in evaluation and their views are to be given prominence' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, p. 14). Children's participation and influence are fundamental values in the Swedish preschool curriculum with a whole section dedicated to the 'influence of the child' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, p. 12). Children's participation is also one of four basic human rights stated in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). In the UNCRC, participation includes children's right to be heard and to express their views in all matters affecting them (Bartley, 1998). Although the word *participation* is not present in the UNCRC itself, it is used on the UNICEF website (UNICEF, 2011). In comparison, in the Swedish preschool curriculum the word *participation* is outnumbered by the word *influence* (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). This can be understood as a greater emphasis being placed on children's agency and competence in the curriculum than in the UNCRC. Thus, the curriculum is more about

¹ Measured with ECERS-R (the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale) and ECERS-E (ECERS-Extension) (see Sylva et al., 2011).

² The following chapter presents a discussion of what pedagogical documentation is.

³ Summative and formative assessment will be further explained in chapter 3.

children's actual influence, making an impact on preschool practice, than about just making children's voices heard.

The preschool curriculum emphasises children's 'real influence over working methods and contents of the preschool' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, s. 12). The objectives are to teach children about democracy, preparing them to exercise their democratic rights and obligations, and to ensure that children's needs and interests are taken into account when planning for the learning environment and pedagogical practice. Teachers are supposed to accomplish this by respecting children's views, letting children participate in decision-making, ensuring that boys' and girls' influence is equal and that all children develop their ability to accept responsibility for their actions and for the preschool environment (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). This means that in preschool, participation is primarily seen as a means for teaching democracy and socialising children to be democratic citizens, but since participation and influence are also seen as human rights, which should shape the preschool practice, children should participate actively in different kinds of decision-making and cooperative endeavours (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). Thus, as reflected in the curriculum, the main motivations for ensuring children's participation are twofold: to foster future democratic citizens and to fulfil a human right..

Documentation in general involves some kind of apparatus, such as paper and pencils, cameras, computers or measuring instruments (e.g. industrial or medical). In preschool documentation practices, different kinds of objects, things, artefacts and devices are present or produced. Preschool documentation involves using tools for the production of documents, such as digital cameras, computers, printers, and pencils and paper, and the documentation practice produces, for example, photos, texts, video recordings and children's crafts and drawings. These things are not passive tools for registering information; they, and documentation in itself, also contribute to shaping preschool practice in different ways (Lenz Taguchi, 2013; Vallberg Roth, 2012). But what significance could they have? How could they affect participation? When I came into contact with the theory of agential realism (Barad, 2007) I realised that this could be helpful for understanding how not just teachers and children but also things such as computers, printed

documents, toys or drawings could play a part in documentation practices.

Research about documentation has often focused on how documentation is used or on teacher's experiences. The present study will contribute to knowledge in preschool documentation research taking a slightly different approach. Instead of focusing on how children can participate in the use of preschool documentation this study focuses on ways that children can participate in documentation practices, specifically when documentation is being physically produced. Also, since the study draws on theories on power relations as well as on agential realism, it can contribute to preschool documentation research from a slightly different angle. This means that it can be useful in describing how the objects that are involved in preschool documentation practices (for example, photos, projectors, computers, papers, printers and adhesive labels) are not only used and produced by teachers and children but also shape the practice itself in different ways. The study could also be useful in contributing to discussions among practitioners about preschool documentation in general and about children's participation in the documentation process (or production) in particular. Taking into account how material objects are also involved (and intra-act) in the documentation practice, the study offers a way to look at preschool documentation from a new angle for both practitioners and researchers.

How then can documentation be accomplished? How can children participate in documentation practices? What things or artefacts are present and/or produced and how do they affect the documentation practice? With this thesis I will explore how participation in documentation practices can be enacted and what role material agents can play.

1.1 Aim and key questions

Based on the description above, it is obvious that there are tensions between the theoretical foundations of different ways of observing and documenting. There are also tensions between views of children's participation as a means for teaching democracy and as a human right. Moreover, since documentation involves not only teachers and children but also a number of non-human material objects, studying the

entanglement of documentation practices, children's participation, and materiality, is crucial.

The aim is to study how participation is constructed and enacted in preschool documentation and what kinds of activities (and participation) evolve between teachers, children and different sorts of other material agents in preschool documentation practices. With the study I intend to contribute to knowledge about preschool documentation and participation. I find this important because not only documentation but also children's participation in preschool documentation and evaluation are prescribed by the Swedish preschool curriculum. In addition, research on children's participation in documentation practices is scarce, especially regarding research on the *production* of documentation.

My research questions are:

- How can participation in Swedish preschool documentation practices be enacted?
- What knowledge about preschool documentation practices can be gained by taking account of materiality in documentation?

The focus of this study is the intra-actions (see section 6.4) between teachers, children and objects such as papers, toys, children's crafts or computers.

The next two chapters introduce preschool documentation and research on documentation from different perspectives. These are power relations and governmentality according to Foucault, documentality as described by Steyerl and agential realism by Barad. Chapter 4 explores children and participation. Chapter 5 presents earlier research on democracy and participation in an educational context, mainly focusing on preschools. The theoretical perspectives that come next are followed by a description of the method. After that I present summaries of two articles, and finally I discuss the results of the study.

2 Preschool documentation

In this chapter I first present what preschool documentation is and what it can look like. I also present what the Swedish preschool curriculum prescribes in terms of documentation. Second, in the following section I will describe how preschool documentation has developed, from observation to pedagogical documentation.

Åsén and Vallberg Roth (2012) point out that, point out that, in our present information and knowledge society, there seems to be an increasing need for documentation and evaluation in educational practices. In general terms, documentation deals with information, often as text, but also as audio recordings or in visual forms, such as photographs, drawings, video recordings and objects such as models or sculptures. To document something means to collect and compile information, digital as well as analogue (Vallberg Roth, 2010). The purpose of documentation could be to inform, instruct, remember or preserve. Moreover, the term *documentation* could be used to refer to the practices of making the documents.

Preschool documentation often entails photographing children and/or activities (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). These photos are usually accompanied by captions, sometimes also with quotations from the curriculum. Digital devices such as cameras, computers and tablets are commonly used to make the documents, along with analogue tools such as pencils and paper, scissors, glue and sticky tape. Preschool documentation can be used as a basis for teachers' reflections on and evaluations of individual children as well as of the practice as a whole. It can also be used to inform parents about what is going on in the preschool or for children to reflect on, discuss and remember what they have done or learned (Vallberg Roth, 2010). Documents are often displayed on walls for visitors to the preschool to see (Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010). Photographs and sometimes also short texts are occasionally shown publicly on preschools' websites or blogs. Generally, preschool documentation is about making something visible.

I consider *documentation practices* to be the actions involved in making documents, digital or analogue. This includes taking

photographs, video-recording, writing (by hand or using computers or other devices), producing different kinds of artefacts (such as drawings or sculptures), gathering children's creative work, and printing digitally produced documents as well as discussing photographs, children's artwork, video recordings and finished documents. A more thorough discussion of preschool observation and documentation will be presented in the next section.

Preschool documentation as a pedagogical tool was common before the revised curriculum (Lenz Taguchi, 2000), and it has often been seen as unambiguously good, since it is sometimes argued that *being seen* is one part of becoming a subject (Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010). Traditionally, preschool observation and documentation has focused on what is general and normal in children of a certain age, according to theories of developmental psychology by Piaget and Erikson (Wehner-Godée, 2000). Over time, there has been a shift in terms and practices in this area; the term *observation* has more or less been discarded in favour of *documentation* (Emilsson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). This has to do with changing views on children and childhood. Observation implies that children are seen as objects, while using the term *documentation* suggests that children are seen as competent. Observation indicates that someone or something is observing and that someone or something else is being observed, while documentation suggests that there is a possibility for activities that are more equally distributed. An example of this could be a teacher writing and a child drawing reflections on an activity. Therefore it would be possible for children to participate actively, especially in the type of documentation referred to as *pedagogical documentation*, originating in Reggio Emilia (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Lenz Taguchi, 2013).

Although the preceding proposition (SOU 1997:157) discussed documentation, the term was not mentioned in the first curriculum of 1998, Lpfö 98 (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2006). As of July 2011 there was a new revised curriculum for preschool with a whole new chapter about follow-up, evaluation and development, emphasising preschools' obligation to systematically document and evaluate their quality (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). It says that 'Preschool teachers are responsible that each child's learning and development is regularly and systematically documented,

followed up and analysed' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, p. 14). The curriculum prescribes that knowledge gained from documentation related to each child should form the basis for understanding how to develop the pedagogical practice. The pedagogical practice as a whole should be assessed, and the methods of assessment should be scrutinised. However, it does not specify the form documentation can or should take or how the actual documents (photos, text etc.) should affect the assessment. Nevertheless, in a publication from the Swedish national agency for education (Skolverket, 2012) written to support teachers in their assessment of preschool practice in accordance with the curriculum, pedagogical documentation is presented as one method. This suggests that pedagogical documentation could be seen as a favoured method. (Pedagogical documentation will be further presented and discussed in the next section.)

Preschools should also document and evaluate children's and parents' participation and prospective influence (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). Although the curriculum emphasises that documentation is supposed to be used to assess and evaluate the pedagogical practice in order to develop it, it may also be used as a way of representing the preschool to others, such as parents and politicians (since preschools and schools are politically governed organisations). Thus preschool documentation is a complex pursuit, documenting every child's learning and development in order to assess the pedagogical practice as a whole and maybe also to inform parents and politicians. The complexity would probably not lessen when taking account of the different methods and tools used in the documentation process. A number of different documentation forms might be used. Documentation can take the form of reports, either kept in the preschool or addressed to municipal leaders, reports or letters to parents, posters or notes displayed on the wall in the preschool, or photographs or video recordings shown during school hours or at parental meetings (see for example Sparrman and Lindgren, 2010, and Markström, 2005). Preschools also present their practice on the internet, with text and/or pictures.

In preschool documentation practices ethical sometimes little thought is given to ethical considerations, which leads Sparrman and Lindgren (2010) to argue that the ethical thinking customary in

research ought to be applied by teachers as well. An interesting thought, also brought up by Sparrman and Lindgren, is that parents are seldom asked to formally consent to their children being video-recorded or photographed at preschool, despite documentation being a governmentally prescribed practice.

This section has presented preschool documentation as a practice prescribed by the Swedish preschool curriculum, but with very few guidelines. The next section will briefly describe and discuss the origin of Swedish preschool documentation and the relation between documentation and pedagogical documentation.

2.1 Observation, documentation and pedagogical documentation

Swedish preschools have a long tradition of observing and documenting children. *Observation* was originally, in the 1930's, seen as a way for preschool teachers to increase their knowledge about children (Johansson, 1994; Lenz Taguchi, 2000). It also had clear connections to child psychology (Emilsson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). Teachers sometimes observed children from a hidden vantage point so that the children could not see them (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). The theoretical underpinning for this was developmental psychology; the observations were supposed to help preschool teachers gain knowledge about children's natural development in order to form a pedagogy that would help the children develop naturally (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Children who did not follow normal development had to be helped and corrected by the teachers. These observations could therefore be said to be normative practices or apparatuses, operating in a regulatory way (Foucault, 1978). In the 1970's the observational practice was questioned, and instead the children were now supposed to be more active, in dialogue with the teacher. The gaze now included the teachers, who were advised to observe their own values, reactions and feelings (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Observations now focused on *why* something happened rather than on *what* happened. Lenz Taguchi (2000) claims that in the 1970's and 80's the way children were talked about changed, but not the observational methods. By the end of the 1990's there was a shift from observation as a *normalising tool*

towards observation as *evaluation* of children's learning (Lenz Taguchi, 2000).

Lately, and in connection with more recent views on children as unique, as opposed to developing universally, the term *observation* has been discarded in favour of the term *documentation* (Emilsson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). The term *documentation* has different theoretical underpinnings than the term *observation*. The universal child of developmental psychology has changed into the active and competent individual of the sociology of childhood (James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998; Corsaro, 2011). Although observation and documentation have different theoretical underpinnings, Emilsson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012) point out that it is not possible to document without observing.

Dahlberg, Moss and Pence (1999) say that to be able to resist the earlier positivistic view implied in observational traditions, practitioners need to increase their reflexivity by, for example, using *pedagogical documentation* as a tool. Pedagogical documentation differs from documentation in that it focuses on reflection and challenges prevalent views on children, teachers and pedagogical practice (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999). Documentation cannot be seen as pedagogical in itself, but could develop to become pedagogical in relation to how it is utilised (Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2009), which would imply that any kind of documentation could become pedagogical depending on how it is drawn on in the pedagogical practice. One way that documentation is made pedagogical is through reflection between teachers or between teachers and children (Lenz Taguchi, 2000). Lenz Taguchi (2013) suggests that by using pedagogical documentation as a 'knowledge-apparatus' (in Swedish: *kunskapsapparat*), teachers can go beyond their everyday assumptions. She also argues that pedagogical documentation makes it possible to go from considering only the discursive to include the material-discursive, where materiality is seen as active. The concept of pedagogical documentation is often assumed to relate directly to the Reggio Emilia approach (Wehner-Godée, 2000; Lenz Taguchi, 2010). In Reggio Emilia the focus of documentation is on understanding what is occurring in preschool pedagogical practice, and not on the individual child's development, which is also what is supported by the current Swedish preschool curriculum (see Swedish National Agency

of Education, 2011). Moreover, preschool pedagogical documentation is often seen as a means for children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000).

Dahlberg, Moss and Pence (1999) recognise risks with documentation, stating that it could become a tool for control and power instead of the opposite, and if teachers are not sufficiently informed about it, documentation may just be child observation. This is further problematised by Sparrman and Lindgren (2010), who discuss documentation in relation to surveillance, arguing that visual documentation (such as photography and video-recording) could 'teach children to adapt to life in a surveillance society' (Sparrman and Lindgren, 2010, p. 250). Even if surveillance is not intended by the teachers, children might still feel scrutinised, since photos are often pinned to the preschool classroom walls. The question is whether documentation as such, despite teachers' efforts not to make it into child observation, could still be seen as a tool for control and power.

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, or to document them. Written protocols of different kinds have been used, but so have photographs, video and audio recordings and sometimes sketches. Various technical aids are currently being used (Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Wehner Godée, 2000), such as computers, camcorders, printers and tablets. Documentation, displayed on preschool classroom walls or in binders, can be used in discussions between teachers, between teachers and children as well as between children (Skolverket, 2012). But documentation can also 'use' teachers, parents and children (Lenz Taguchi, 2013). For example, documentation displayed on the walls, can intra-act⁴ with teachers, parents and children and change what is happening in the preschool. Photos from recent activities could start discussions between teachers, parents and children, and children might take an interest in and want to try activities depicted in the photos.

According to Åsén & Vallberg Roth (2012), the picture of preschool documentation and evaluation has become increasingly complex. On the one hand it emphasises dialogue and participation, and on the other hand it emphasises assessment of individual

⁴ Intra-action will be further explained in chapter 6, Theoretical perspectives.

knowledge and skills. They explain this as a result of two discourses (the earlier one along with the newer one) being present at the same time.

Preschool documentation is complex, it entails gathering information in a number of ways, and it produces digital and analogue records as well as evaluations of preschool practices and individual children. Preschool documentation is required by the curriculum and it has a history and tradition with different theoretical underpinnings, which might still influence present-day preschool documentation. The result of this is that a certain tensions can be discerned between past observational and present documentation practices as well as within the area of documentation itself, due to its implications for surveillance and assessment at the same time as it is seen as a means for children's participation.

3 Research on (preschool) documentation

In this chapter I present a selection of research that has been found relevant as background to the present study. The primary focus is on research on preschool documentation, although some relevant research focusing on documentation in schools is also included. The chapter is divided into five sections. This introductory section introduces research about documentation in general. Section 2.1 focuses on documentation and participation. Section 2.2 presents research on documentation in relation to visibility. In section 2.3 the tools of documentation are in focus, and the final section summarises the research on documentation.

Research on preschool documentation sometimes takes as its point of departure various aspects of assessment. There is also research that takes participation as its point of departure or relates documentation to aspects of visibility or ethics. Some research focuses on positive effects of (pedagogical) documentation, while other research questions or discusses its use. Some research on documentation in preschools investigates how teachers change their practice after working with documentation, for example, Given et al. (2010). Other research explores how documentation can be beneficial to both teachers and children in developing everyday practice, and how it compares favourably to various forms of assessment, such as observation or standardised testing in preschool as well as primary school (Krechevsky, Rivard, & Burton, 2010; Lenz Taguchi, 2000; MacDonald, 2007). Buldu (2010) and Bjervås (2011) have found pedagogical documentation to be a possible way to do formative assessment, which looks forward and supports further learning, in contrast to summative assessment, which looks back at what has been achieved (Bjervås, 2011). Summative assessment can be seen as an assessment *of* learning while formative assessment is an assessment *for* learning (Vallberg Roth, 2012). In Bjervås's (2011) study, teachers saw documentation 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, which is something completely different from testing, assessing or measuring. They also saw disadvantages, for example,

that documentation was time consuming, but the advantages prevailed. Elfström (2013) came to similar conclusions; pedagogical documentation can function as formative assessment, but it demands a lot of time and it is also dependent on teachers being curious and willing to actively search for new theoretical perspectives.

Both summative and formative assessments are related to assessing in relation to goals to be *achieved*. In the Swedish preschool curriculum there are no goals to achieve; instead, the curriculum contains goals to strive for (Vallberg-Roth, 2012). Vallberg Roth (2012) proposes the concept of *transformative* assessment, which is understood as a more flexible concept. Transformative assessment can shift between looking back and looking forward and move between individual children and preschool activity as a whole; it is not based on fixed goals. It also indicates that documentation is contextual. Vallberg Roth sees transformative assessment as ‘an interplay between linear (goal-directed) and nonlinear (rhizomatic) assessment and between punctual and processual assessment’ (Vallberg-Roth, 2012, p. 15), which means that it is a kind of assessment that takes into account the interaction between multiple forms of assessment, such as pedagogical documentation and portfolios as well as assessment on micro and macro levels, offline and online.

McKenna (2003) compared documentation practices (in the form of portfolios) in Sweden and the USA and found that the US documentation was made to assess children’s cognitive development in preparation for compulsory school, while the Swedish preschools had no such aim. In Sweden it was instead crucial not to assess individual children. McKenna found that Swedish preschool portfolios focused on making children active participants and were used for reflection, to promote democracy without measurement and quantification, the latter being more common in the USA.

In contrast to McKenna, Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012) question the focus of, and communication emerging in, preschool documentation practices when compared to notions of Reggio Emilia–inspired pedagogical documentation, calling for better communication between teachers and children. In their study, documentation was found to focus mainly on children’s achievements, which, according to the authors, can lead teachers to see children’s competences as placed within the child, going against theoretical claims associated with

pedagogical documentation where competence is seen as relational (Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson, 2012). The curriculum emphasises that documentation is supposed to evaluate preschool practices and not individual children's achievements, although it also states that 'evaluating the quality of the preschool and creating good conditions for learning requires that the child's learning and development be monitored, documented and analysed' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, p. 14).

The opposing arguments of McKenna and Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson can seem very strange, but from their respective vantage points they may not be so surprising. McKenna compared documentation in two very different contexts where the US context included measuring children's achievements against fixed goals, as opposed to the Swedish curriculum containing goals to strive for but not goals to achieve. Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson, on the other hand, compared preschool documentation practices to the theoretical notions of Reggio Emilia-inspired pedagogical documentation, which are not compatible to notions of measuring.

3.1 Documentation and participation

While some researchers see (pedagogical) documentation as a means for children's participation (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Lenz Taguchi, 2000), others dispute this. For example, Vallberg Roth and Månsson (2011) question the degree to which documentations can be said to be democratic or 'whether they also help maintain a subordinate position and corrected self-image among children' (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011, p. 12). Documentation can therefore be seen as an ambiguous practice in relation to children's participation.

Garrick et al. (2010) found that many of the children in their study had limited involvement in documentation *production*. Although the children felt more involved when photographs were used, they were sometimes puzzled about why a certain photo had been taken. Moreover, written records sometimes made them feel excluded. Bath (2012), using the same data as Garrick et al., brought forward the matter of children's lack of participation due to their lacking literacy skills. Their inability to read what teachers had written made children feel excluded and less valued. Bath also discussed pedagogical

documentation in relation to assessment. She claimed that, despite the intentions, written records of children's learning often end up assessing children. She concluded that in order for pedagogical documentation to work as intended (to enhance children's participation and involvement), all participants need to be equally active and that different ways of communicating are needed. She stated that assessing children's progress in learning would not be consistent with this. This was also found in the above-mentioned study by Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012), who stated that children became objects of study for the documenting teachers, which again can be seen as opposed to the fundamental idea in pedagogical documentation of making children active subjects. Contrary to this, Elfström (2013) found that children, through drawings, were able to participate in developing a preschool project.

In a study of blogging teachers by Lindgren (2012), the teachers constructed documentation as means to observe rather than to create dialogue with children. The teachers discussed ethics, comparing their own experiences being photographed against their will to the children's situation. However, when visual technology came into the picture, ethics seemed to be overlooked in favour of discussions about benefits and restrictions related to the use of digital cameras. Lindgren mentions two competing preschool discourses, on the one hand the good of visualising (and implicitly, observing) as a kind of good governance, and on the other hand the participative, competent child, who is governing him- or herself, and she calls for recognition of the visual as a powerful and complex tool and also for highlighting adults' position in relation to children, which her study found not to be problematised by the teachers.

The conclusion is that children's participation and involvement in documentation has been found to be ambiguous. Pedagogical documentation as a means for children's participation is sometimes seen as given, and sometimes discussed and/or contested.

3.2 Documentation and visibility

The importance of visibility is often stressed in Swedish preschools, where making individual children as well as the preschool practice visible is seen as inherently good (Markström, 2005; Sparrman &

Lindgren, 2010; Lindgren, 2012). This can compare to Fraser's (1995) discussion about affirmation as a remedy for non-recognition and disrespect, in which she says that affirmative remedies will promote group differences rather than change them. In current views on children and childhood, recognising children for their own sake is often seen as important, which in this Fraser's perspective could be discussed.

Even though Swedish preschool documentation may not (or is not intended to) measure children's knowledge or development, Sparrman and Lindgren (2010) and Vallberg Roth and Månsson (2010) argue that documentation, despite intentions, will become a way of making children into objects for adults' surveillance, where adults take a superior position as onlookers while children are subordinated, being looked at, which is also in line with what Emilson and Pramling Samuelsson (2012) noticed, as mentioned above. Sparrman and Lindgren (2010) discuss what documentation and being looked at means for children, 'to be seen is to exist' (p. 259). They ask if this will generate individuals who are used to being looked at to such an extent that they readily accept surveillance. Thus, documentation could be seen as a surveillance technology, as an inspecting gaze and as a technique of power (Foucault, 1980).

Vallberg Roth and Månsson (2011) also question the degree to which documentation practices can be said to be democratic, the extent to which children can participate in them, and 'whether they also help maintain a subordinate position and corrected self-image among children' (p. 12). Svenning (2011) joins in and compares the use of documentation to the TV series *Big Brother*, where the participants are watched through cameras. She problematises pedagogical documentation where children are seen as co-constructors of documentation but may not always be able to choose whether they want to participate or not, due to the above-mentioned unspoken norms about the good of documentation. However, if children are *required* to participate it can be questioned whether this really is participation or if it could be equated with any other kind of compulsory activity. Like Sparrman and Lindgren (2010), Svenning (2011) asks whether the documentation practice will lead to children thinking that they have to be documented in order to have value.

The notion of children's visibility as something unambiguously good was obvious in two studies examining preschool documentation in different media: first, the above-mentioned study by Lindgren (2012), and second, a study by Sparrman and Lindgren (2010) of a series of Swedish educational TV programmes about pedagogical documentation, produced mainly for preschool teachers. In the TV programmes children were never asked for their opinions or asked to comment on documentation. 'Being a preschool child means, frankly, being trained to attract attention by subordinating oneself to the practice of being looked at. Children never get the opportunity to be in, or to be trained to be in, the position of onlooker' (Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010, p. 256). Furthermore, the series never suggested the possibility of children having a chance to resist being documented.

To conclude, documentation is in itself about making something visible. Making children visible is sometimes seen as unambiguously good, but this is also contested by some researchers.

3.3 Documentation and (digital) tools

According to Sparrman and Lindgren (2010), technology has facilitated preschool documentation practices. Digital cameras, video cameras and computers are inexpensive and commonly used, they are powerful and easy to handle and can store huge amounts of information. Using computers and digital cameras could make it easier for children to participate in documentation and to comment on photographs taken during play and other activities since they can be accessed immediately, which means that the children do not have to remember what happened last week or even further back in time (as was the case using analogue cameras). Children can also use digital media themselves.

An area not obviously connected to preschool documentation, but with some affinities to it, is the inclusion of children in the research process. Einarsdóttir (2005) provided children with digital cameras in order to empower them, focusing both on children's own perspective on preschool life and on using a language other than the verbal, thus relying on different modes of expression. Using this method, combined with interviews where children were asked to talk about their photos, could be a way to come nearer to children's own perspectives in

research. This kind of method might also be useful in documentation practices in order to increase children's participation. Luttrell (2010) likewise provided children with cameras and found that the children saw cameras as more than tools for documentation; cameras also became valued possessions. The children in this study were asked to take pictures of their school, family and community, as if they were to give someone information about how it was to be there. In her conclusions Luttrell discusses recognition of underprivileged individuals and asks for caution about 'the relationship between what we can see and what we can know through this mode of inquiry' (Luttrell, 2010, p. 234), meaning that it is important to discard our assumptions in favour of children's own perspectives, which is something that could also be related to preschool documentation. An interesting thing in Luttrell's study was that, although the children were asked to document their school, family and community, family photos were most frequent; the children also let others take pictures of themselves and they sometimes had their own purposes for taking pictures, for example to give to a parent, indicating that the children had slightly different agendas from the researcher's.

In these studies of documentation, technology was seen mainly as a tool for human use and not as actively involved in the documentation practices. Giving cameras to children could empower them, but cameras themselves were not considered co-constructors of the photos taken. In my study, technology as well as other things are seen as becoming active agents through intra-actions (see section 6.4).

3.4 Summarising preschool documentation

As presented above, preschool pedagogical documentation has sometimes been researched in relation to assessment, seen by some as better than other kinds of assessment, although others have criticised all kinds of documentation, arguing that it is a form of surveillance. Unreflected notions about visibility as unambiguously good could lead to seeing children as objects of study even if that is not the intention. Children's participation in documentation has been found to be limited, and notions of ethics are sometimes overlooked. However, some children expressing themselves through drawings were found to participate in developing an ongoing preschool project. The use of

technology in documentation could be another way of enhancing children's participation, but the tools themselves were not taken into account in the presented research. The conclusion is that there are tensions and contradictions inherent in all aspects of the concepts of documentation, which makes it crucial and interesting for me to study, especially from a posthumanist stance. One reason for this is that preschool teachers are required to scrutinise the methods of documentation, which means that a study that examines documentation practices from a posthumanist stance might help teachers to look at documentation from a different angle. Another reason is that preschool documentation involves a number of objects, digital as well as analogue. Objects that often are taken for granted are usually seen as tools for human use, and not as active in themselves. It is hoped that the present study might introduce a new way of looking at different tools involved in documentation.

4 Children and participation

In this chapter I present children and participation. This first section will discuss different definitions, and the following section will discuss participation in relation to human rights, power relations and posthumanism.

But first: what do I mean when I use the word *child*? In the UNCRC a child is described as a person under the age of 18. The children in this study are well below this age. Swedish children usually attend preschool until autumn of the year they turn six years old. This means that the children in this study are between about one and six years of age.

There is great interest in children's participation and influence, but what it means is not always defined. Lindgren and Halldén (2001) state that children's participation is at times equated with asking for their views. Adults are interested in what children think about different topics, but sometimes still fail to take their ideas into account. This brings to mind the old saying that children should be seen but not heard, although in this case, children's views may be visible, but they have no real say.

The idea of children's participation has different connotations in different cultures (Kjørholt, 2004). To participate, take part or be involved in something could, for a child, mean anything from taking part in providing for your family and yourself in order to survive, which is the case for some children in the world (Lund, 2007), to being involved in making democratic decisions. Children in cultures that do not segregate children and adults, for example, cultures in which childhood is not largely spent attending preschools and schools, do not have to engage in special child-focused activities to prepare for participation in adult practices, since they are already part of the adult world (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2003).

Participation in decisions is often referred to as political participation, in contrast to social participation (Elvstrand, 2009; Thomas, 2007). These can be seen as different practices but can sometimes also be different ways of looking at the same practice. For example, a child participating in choosing photos for documentation

could be seen as participating in a social way and/or participating in deciding about what to document. Children who are asked to decide whether something should be documented or not could be seen as involved in a form of political participation, while children and teachers commenting on a recent activity together, in order to document it, would be participating in a social sense.

In some research, in a Swedish educational context, the concepts of participation (in Swedish, *delaktighet*) and influence (*inflytande*) have been given different meanings. In some research, participation is equated with influence (Pramling Samuelsson & Sheridan, 2003; Hamerslag, 2013), in other research the concepts are totally separate, with participation seen as taking part in something someone else has decided upon and influence as having an impact on something (Arnér, 2006). Moreover, participation is sometimes seen as an overarching term and influence as a part of it (Elvstrand, 2009; Westlund, 2011). In this text participation and influence are neither considered to be separate nor equivalent concepts; instead, I agree with the latter definition where participation is a wider concept which could encompass attendance, partaking and involvement as well as influence, with influence seen more as having an impact on or affecting something. Influence in the sense of having an impact on something so that it changes could also be seen as political participation, while attendance and partaking are linked to social participation.

Political participation is connected to children's rights to express their views and to power relations, which are not symmetrical between children and adults (Dolk, 2013). To conclude, the terms *participation* and *influence* are sometimes used alternately. They can also be used in a number of ways and have different meanings in different contexts. In this study, participation is seen as the overarching concept, encompassing attendance, partaking, involvement and influence. Children's rights and power relations will be the topic in the next section.

4.1 Participation, rights and (power) relations

Why should children have a right to participate, and why is it of interest right now? The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), the new paradigm in child sociology, in line with, for

example, Corsaro (2011), as well as consumer influence are, according to Sinclair (2004), three important perspectives explaining why children's participation and influence are of interest. In this section I will discuss the first one, children's participation as a (human) right.

Some of the articles in the UNCRC specify children's rights to express themselves; children should have a say, participate and have influence in matters concerning themselves. In other articles the UNCRC states that children have a right to provision and protection. The UNCRC furthermore states (in article 5) that children should be directed and guided in exercising their rights (UNICEF, 2011). Children are seen as competent and as participating, as well as vulnerable, in need of protection and as not-yet adults, in need of guidance (Hill & Tisdall, 1997). Thus children are seen as both autonomous and dependent (Lindgren & Halldén, 2001).

Wall claims that despite children's rights as depicted in the UNCRC and the perception of children as participants in the name of the new sociology of childhood, children are still being marginalised in several areas (Wall, 2008). Wall argues that this has to do with how children's rights are perceived, and he states that we need 'a shift from "second-wave" to "third-wave" childism, from modernism to postmodernism' (Wall, 2008, p. 542). This means that, in his view, modernist thoughts about rights being held by individuals need to be transformed into rights seen as mutual responsibilities in a 'postmodern circle of responsibility' (Wall, 2008, s. 524). He states that children will never be seen as fully social citizens until human rights are transformed to encompass both adults and children, thus bridging the divide between adults and children in this respect. Related to this is Wyness's (2013) argument that too much focus on children's rights has led to a point where adults' roles related to children's participation are marginalised in research. He asks that more emphasis be placed on the interdependent relations between adults and children in relation to children's participation.

This can also be compared to Fraser (1995), who discusses the dilemma of recognition as a remedy for cultural inequity, for example in the case of gender or race, which in this case could also relate to children. Recognition is how individuals gain identity through being seen by others, as equal and separate, the end result being a stable self, belonging to a certain group or category. Fraser problematises this,

stating that one dilemma is that recognition could result in increased differentiation between groups, in this case children and adults. This is also pointed out by Dahlbeck (2011), who claims that an image of the child as helpless and in need of support and governance is outlined in the UNCRC, defining childhood as distinct to adulthood. The effect of this is that the UNCRC upholds the asymmetrical power relation between adults and children (Gadda 2008). Since the thought of rights relies on seeing individuals as equal and separate, rights for children could be problematic due to these asymmetrical power relations, but also due to children's limited knowledge and understanding of rights (Dolk, 2013).

Claiming human rights as universal means that different environments, cultures and so on are not taken into account. This is discussed by Gadda (2008) and Kallio (2012), both taking Foucault as their point of departure. As previously mentioned, children can participate and have a say in very different ways in different cultures. However, the UNCRC presents a view of children and childhood that corresponds with a Western norm (Gadda, 2008, Kallio, 2012). Kallio (2012) argues that only children living the 'right' kind of childhood will be able to make their voices heard. The 'right' kind of childhood does not, for example, include children living in refugee camps who, given the choice, would *choose* to fight alongside rebel soldiers rather than carry water to the camp. The UNCRC has become a universal truth about what childhood *should* be like, which does not entirely correspond to what childhood *can* be like in different parts of the world (Kallio, 2012). Power relations between Western and non-Western nations are also asymmetrical since the UNCRC marginalises nations that are unable to or do not want to embrace the values of the UNCRC (Gadda, 2008).

Seeing children's participation as a human right, according to the UNCRC, includes seeing children as competent and autonomous, which also means assuming that competence is something that is inherent in the child. Participation seen as a right could be seen as a thing to be handed over by adults to children. If, on the other hand, competence and participation are seen as relational (which could be the case in a posthumanist perspective), they will have to develop in relation to the environment, which could involve human as well as non-human entities. A posthumanist perspective, which questions the

centrality of humans, can be seen as a questioning of the notion of *human* rights. Ascribing rights to humans positions the human individual in a privileged position, and obfuscates how human beings are made significant in a network of materialities and discourses. Deckha (2008) problematises rights from intersectionalist and posthumanist perspectives. As a universal claim, human rights in themselves will exclude and ‘other’ some (as discussed above). Deckha also includes animals in this and discusses the human/animal boundaries. Since posthumanism, as I see it, deals with relations between entities, talking about rights as universal becomes highly problematic. Universalism sets one standard equal to all, despite conditions and relations.

In conclusion, participation is a right according to the UNCRC, but despite that, children are often marginalised, and they are seen both as active participants and subordinated. The notion of universal human rights has been criticised from different viewpoints for upholding power relations between Western and non-Western nations as well as between adults and children, humans and animals. In a posthumanist perspective universal human rights could also be seen as problematic because it fails to acknowledge relations.

5 Research on participation in a preschool context

In this chapter I present a selection of research on participation in a preschool context that is relevant for the present study. The chapter is divided into four parts. This first one will very briefly put children's participation, as described in the curriculum, into an international context. It will also present and discuss motives for children's participation in the curriculum. Section 5.1 will present research about teachers' role for children's participation. In section 5.2, research that accounts for children's perspective, in relation to children's participation, will be presented. The final section will summarise research on participation in a preschool context.

Fleer (2010), examining early childhood curricula in a number of countries,⁵ found that Sweden and New Zealand stood out in that their curricula placed a much greater emphasis on participation than the others. The motives for including children's participation in the Swedish preschool curriculum are in line with participation as a human right and as a way of teaching democracy, but also as crucial for learning (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011). A Swedish government investigation about UNCRC states that students' learning is dependent on their participation (SOU 1997:116).

Söderlind and Engwall (2005) see the view of participation being essential for learning as characteristic of contemporary views on children and adults. Emphasis on giving children a voice and on the idea that children should have their own responsibilities could also be seen as a way of increasing control. The idea of children as competent and responsible is just another truth or norm about children that is produced. In Foucault's terms this could be seen as a 'regime of truth' (Foucault, 1980) generating certain ways of thinking about and dealing with children. Instead of a vulnerable child in need of fostering, a competent child in need of freedom is produced. Focusing on control

⁵ Queensland (Australia), Ontario (Canada), England, Hong Kong, Korea, Malawi, New Zealand and Sweden.

and power could also overshadow children's own strategies for participation and influence (Bergström & Holm, 2005).

Studying official Swedish government reports, Söderlind and Engwall (2005) found (in accordance with the discussion above) that human rights were expressed as one motive for children's participation. Another motive was to improve decision-making, since children and young people possess important knowledge about what it is like to be young today. A third motive for inviting children's participation was to help prepare them to be democratic citizens; here it was viewed as a pedagogical tool rather than as important in itself. This shows a tension between participation as a pedagogical tool and as important in itself; as a right and as way of making better decisions. This means that children are seen both as having knowledge and rights *and as lacking democratic skills*.

5.1 Adults' or teachers' roles for children's participation

Teachers' role for children's participation has been brought up by some researchers (Emilson & Folkesson, 2006; Karlsson, 2009), but not always as the main theme. Generally children's participation seems to be connected to the ways adults interact with children (Bae, 2009). Teachers' views, positions and power have been found to be important factors. Westlund (2011) and Eriksen Ødegaard (2007) have studied how teachers talk about and how they deal with children's participation. In Westlund's study teachers described how they dealt with children's participation in different ways, from indirect ways, like planning activities in accordance with children's needs and interests, to more actively giving children responsibilities. The teachers equate participation or influence with freedom, often expressed as freedom for children to choose what they want to do. Eriksen Ødegaard (2007) studied how teachers deal with children's participation in conversations at mealtime, where teachers stressed the importance of listening to and valuing children's contributions. These teachers also adjusted to the children in order for them to have a real influence on the topic of the conversations.

Davies and Artaraz (2009), Komulainen (2007) and Kjørholt (2004) have studied listening to children's voices. Listening to and

consulting children could mean giving them options, although sometimes quite limited ones (Davies & Artaraz, 2009). Giving children a voice can imply limiting articulation to the verbal or linguistic, which overlooks other means of expression (Komulainen, 2007). Listening to children can also imply a view of children as competent, responsible subjects, capable of deciding for themselves, and therefore also seeing them as ‘self-determining rational subjects’ (Kjørholt, 2004, p. 214), which could be seen as a ‘truth regime’, to use a Foucauldian term. Thus this can be seen as a form of governmentality, governing children through freedom (Kjørholt, 2004). Kjørholt (2004) problematises this and argues for a view of children (and adults) as shifting between dependence and independence; neither children nor adults are solely autonomous, and both categories rely and depend on others to a greater or lesser extent.

Emilson (2007) claims that strong teacher control does not necessarily mean that children have less influence; it is a matter of the character of the control. She argues that to promote children’s participation and influence teachers should not have strong control over ‘the *what* and *how* in communication’ (Emilson, 2007, s. 33). Other kinds of control, of a more structural nature, like sitting in fixed places or directing children’s attention towards specific content, did not seem to have a negative effect on the participation in Emilson’s study. Playfulness, emotional presence and closeness to the child’s perspective are important features in promoting children’s participation and influence (Emilson, 2008). In contrast, Kjørholt (2004) found that there seemed to be different agendas applied to children and adults; children’s participation, for instance, was thought to be threatened by too much structure, whereas structure was seen by the teachers as something adults required; the teachers expressed that their activities needed to be structured in time and space, which is a different viewpoint from Emilson’s (2008), to whom structure was more or less irrelevant. However, Emilson studied preschool practice while Kjørholt studied documents written by teachers, which may explain these differences. In Kjørholt’s study, the teachers saw negative freedom, that is, freedom from adult control, as favourable.

On the other hand, participation and influence are sometimes equated with freedom of choice, which was one of the understandings of democracy in a study by Pettersvold (2013). This study examined

teachers' understandings of democracy when reflecting on their work with children's participation. The teachers showed three different understandings: first, liberal democracy, where individual freedom and choice were highly valued; second, majority democracy, based on voting; and third, deliberative democracy, where decisions were made in agreement after discussions. Pettersvold found deliberative democracy to be favourable for children's participation, as it was likely to give children a positive social experience. The current emphasis on children's participation as universally good is also problematised by Raby (2012). She suggests that the current discourse on children's participation requires, and constructs, a child who is verbal and self-directed, which resonates with a Western, individualist neo-liberal approach (thus also with documentation focusing on individual children). This emphasis on individualism could prevent the possibility of seeing participation as collective involvement, for example, in decision-making (Raby, 2012). In conclusion, in research, teachers have been found to be important for children's participation. Children's participation and influence are sometimes thought of as children being able to make decisions for themselves, which could lead to overlooking more collective ways of participating.

5.2 Accounting for children's perspective

Children's participation has not only been studied in relation to how adults deal with it, but also taking their perspective into account. Through observation and interviews these studies show that children's active influence is more or less restricted to certain areas even though teachers often take children's interests into account when planning.

Karlsson (2009) observed how children 'do' democratic values such as responsibility, care and respect. Here, their agency was connected to teachers' position and formal power. Play can be seen as an area where children can exercise their right to participation. This was also found by Sheridan and Pramling Samuelsson (2001) interviewing five-year-old children in a preschool. The children expressed that they primarily decided about activities and play initiated by themselves, but had little or no influence on the overall organisation, routines, content and teacher-initiated activities. Nevertheless, although teachers often plan activities taking children's

views and interests into account, children might not be aware of this indirect participation (which can compare to Westlund's (2011) study mentioned above). Then again, Tullgren (2004) argues that what could appear to be children playing freely is often well regulated by teachers, in a subtle and perhaps unintended way. Dolk (2013) showed that possibilities for children and adults to participate arose when boundaries were transgressed. One example was when children transformed playing house into a game where they were robbers, moving all the things to different places. In Dolk's study the existence of boundaries and norms enabled children to break them and to create something new, by being unruly (in Swedish: *bångstyriga*). When frames were more rigid and boundaries set, the possibilities for participation were reduced. However, when boundaries were transgressed, possibilities for participation were enhanced. The way this was received by teachers determined whether children's participation was enabled or limited.

In a study by Hamerslag (2013) of a Reggio Emilia-inspired preschool, children were primarily participating in relation to the content of the activities rather than the form or methods. All materials used in the preschool were available to the children, but they still often asked teachers when they wanted to use, for example, paint and brushes, clay or scissors. This was also discussed by Nordin-Hultman (2004), comparing Swedish preschools to English ones, claiming that in Swedish preschool children had less opportunity to use materials as they wished; this was especially true when it came to 'dirty' or 'messy' materials such as water or sand. Here different kinds of material objects could be thought of as enabling or limiting children's participation.

In these studies there were possibilities for and restrictions on children's participation. Studies have found that children often have limited opportunities to participate. Nevertheless, children sometimes break boundaries and participate in ways that teachers do not always expect.

5.3 Summarising children and participation

Participation or influence is often considered to be something that equals *freedom* from control and structure in studies of how teachers

talk about children's participation, whereas, in their practice, teachers often control children explicitly or implicitly. However, in one study structure was not considered relevant for the promotion of children's participation. The notion of children's participation and giving children a voice can be seen as a kind of governmentality, steering children's behaviour towards a norm of competence. Children's participation has been found to be more or less restricted to certain areas. However, children do not always stay in assigned areas; instead, they find ways to break boundaries. Children's participation has mostly been studied from a social and anthropocentric perspective, as this review shows. In the present study I am also taking account of how the materiality of preschool documentation practices can play a part for children's participation.

6 Theoretical perspectives

In this chapter I present the theoretical perspectives used. To be able to understand children's participation in documentation practices I use theories to help me raise questions and give me a variety of perspectives. The theories I have chosen have helped me to see children's participation in documentation in new and different ways. The chapter is divided into five sections. In this first section the perspectives are briefly presented and introduced and a drawing is used to explain why these theories and concepts have been chosen. In the following sections the same drawing is reused to explain the concepts in relation to the study. In section 6.1 I present power relations and governmentality by Michel Foucault. In section 6.2 I describe documentality by Hito Steyerl, followed by a discussion about agency in section 6.3. In section 6.4 I present agential realism by Karen Barad. In the final section I summarise the theoretical perspectives and relate them to the present study. The way these different theoretical perspectives are presented is at the same time a description of my own research process. I started with an interest in children's participation in documentation which, over time, gradually included an investigation in how the objects involved in the documentation practice also mattered.

Studying children's participation involves studying how children and teachers relate to each other. Relations between children and adults are embodied by power, due to preschool children being dependent on parents and teachers, who in turn are responsible for their care, upbringing and education (see studies described earlier by, for example, Dolk, 2013 and Gadda, 2008). To be able to specifically study children's participation in documentation practice a theory that takes power relations into account was needed. Therefore, I initially turned to ideas of power relations (Foucault, 1982).

Children's participation is often mentioned in terms of listening to children, giving them a voice, empowering them or recognising them, implying that participation is a 'thing' that can be given to children, as is the case when participation is seen as a right. The focus on listening to and consulting children in research has been questioned by Mannion (2007), who suggests that research on children's participation needs to

be reframed and also take relations, space and objects into account. Focusing on participation as a right for children also means, according to Wyness (2013), that relational aspects have been pushed aside, meaning that focusing on participation as an inherent right risks overlooking the relationship between adults and children in this respect, as discussed in section 4.1. Seeing participation as relational means taking the uneven power relations between children and adults into account, but it can also mean that agents other than human ones can be seen as contributing. In this study I see participation as a relation rather than as a ‘thing’ or right. Participation is seen as *produced* rather than as ‘owned’ and handed over or given to children.

In the following, using a drawing of a child, a teacher and a computer (figure 1), I describe my research process starting with an everyday perspective. I start by describing the immediate picture, how the depicted situation could be seen without using any theoretical perspectives. Then I will use the same drawing to show how different theoretical concepts gradually emerged as a result of a process where I started to familiarise myself with doing research. Thus, the picture changed slightly as the research proceeded, with the addition of words expressing my evolving understanding of the situation through the different theoretical perspectives.

Figure 1 Teacher and child documenting at a computer

Figure 1 is a drawing⁶ from a documenting situation in the video-recorded material of my study. I will use this picture to show how the theories are helpful. In the picture there is a teacher, a child and a computer. The teacher and the child were documenting together at the computer. The teacher was in control of the keyboard as well as of the mouse. Photos taken at a recent activity were shown on the computer screen. The child was sitting next to the teacher, facing the computer screen. The teacher asked the child what was happening in the photos and typed the answers on the keyboard. At first glance, taking an everyday perspective (more or less unreflected), this situation can be seen as highly unequal, a teacher in charge of a documentation activity (controlling the computer, asking questions) with a young child next to her looking at the computer and answering the teacher's questions. In this situation, the child would seem to have little chance to have an impact. The teacher has the advantage of age, size and a position as

⁶ All drawings in this thesis as well as in the articles were made by the author.

both caretaker and educator of the child as well as of being literate and thus in control of the computer's word processing software and also in control of choosing what photo to show on the computer screen. Questions about children's participation could sound like this: What kind of participation could be possible in this kind of situation? How could the teacher give this child a voice and participate (which would mean that the child's voice and participation are seen as 'things' that the child does not have and that the teacher can give to the child)? The teacher seems very powerful, not only by her size and her position as a teacher, but also because she is in control of the activity, the questions, the computer keyboard and the writings. Using theoretical perspectives, I would be able to analyse this documenting situation, and others, more thoroughly, and possibly, to see the situation differently (for example, also seeing children's voice and participation more as a relation between humans and/or humans and materiality). In the following I have looked at the documenting situations from mainly two perspectives, power relations and the role of materiality, which also reflects my research journey from focusing primarily on children's participation to focusing on how objects also matter. For that reason the chosen theoretical concepts presented are power relations, governmentality, documentality, agency and agential realism – the mattering of matter.

Preschool documentation not only includes humans (children, teachers and sometimes also parents), but also a number of material objects, such as cameras, papers, computers, pencils, crayons, printers, binders, plastic pockets and sticky labels. These could be seen as passive tools used by the humans involved, but they could also be seen as more actively involved in the documentation practice. The way these (and other) objects intra-act (see section 6.4) with children and teachers interested me and made me turn to the theory of agential realism (Barad, 1996). In agential realism, where 'matter matters', things as well as people are seen as becoming agentic (Barad 2003). When using a posthumanist perspective like agential realism there is a risk that children's participation may be seen as less significant. Since both humans and non-humans participate in activities, and are seen as agential, through intra-action, differences in participation between children and teachers might become secondary.

Both power relations and agential realism focus on relations, in the first case between humans, in the second case between human and non-human entities. To be able to account for these relations, these perspectives could be seen as complementary. I will try to explain how this could work in the last section of this chapter.

In the next section, reflecting my research process, I start with power and governmentality, then I turn to documentality and thereafter I discuss agency. Finally, I turn to agential realism. The drawing in figure 1 will be reused to show how these theoretical perspectives are useful for the analysis of children's participation in documentation practices.

6.1 Power relations and governmentality

To Foucault, power is a relation instead of something that can be possessed. What is of interest is how power operates rather than who or what has power (Foucault, 1982). Power is seen as productive; it 'constitutes discourse, knowledge, bodies and subjectivities' (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 13) (Discourse will be further considered and discussed in relation to agential realism in section 6.5). Foucault (1982) talks about the *conduct of conducts*, using the word *conduct* in two senses, as leading others and as behaving. Thus he sees power more as a way of governing than as dominance and/or confrontation. The word *government* is used in a broad sense, referring not only to the government of a state, but also to the government of, for example, children or families (Foucault, 1982). Government works on affecting the ways individuals regulate their own behaviour rather than on controlling them by domination (Hindess, 1996).

Foucault understands power as 'the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses' (1978, p. 92) force relations. Power relations are immanent in all other relations and have a productive role. Power is produced in every relation and is conjoined with resistance: 'where there is power, there is resistance' (Foucault, 1978, p. 95). But power is not one stable thing with resistance as its likewise stable opposite; instead, there are a number of different resistances, on different levels and of different magnitudes (Foucault, 1978). An (unpublished) example from my data material would be when a child started to draw a flag next to a lion,

which was the main topic, and the teacher asked her to take a new piece of paper to draw the flag on, thus resistance was present on both sides. The child's resistance to the subject can be understood as quite subtle, while the teacher's resistance can be seen as more obvious. The child departed from the required task by drawing a flag, and the teacher tried to stop the (unwanted) flag-drawing by suggesting that it take place on a second piece of paper.

Governmentality as a concept was coined by Foucault (1991). It deals with control, regulation and normalisation of people's behaviour, although not through subduction. One example of how this could be done is given by Hultqvist and Peterson (1995), referring to the increased tendency of evaluation and assessment. In order to regulate the conduct of a thing, phenomenon or person, knowledge is needed, which can be obtained through evaluation or assessment (Hultqvist & Peterson, 1995; Hindess, 1996). Moreover, the evaluation or assessment itself can function in a regulatory way, as a kind of panoptic apparatus. The panopticon was an architectural device designed to control inmates in a prison. It consisted of a circular building with a surveillance tower in the middle. The prison guard could not be seen as easily by the prisoners, in that they would always be aware of being seen, but never know at what exact moment, which meant that the inmates would regulate their behaviour whether the guard was present or not (Foucault, 2003). Panopticism may also to some extent be compared to the use of digital cameras, and sometimes video cameras, in documentation practices. But surveillance in schools could be less continuous and much messier than panopticism, which has been argued by Gallagher (2010), for example, since teachers sometimes ignore children's resistance. Surveillance was also conducted through sound in Gallagher's study. Since the children were supposed to work quietly during class, the teacher's surveillance often involved listening.

Figure 2 Power relations

When I looked at power as not inherent in the participants but instead as a relation between them, something new appeared. This makes the drawing a little bit different. In figure 2 I have added some words to the drawing, showing how the documentation practice is a part of a bigger picture in relation to the preschool as a whole, to the community, to parents and to overarching thoughts about evaluation and assessment.

The words could be seen as involved in discourses producing, for example, preschool practice, the view of children as preschoolers, and the 'truth' about documentation as evaluating and assessing both children and preschool practice. However, discourse focuses primarily on language, which would mean that agency of material objects such as computers, papers and sticky labels could be overlooked.

Now the questions that might be posed change slightly; instead of asking who has power and over what, the question could be: How does power operate? What is possible for the child and the teacher to say

and do in this situation? How can the child participate? How can he resist? How do the curriculum, the community policy, the parents and so on affect the child's participation in the documentation activity? Taking a step further, the produced document itself could be said to affect the child in several ways, for example, as a kind of panoptic device, directing the child's behaviour when doing things that might be photographed by the teachers. What is documented will also produce a certain truth about someone. How this truth will govern the documented person has been described as documentality, which is the topic of the next brief section.

6.2 Documentality

What does documentation do? What is possible to do and not to do in preschool when documenting? Steyerl (2003) writes about documentality, which she situates in between governmentality and documentation. With this concept she describes how documentary truths⁷ turn into government and vice versa. As I understand her, documentation can be used both as a way to establish and conserve a truth but also as a way to contest or problematise dominant forms of truth. Both these functions can be seen as governmentality techniques, in that they limit or enable subjects' actions through the production of truths.

Steyerl discusses the myth of seeing documentaries (for example, photographs, films) as providing immediate access to reality. Instead, she asks how documentaries deliver certain politics of truth and what possibilities for action they advocate or reject (Steyerl, 2007), thus it can be seen as a kind of governmentality.

Returning to the drawing, now the content of the photographs displayed on the computer screen could be seen as involved in producing a truth about the child, the teacher, the preschool and also about preschool documentation. Some activities were chosen to photograph and some were not. Seeing photographs as a way of 'freezing' certain moments in a preschool activity in order to be able to go back and discuss and/or evaluate the activity could, in comparison to the above, be seen as a way of getting access to what actually

⁷ 'Truths' produced by and/or in documents

happened, to reality. The questions that could be asked now are about how these specific photographs make certain things possible and not others.

Figure 3 Documentality

The drawing in figure 3 now depicts the situation of seeing documents (including photographs) as governing preschool activities, by producing a ‘truth’ about what has happened in a certain previous activity that has been photographed. The content of the photographs could be seen as showing what actually happened, as reality, which could then be evaluated. What happened in situations that were not photographed would thus not be evaluated and also not part of ‘real’ preschool practice. The photographed reality would therefore function as the truth about preschool activities, which could be used to conserve or contest the way teachers, children and parents view preschool practice.

In accordance with the documentality concept, in this study documents are seen as productive. As *social objects* they produce something, be it an academic degree, an evaluation of preschool

practice or a view on a specific child. Documentation also regulates preschool activities in that it is used in the evaluation and development of preschool practice, but also in that it could be assumed that those preschool activities that can be documented are the ones that are more valued. As *physical objects*, documents could also be desired by both teachers and children for different reasons (see article 2). In this sense they can also be seen as agentic, together with the persons involved.

In the next section I will discuss agency. Since children have sometimes been seen as becoming, and sometimes as beings, I will begin the section with a discussion about agency as *inherent in* individuals, seeing children as active agents or beings, and move on to seeing agency as a *relation*.

6.3 Agency

Even if children are seemingly in a situation in which they are overpowered and subject to adults' control, they can still resist and in that sense be *active agents*. As previously mentioned, resistance is inherent in or necessary for power in Foucault's terms.

Children's active agency is emphasised in what has been called, 'the new sociology of childhood', which emerged in the 1990's (Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008). The sociology of childhood was a reaction against notions of children as incompetent, as 'not yet' adults and against thoughts of childhood as a universal phase in life, on the way towards adulthood, *becoming* adult. It was also a reaction against seeing childhood considered in research merely as a phase and not important to study in itself (Lee, 1998). Instead, the new sociology of childhood saw children as already *being*, not adult, but humans; it saw childhood as important in itself (James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998).

Focusing on children's participation also means that children would have to be seen as active agents, competent and able to influence situations, since it would not make sense to study children's participation if they are viewed as incomplete and becoming. If the child and the teacher are seen as active agents, it means that, in Foucault's terms, power could operate between them. Seeing the child and the teacher as agents would imply that agency is something they possess, a property or an essence. But what if agency is seen as a relation? As Lee (1998) argues, this means that children need not be

seen as stable ‘beings’, given agency; instead, agency evolves between the child and something else, which in this case could be the teacher.

The view of children as *being* and, accordingly, as active agents relies on a view of society as a finished product, which is questioned by Lee (1998).

Childhood can open the door on an unfinished world because childhood cannot be finished. It is neither a state of ‘being’ nor a state of ‘becoming’. Instead it continually poses the question of being and becoming as it moves through the social, disturbing social ordering practices and calling for temporary resolutions as it goes. Since ‘childhood’ is constitutionally incomplete, it can lead sociology away from a reified view of conventions, away from an essentialist view of agency and away from a view of ethics as a set of standpoints. (Lee, 1998, p. 465)

Thus Lee also questions the view of agency as inherent in, or as a possession of an individual, proposing an ‘immature sociology’ in which position is replaced by motion, where agency is closely related to dependency. Lee (1998) exemplifies this by referring to court procedures, where he compares children bearing witness through video recordings to adults having to be ‘sworn in’ in order to be able to account for their testimonies, meaning that both children and adults in this situation are dependent on some kind of mediation in order to guarantee that what they say comes from themselves. The conclusion to this is that agency is not to be seen as an essence, but instead arises from dependency, implying that there is no stable end to society and thus that children (and adults) should be seen as neither becoming nor being, which means that they are not seen as stable entities. In accordance with this, agency could be seen as conditional (Kummen, 2014). Therefore, agency would have to be seen more as a relation than as a possession or a property. Decentring agency in this respect might open up for a notion of how materiality could also be playing a part in preschool practices. If agency is not inherent in somebody or something, it would perhaps not be restricted to working only between humans. The computer software, highlighting misspelled words, the materiality of the paper, which the documentation was later printed on, and the positions of teachers and children (at the computer or in other documentation practices) might then also be taken into account.

Figure 4 Agents present in documentation

The drawing in figure 4 is now used to show some of the entities present in and around a documentation activity at the computer in a preschool. There are a number of different things involved in the documentation practice. The teacher, the child and the computer are visible in the drawing. The computer software and the printer are involved in producing the printed document. The document is then inserted into a file or binder.

The teacher and the child in this situation use speech and body language to communicate with each other as well as with the computer. The computer communicates with visuals and sound and electronically, with the printer. One way of understanding what is happening in this situation could be to explain it in terms of relations or interactions between teacher and child, which would include the humans and their language (including body language), but probably not the computer itself. Another way could be to focus more on language (or discourse), seeing participation as socially constructed by

the words (and actions) of teacher and child, and maybe also by the curriculum. This would involve the humans, language and the computer in terms of how the humans use language to involve the computer, but this would probably not include how the computer itself could have an impact on the situation.

To be able to see the way these things contribute in the documentation practice a theoretical framework that also recognises materiality would be needed. Objects, as well as humans, make things happen. Humans use objects for different purposes, but objects also have an impact on humans, affecting their behaviour in different ways. Not only words shape our world but so do objects and materiality. Words are used by us, *and* they govern us, but so does materiality. This was shown by Björk-Willén (2012) studying children playing computer games. In her study the children were positioned through both discursive and material practices. The computer itself, as well as the computer game and the children's respective experiences with computer games, and with preschool and popular cultures, produce the positions that are possible for the children. An example from the present study is when a child took an interest in a specific photo, which led to a change in what was documented (see article 1, activity 3). Further examples are presented in article 2.

Studying how children's participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices also involves studying how things, notions, behaviour, words, concepts, curriculum, body language, positions etc. produce children's participation. To account for children's participation in preschool documentation practices means to put all of those together, this is why I chose the posthumanist theory of Agential Realism by Barad (2007).

6.4 Agential Realism

In agential realism agency is not seen as something one has, but as a relationship where agents are produced through intra-action (Barad, 2007). But where Lee (1998) describes agency as a relation in a sociological perspective, Barad perceives agency as a relation between humans *as well as* between humans and non-humans. Humans and objects are not seen as active agents, but *become* active agents. Seeing children as active agents in themselves, is therefore not relevant,

instead agency is a relation between the child and the adult, or the computer, or the toy (or whatever). Children would thus be seen as one part of the world, the same way as adults or objects or animals would. Talking about agency within a child would be problematic, since the child would not be seen as being an active agent in him- or herself; rather, agency would be the result of the child's cooperation with (or the relation to) the surrounding world (Hultman, 2011; Kummen, 2014). Children become active agents in different settings or when they encounter other children, teachers, objects or environments. Participation could thus, in this perspective, also be seen as a relation between the child and other parts of the world. Children become participants through intra-actions with the surrounding world.

The focus of this study is on how participation is enacted, not how it is being talked about, or considered by any concept or way of talking. This means that discourse analysis was not enough as an analytical tool. Since we concurrently live in nature *and* society, the divide between them is not necessary. In social theory, materiality is not altogether absent, but it is seen as a tool used by humans; still, humans are at the centre, they are seen as more important and placed above objects or materials. In posthumanist perspectives the human is instead placed *among* materials, using as well as *being used* by them (Sørensen, 2009).

To a traditional realist the world is a matter of discovery, and objects and observers are seen as separate, which is not the case in agential realism. 'We are a part of that nature that we seek to understand', Barad says (2007, p. 67). She draws on the ideas of physicist Niels Bohr, who argued that observational practices had to be taken into account in quantum physics, claiming that measurement interaction involved intervention and therefore could not be separated from the result of the measurement (Barad, 1996). Bohr thus questioned the subject/object distinction and the representational status of language (Barad, 1998). Barad wants to overcome the dualism of material and discursive, extending Bohr's thoughts and reformulating the terms *agency* and *realism* in order to understand how materiality matters, challenging the separation between social constructionism and realism (Barad, 1998; 1999). 'What is being described by our theories is not nature itself but our participation *within* nature' (Barad, 1999, p. 7), meaning that we cannot stand apart from nature, since we are

always in it or rather, a part of it. Nature and culture are intertwined, objects and humans produce and are produced by each other.

Agential realism provides an account of the simultaneously material and cultural nature of the ontology of the world. Saying that something is socially constructed doesn't mean that it isn't real – on the contrary, according to agential realism, reality is itself material-cultural. (Barad, 1996, p. 181)

In this quotation, Barad argues that agential realism is a kind of social constructionism that does not reduce knowledge to language or reject objectivity but instead also takes materiality into account. She ascribes agency neither to the observer nor to the observed, neither to the human nor to the non-human. Instead, they have agency together, between them, in a dynamically shifting mode (Barad, 1996).

Barad compares Foucault's discursive practices to Bohr's thoughts of apparatuses, which Bohr sees not as mere things but also as practices. Both of these practices enable and limit knowledge, but while Bohr's thoughts *question* the divide between knower and known, and between nature and culture, Foucault suggests that discourse is *supported* by materiality, implying the existence of a divide (Barad, 2007). However, this is disputed by Hekman (2010), who claims that discourse and material reality interact in the work of Foucault, and that his work has been misinterpreted as focusing only on discourse. She says that Foucauldian analysis is based on the interface between the discursive and the material. And 'it is in the apparatus that the discursive and the non-discursive come together in the practices of power' (Hekman, 2010, p. 56). Hekman argues that the Foucauldian understanding of power is very physical, it affects our bodies. 'Power is always already material' (Hekman, 2010, p. 57). Foucault himself says that 'nothing is more material, physical, corporal than the exercise of power' (1980, p. 57). Hekman (2010) also shows how, in *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1979), bodies are at the same time products of discourse as well as material reality. Having said this, it could be argued that bringing agential realism into this study would not be necessary. The main difference, as I see it, is that Barad also takes into account material objects that are commonly considered passive, claiming that they, too, through intra-action, can be thought of as

produced as active agents. Also, Barad (2007) does not privilege human agents.

After turning to agential realism the Foucauldian concepts needed to be scrutinised further, which led me to Hekman and her rereading of the works of Foucault. In addition, Hekman's claims challenge earlier interpretations of Foucault's work. Hekman's answer to the general understanding of Foucault as primarily exploring how the world is shaped by discourse is as follows:

What Foucault is attempting to do, then, is far from simple. He wants to question universal truth and explore how language, discourse, and knowledge shape our world. But he also wants to talk about the material parameters of that world and how that materiality interacts with discourses. (Hekman, 2010, p. 63)

Thus, Hekman is arguing that Foucault has been misunderstood because of the complexity and difficulty of challenging linguistic constructionism. In this thesis I have used Hekman's ideas in order to try to move the thoughts of Foucault and Barad, which can be seen as opposed, a little bit towards each other. For now, I will settle for trying to relate to Foucault's notion of power relations and Barad's intra-activity to be able to analyse, on the one hand, how children's participation is enacted, and on the other how material objects can be taken into account in the preschool documentation practice.

The concepts of human and non-human are often used in posthumanist theories (Hultman, 2011; Barad, 1996) that try to overcome the dichotomy between humans and objects, material and discursive. However, to refer to everything that is not human as 'non-human' is problematic, since the very use of the word *human* in *non-human* puts the human at the centre. Furthermore, human bodies also consist of matter that could be said to be non-human (e.g. bacteria, pacemakers, ear implants) (Haraway, 1991). Henceforth I will not use the concept 'non-human' but will refer to different kinds of objects, things, and 'non-human' material as material agents (which of course also could include humans, since our bodies are indeed material) or I will use specific terms, such as *computer*, *paper* and *toy lion*.

Words and things are not seen as separate, and concepts are not seen as representations of things. Instead, reality and concepts are

mutually dependent, and for this reason the term *intra-action* rather than *interaction* is used to describe what is going on between human and thing (or human-human, or human-animal) (Barad, 2003). For example, using a digital camera and taking a photo of something is choosing an aspect of a phenomenon that is possible to photograph. The camera itself is ‘doing’ something here, intra-acting with us and with the focus of what we are photographing. In this study, computers, toys and other material objects as well as situations such as physical positions are important for children’s participation in addition to children and teachers themselves. The study explores how intra-actions between humans and different kinds of materiality, such as computers, papers or toys, have an impact on participation.

Figure 5 Intra-actions in documentation

The drawing has now changed again; instead of focusing on the *entities* (teacher, child, computer and so on) it focuses on what is happening *between* entities. Now the teacher, the child, the computer, and the printer are all involved in the actions, they all *become* active

agents through intra-action. The teacher and child are talking, the child is pointing, the computer screen is showing, the printer is printing and so on. All these actions are producing the entities involved as agents. If all of them are produced as active agents the power relations could be obscured, which means that, in order to be able to focus specifically on children's participation, I also need the Foucauldian concepts. I need the concept of power and governmentality in order to discern how children's participation in the documentation practice can be shaped in different ways, and how power relations can shift between children and teachers, or humans and computers. Using only agential realism, all entities present in the documentation practice could potentially be seen as equal.

The theoretical perspectives in this study are used as complementary tools for understanding something in a new way as well as for discussing these understandings. The theories and the empirical data will (hopefully), through my intra-actions with them, create knowledge about some children's participation in documentation practices in a Swedish preschool.

6.5 Summarising theoretical perspectives

I have chosen to use theoretical concepts from Foucault, Steyerl and Barad. These theoretical concepts may not seem altogether compatible. At first glance, Foucault's notions about power and discourse are seen as restricted to the social, and the way material objects can contribute in power relations or in producing truths is not considered, even though power is sometimes exercised through technical instruments or apparatuses such as the panopticon or, as in this study, a camera and a computer (Barad, 2007). However, rereading Foucault, Hekman (2010) claimed that this is a misinterpretation of his work, and that he does not separate the discursive from the non-discursive. On the other hand, as I understand it, Foucault does not focus on 'assigning' agency to material objects in a way that sees agency as distributed or produced towards materiality through intra-action in agential realism. The notion of power relations will, in the present study, be fruitful when examining children's participation in preschool documentation practices. In this study children and their participation are seen not as inherent qualities (they *are* not children, or participants) but as being

discursively or material-discursively produced. Foucault (1982) writes about power producing subjects, subjectification, instead of identity as essential. Documentation could thus in Foucauldian terms be seen as a way of regulating the self, through confession (Foucault, 1978). This is especially true when those who are to be documented also participate in documenting themselves.

Foucault considers discourse as something that regulates what can be said and done, something that produces certain ‘truths’. These truths are produced through power and knowledge, which are dependent on each other. For example, certain knowledge about children has been distributed by certain researchers at certain times. For a period of time this knowledge has been dominant, and thus powerful, but there is always some degree of struggle between different truths or discourses. The truths will govern us, which means that truths about children will govern how children can participate in preschool documentation practices. Steyerl’s concept of documentality pinpoints how documentation turns into government. To me, this concept serves as a bridge to seeing the documents themselves as becoming agentic.

Barad takes discourse as her point of departure when she proposes ‘a new understanding of how discursive practices are related to the material world’ (Barad, 2007, p. 34). In her approach, discourse and materiality are both involved in producing the world and what we can know. She suggests that knowing and being cannot be separated; we cannot stand outside of the world to know about it. Words and matter are intertwined, humans and material objects intra-act producing a phenomenon, which in this study is children’s participation in preschool documentation practice. Hopefully, looking at the way material objects play a part in the documentation practice will turn given assumptions around and pave the way for new ways of looking at children’s participation. Studies of how material agents affect children’s participation are scarce, even if posthumanist studies of preschool practices are increasing (for example, Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010; Hultman, 2011). Thus this study can contribute to knowledge of children’s participation in documentation practices from a different perspective than that taken in earlier studies on children’s participation. To me, these theoretical concepts seem fruitful in illuminating children’s participation in preschool documentation from different angles.

7 Method

In this chapter I present the method of the present study. This first section gives a very brief introduction to some methodological considerations. Section 7.1 presents background information on the studied setting, and the following section presents and discusses video recording. Section 7.3 introduces the transcription principles, section 7.4 discusses ethics, and the final section presents the analysis.

The purpose of this study is to obtain knowledge about how participation is enacted in preschool documentation practices, and about the role of teachers, children and other agents in this practice. Taking social constructivism and agential realism as a point of departure and having in mind different views on children it is assumed that discourse *as well as* objects and materiality shape understanding of the world (Barad, 1996). The analysis will thus involve both material and discursive elements. Video recordings enable the analysis of material aspects and could therefore serve as a method for data construction. The object of the study is not separate from the agency of its observation. There is no prior distinction between the studied object and the way it is studied. To be able to study anything at all, some kind of distinction has to be made. Thus, in this study ‘cuts’ have to be constructed for the specific contexts, and something out of a whole has to be chosen (Barad, 1999).

7.1 Background information on the chosen preschool

To find a suitable site for my study I searched the internet for preschools that would match my purpose, namely preschools that prioritised children’s participation in documentation practices. It is common in Sweden for preschools, whether municipal, private or cooperatives, to present themselves on the internet. Another criterion was that it had to be situated within a reasonable distance. Thus it was both a convenience and a purposive sampling (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). The chosen preschool is situated in a small Swedish community in a neighbourhood that is largely inhabited by migrants. It

consists of three groups of about 20 children each, aged 1-5 years. This study focuses primarily on the relation between teachers, children and material objects. This means that it takes age (children and adults) into account (see discussion on power relations in the previous chapter). Since the study was carried out in a preschool where a number of migrant children attended, ethnicity could have been one additional focus. Furthermore, gender is always an important issue in preschool practice, not least because preschool teachers are predominantly women. Although both ethnicity and gender are important considerations when studying children's participation, I have chosen not to focus on either of them since the primary focus lies on the relations mentioned above: teacher/child, human/non-human. In addition, it was necessary to limit the focus of the study due to time and space limitations. Two of the preschool groups were chosen for this study based on their more explicit focus on children's participation in documentation than the third group.

The preschool groups regularly create documentation with pictures (photographs, drawings) and text, often using digital cameras and computers. Children are often invited to participate in documentation in a variety of ways, such as dictating to the teachers what to write about a particular photo, discussing the outcome of an activity (which the teachers then write down) and making drawings. In one of the groups the documents are mainly placed in portfolios, one for each child, and are often viewed by the children during the day. In the other group documents are primarily placed on the walls and in thematic portfolios (one portfolio for each finished project/theme). The documents are further used as a basis for discussion in parent-teacher conferences. Recent photos are also often on show in a digital photo frame in the preschool.

7.2 Video-recording

A short pilot study, in which I video-recorded a documenting situation, was performed in April 2011. Thereafter, I visited the preschool on 11 occasions from November 2011 to January 2012. During the first visits after the pilot study I did not use the video camera. In order to be able to choose specific situations to video-record, the preschool documentation practice as a whole needed to be examined. Which

situations could be interesting for the objectives of the study? Which situations could be used for further analysis? To be able to get an overview, the amount of data had to be reasonable. The observations served mainly as a way of getting to know the preschool and finding which situations were interesting to video-record and to study further. After observing the preschool's documentation practices I chose to video-record some specific situations. These situations included children and teachers producing different kinds of documentation since I was interested in varied ways of working with children's participation in documentation. I found the pilot study to be in line with this, and therefore it was included in the data material.

In one group using portfolio documentation (Ellmin & Ellmin Cederholm, 2012), doing what I call *retrospective documentation*, I video-recorded situations where children and teachers were sitting at the computer documenting past activities. I also video-recorded other situations where the portfolio documents were involved, for example, fetching documents, putting them into plastic pockets and then into binders. The other group was doing what I call *activity-integrated documentation*,⁸ inspired by Reggio Emilia. In this group I video-recorded a whole introduction of a theme in order to be able follow how documentation was integrated into the activity. In this group I also video-recorded discussions about a recent activity between children and a teacher before and while they looked at photographs of the activity. Altogether there were 4 hours and 44 minutes of video recordings from 9 different documentation situations. The focus was on how children were participating in *producing* documentation and on the role of other material agents. In some situations I held the camera in my hand, and in others the camera was placed on a tripod, facing a computer. Additionally, a microphone, connected to the camera, was in one setting hung above the computer, where a teacher and a child were documenting together.

The choice of video-recording reflects my interest in how materiality matters since interviews, for example, would fail to capture the role of objects, positions and body language. Hadfield and Haw (2012) question a saying that the first decision to make when video-

⁸ Elfström (2013 p. 177) describes a similar kind of documentation as 'immanent utvärdering' (immanent evaluation).

recording is when to turn the camera on, arguing that before that the researcher needs to determine why video recording is used and, in their words, what modality of video recording to use. They describe five different modalities. In this study, video recording is used as an *extractive modality*, capturing situations that can then be analysed later. Another example is *reflective modality*, which would be the case when using video recordings for stimulated recall interviews.

The ability to replay sequences in order to analyse situations is one advantage with video recordings (Rolfe & Emmet, 2010). Disadvantages could be that the camera is highly interesting to the children, which would affect the outcome of the study, and that the video camera only captures a certain segment of what is going on (Rolfe & Emmet, 2010). However, this would depend on the epistemological and ontological assumptions behind the study. The approach in this study does not consider that there is a world ‘out there’ to obtain knowledge *from*, only a world of which we are one part, a world where social construction and materiality are intertwined. Also, as Sparrman expresses it: ‘An image is never just an image. Images are always situated in time, space and cultural/historic conditions’ (Sparrman, 2005, p. 253). The data that have been used in this study should therefore be considered to be *produced* by me, the researcher, and the video camera, rather than *obtained*.

7.3 Transcription principles

Transcriptions can be made in a number of ways. For example, in interaction analysis they are not always as thorough as in conversation analysis and can also include body positions and materiality, such as cursor movements on a computer screen. Jordan and Henderson (1995) claim that transcripts should be done in accordance with the purpose of the current analysis. If the focus is on interactions seen as more than verbal, body language, positions and material objects should be taken into account as well as spoken words (Jordan & Henderson, 1995).

According to Flewitt (2006) all kinds of data need transcription for analytical purposes. She finds *representation* to be a better word than *transcription* since representation can also include the interpretation of what is going on in a video or audio recording. Transcription would suggest that it is possible to write down exactly what is going on.

However, I will keep the word *transcription* and next I will explain how I have used it.

Since I am analysing *intra-actions* the focus of the analysis is in between the participants, on what is *happening* rather than on what they say or how they act. To be able to see this I have used the video recordings extensively while analysing. To describe everything that is happening in a video-recorded sequence in text is practically impossible. There are different ways of describing video recordings in a text. Flewitt (2006) uses the term ‘dynamic texts’ (p. 35) to describe the way video-produced data can be represented in text. Since video recordings contain many ‘layers’ of information (such as talk, body language, noise, things in the environment) it is hard to present this in a straightforward way. Flewitt presents video log and audio transcripts, which are combined and thereafter reconfigured into a multimodal matrix. Another way is to combine still images from the video recording with field notes. With these kinds of transcriptions or representations, Flewitt shows that any kind of representation involves a selection of what to show to the reader of the text.

In this study I initially transcribed only the spoken words verbatim. After this I wrote descriptions of, for example, positions, actions and in some cases bodily movements. I also used my own drawings from parts of the video recordings to be able to describe body language, positions and material objects. Another way of describing the intra-actions between teacher, children, laptop computer, projector and an image displayed on the wall was to draw a schematic overview of the situation, shown in figure 6. By using this image I was able to focus on what was happening *between* the entities involved. The drawings have thus also served as analytical tools.

Figure 6 Schematic overview of documentation situation

7.4 Reflective considerations on ethics and method

To ensure that the study was conducted in an ethical way it was vetted by the Central Ethical Review Board. A letter was distributed to the teachers (Appendix 1) and to the parents (Appendix 2) to sign if they consented to their or their child's participation in the study. I made a pamphlet (Appendix 3) directed to the children explaining what a researcher is, what research is about and what I would be doing at the preschool. In the pamphlet I also explained about ethics and made it clear that children could say no to participating in the study at any time. The pamphlet was distributed with the letter to the parents to be read at home with the children, and copies of it were given to the teachers, to be used in the preschool with the children. The teachers explained to the children that I was to video-record them talking about photos on the computer. I also continuously asked the children if they would allow me to video-record them and they accepted. Dockett et al. (2009) discuss how to make children active participants in research

and how to ensure that children's assent is taken into account. They use the word *assent* rather than *consent* since consent refers to agreements made between people who are able to enter into legal contracts, which young children are not. These children, being used to photographing and video-recording, were inclined to be less cautious about agreeing to be filmed by me. Dockett et al. (2009) mention that children will sometimes agree to participate when an authority figure asks them to, even if they are not all that eager to do so. Since their teacher consented to taking part in my study, asking the children to join, that might have made the children more inclined to agree to participate as well. Since I also participated, even if it was to a limited extent, in the preschool practice during my participative observation period, the children could perhaps see me as any adult taking part in preschool practice. In this preschool there were not only preschool teachers, but also home language teachers, since many of the children were immigrants.

During my visits at the preschool I took part in several different practices, such as circle time, outdoor activities, playing board games and helping children with their clothing. The children often asked me to help them with little things, just as they would any other visiting adult. While I was video-recording they often came up to me and looked into the video camera, sometimes they 'acted' in front of the camera, often by saying hello or by making funny faces, towards me and their friends who were looking into the camera beside me. This can be compared to Sparrman (2005), who found that children in her study sometimes danced and acted in front of the video camera, perhaps as a way of making its presence understandable. Sparrman also understood this as children's awareness of the cultural meaning of video cameras as things that produce, for example, music videos. In analogy with Sparrman's findings, children in my study took an interest in the video camera itself as well as in looking at each other through the camera and acting in front of it. One time while I was video-recording, a child asked me to play a board game, which I did at the same time as I was holding the camera; the child seemed content with this arrangement. While I was video-recording, the video-recorded children occasionally turned to me, invitingly, smiling and talking to me; this made me feel even more comfortable with their participation.

Video-recording in itself could also be ethically problematic when it comes to presenting results. This was also brought forward by Sparrman (2005) and Flewitt (2006) discussing different approaches to presenting images of children in research results. One possible way of presenting images and still protecting identities was by making drawings from video stills, which is the method used in this study.

The focus on children's participation could be argued to affect teachers so that they would be more willing to let children participate in documentation practices than they normally would, and so the situation would not be 'naturally occurring' in that the children would, through my presence, perhaps be participating in something that they normally did not. However, I was not interested in whether participation in documentation practices was a normal activity or not. Instead, my interest was in how children could participate in documentation practices and what consequences this would lead to. Furthermore, the chosen theoretical approach means that seeing myself as separate from the practice, looking at it from without, is not relevant.

The children could see me as any adult entering the preschool, available to them as someone who could help them to put on socks, someone to play a board game with, or someone who would listen to them talk while they were drawing. My presence as an adult in the preschool thus affected the children as well as the teachers and the preschool practice. I became one element in their lives for a short time. I went there, got to know them a little, and then I walked away. This is, however, not unusual in preschools, since replacement personnel are sometimes required. Nevertheless, this is also worth considering ethically. What in my objectives would make this behaviour worthwhile? Why is it important to enter this world and study children (and teachers) in their everyday activities? If we did not study preschool practice there would be less knowledge about what happens and how to deal with different aspects of children's lives in preschool, and the knowledge that there is may not be as widespread. Researchers who take an interest in the everyday practice are needed in order to examine, discuss, question or spread different examples of this practice.

My use of a posthumanist agential realist perspective shapes how I look upon my own role as a researcher. In an agential realist approach,

nature and culture, non-humans and humans are seen as intertwined. Entities are not seen as separately pre-existing but rather as produced by intra-actions of a phenomenon. This means that my presence in the studied preschool would be seen as a part of the preschool documentation practice. Through the intra-actions between me and the children as well as the teachers and the preschool environment I was produced as similar to any visiting adult and also as a researcher. The fact that I too was documenting (taking notes, video-recording, photographing) also added to the preschool documentation practice, as this behaviour could be seen as resembling 'normal' preschool teacher documentation practice. My focus on children's participation could be seen as affecting what the teachers and children were doing, and affecting how they looked at their own practice. A teacher might be more inclined to let a child participate as a way of meeting my interest, which would mean that my presence was contributing to the documentation practice. One example of this is when one of the teachers in the study expressed that, through my presence, she gave more thought to how she could include children in the documentation practice. A child could be more (or less) eager to participate as a way of getting attention from a new adult. My position as a researcher meant that I would sometimes write notes on a notepad and sometimes be placed behind a video-camera. These positions and actions could be seen as a part of the documentation practice I was studying, as intra-actions in the documentation phenomenon which would make an agential cut between me and the studied practice, thus creating a divide between me and the practice at that specific moment (Barad, 2007).

7.5 Analysis

In this section I describe the analysis by presenting it as a process. The description should not be read as the actual way that the analysis was conducted. Instead, it should be read as the way I arrived at doing the analysis. The first steps of the analysis originate in the empirical material. Thus, they focus on humans, or specifically, children. The description then gradually depicts how I arrived at using theory in the analysis.

The very first step in the analysis of the video recordings had already started when the video camera was turned on, since *what* to

record had already been chosen. The finished video-recorded sequences were then viewed and the dialogues were transcribed. The transcriptions were read through several times in order to become familiar with the material. This reading also alternated between viewing the recordings, looking for significant moments and reading literature. The moments of significance that I was looking for were instances when children were participating in one way or another; this could include instances where teachers asked for children's opinions or instances where children initiated or refused to do something that the teacher responded to or ignored. Furthermore, instances where things, such as toys, children's crafts or computers in some way impinged on (e.g. changed or initiated) children's actions, could also be seen as significant moments.

Initially I transcribed only spoken words, cut the transcriptions into pieces and coded them. I constructed different themes, and disassembled and reconstructed them over and over again, in order to be able to notice what was not immediately obvious. I viewed the video recordings recurrently throughout the analysis. I constructed themes answering the research questions and thoroughly analysed illustrative examples of these. However, coding would 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 data, also means familiarisation, entangling the researcher in it, making it possible to experiment and even play with data, 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 data would reveal. Consequently, coding could be a good way to get into the material in detail, and a way to see what is not immediately discernible.

Here follows a description of the process of trying to code the data material, initially without linking it to any specific theory. This should be seen as a tentative way to get into the produced data material. Looking at the material in one way I constructed a theme that had to do with conditions. There seemed to be different conditions involved in order for children to participate in documentation production. These conditions were about children recalling and retelling, verbalising,

letting teachers write down their words and then verifying the writings. They were also about children being able to illustrate their thoughts by drawing. Thus documentation seemed to have to result in a *piece of paper* that would be displayed in *binders* or on the *walls* of the preschool. However, at this stage I did not think of the paper as a participant or agent.

Looking at the material in another way I constructed a theme that had to do with meaning in different situations. This theme was about fairness, learning, children's abilities, inclusion, and differences. A third way of looking at the material resulted in a construction of a theme that had to do with what children were doing. This included verbalising, playing, resisting, partaking and following others' initiatives. Next I looked at what the teachers did. This theme included the use of questions in a number of ways – to initiate conversation, to ask children to tell something, to demand, and to ask for solutions to problems; there were also rhetorical questions. Apart from the various kinds of questions asked, I also made note of the number of questions asked. Too many questions would hinder children, making them silent. This theme also included teachers following children's suggestions, pointing to differences, questioning, being fair and playing with children.

All these themes and categorisations or codes would not cover 'everything'; there were always things that were missed, when looking at the material in different ways. 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' roles, and focusing on meaning excluded what children and teachers were doing. Focusing on what children were doing excluded what teachers were doing, and focusing on teachers' roles excluded what children were doing. All these themes also excluded the role of objects.

Something that struck me after a while was that participation 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 using 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.

Using video technology would correspond well with a perspective such as interaction analysis, originating, for example, in ethnography, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (Jordan & Henderson, 1995). Interaction analysis takes an interest in physical arrangements, and how they affect interaction between people. Objects are also included as special kinds of participants, which is why interaction analysis could have been a good choice for the analysis of the data in this study. However, to be able to thoroughly account for what material objects do, a different theoretical approach was needed, which is why the concepts of power relations, governmentality, documentality and agential realism were chosen (see Chapter 6, Theoretical perspectives, above).

The analysis next focused on the intra-actions between the teachers, children and objects as well as on power relations between children and adults, and between human and material objects. Using the word *intra-action* rather than *interaction* indicates that I do not look at, for example, teachers, children, toys, computers and papers as separate entities, focusing on what they do or how they function. Instead, I focus more on what is happening between them. This is more obvious in article 2 than in article 1. When I started my research I was not as familiar with the posthumanist perspective. Thus, the slightly different perspectives in articles 1 and 2 can be seen as an indication of my own learning or research process. One way of trying to place the focus *in between* the entities was to use the schematic overview mentioned earlier (see figure 6). The overview helped me to focus on something other than separate entities, namely, what was happening between them, the verbs.

The two theoretical lines (power relations, governmentality and documentality on the one hand and agential realism on the other) made it possible for me to see first how power relations were produced in the preschool documentation practice, and second how material objects as well as humans were entangled in this.

8 Presentation/summary of articles

In this chapter I present the two articles included in the thesis. Article 1 focuses mainly on children's participation in preschool documentation practices, while article 2 focuses mainly on material agents in documentation practices and their importance for participation.

8.1 Article 1 - Children's participation in preschool documentation practices

The objective of article 1 was to explore children's participation, and to show its complexity, in different forms of documentation in a Swedish preschool. Children's participation, in itself a complex concept, is a human right and is often thought of as empowering children. Even so, studies on children's participation in early childhood are rather scarce. Children's participation is also prevalent due to the 'new sociology of childhood', which views children as competent, yet children continue to be marginalised in several areas. In the article I see children as competent in their position as children, but they are also in a process of becoming, like all humans.

Documentation was chosen as a site for studying participation because it is often thought of as a tool for enhancing children's participation. In addition, documentation, similar to children's participation and influence, is prescribed in the Swedish preschool curriculum without guidelines for how to accomplish it. Thus different kinds of documentation could be used. In the article I examine two kinds with different theoretical connotations. The portfolio method could be seen as focusing more on individual children's development, while pedagogical documentation could be seen as focusing more on cooperation and participation.

Earlier research has shown that children's participation is often restricted to certain areas. Research concerning documentation often either focuses on the benefits of documentation or is critical towards it.

For the article, two groups, each taking a different approach to documentation, were observed and video-recorded, focusing on children's participation in documentation production. The first group,

named the Zebra group, took a Reggio Emilia-inspired approach to documentation, which I call *activity-integrated documentation*. The second group, the Giraffe group, were using portfolios; I call their approach *retrospective documentation*. These two approaches could be seen as having different theoretical underpinnings and thus could be expected to have different outcomes regarding children's participation.

The article described three activities depicting three different kinds of participation. The first two activities are examples from the activity-integrated documentation. In the first activity, *Drawing lions*, a teacher introduced a theme to two children, and then asked the children to document their thoughts through drawings. Although the focus was on the children's views and thoughts, the children's participation was framed by a number of things. Thus this kind of participation could be seen as *attendance*.

In the second activity, *Making paper houses*, a teacher and three children were evaluating a recent activity together. Here the children were asked for their opinion, which was not really taken into account. This kind of participation could be seen as *involvement*.

The third activity, *Guitar making and vampires*, was an example of retrospective documentation, which theoretically could imply less chance of participation. Here a child and a teacher were documenting together at the computer; the teacher had one objective for the documentation, and the child seemed to have another. Eventually the teacher discarded her objective in favour of the child's, and a different documentation was produced. This kind of participation could be seen as *influence*.

Article 1 concluded that, in these cases, the different documentation approaches did not match their respective theoretical connotations; instead, what to document, teachers' and children's different agendas, children's interest, the degree of teachers' flexibility and the notion of what documentation is all affected and complicated children's participation.

8.2 Article 2 - Papers, Sticky Dots and Lion Adventures playing a part in preschool documentation practices

The objective of article 2 was to examine how material objects such as papers, sticky dots and computers play a part in and affect Swedish preschool documentation practices. Documentation has been emphasised in the 2010 revised Swedish preschool curriculum as a way of evaluating preschool quality. The curriculum gives no guidelines on how to accomplish this, and a quality audit has found that teachers are unsure about how to document.

The word *documentation* in this article refers to the *act* of documenting as well as the *product* of this act. But where a document is a physical object, a printed paper or a photo, a documentation is both the document and its content.

Pedagogical documentation is one kind of documentation that has often been connected to the preschool practices in Reggio Emilia. Earlier research on this kind of documentation has often dealt with how it can be used in preschool practice, both as a means for children's participation in evaluation and as a better alternative to other kinds of evaluation. Some research is critical of documentation and regards it as surveillance. This study focuses on the *production* of documentation rather than its use. In earlier research children have been found to have limited influence on documentation production.

An interest in children's participation in preschool documentation practices led to a focus on theories of power relations, governmentality and documentality. Documentation involves apparatuses, such as pen and paper, cameras, or computers. The information collected needs to be presented in some form, whether printed, projected or (re)played. Thus documentation involves the use or production of some kind of material objects. One way of looking at these objects would be to ascribe meaning to them, but in this article I have chosen another way. The way these objects affect the preschool practice is, in this article, analysed using Karen Barad's theory of agential realism. The objects not only affect but also sometimes determine who or what is governing the documentation practice, thus Foucault's theory of power relations is also used.

The article is based on a study of Swedish preschool documentation practices in two groups of children in one preschool. Documentation activities were video-recorded and analysed. The study was underwent an ethical review. The analysis focused on the intra-actions between teachers, children, computers, papers and other material agents in preschool documentation practices.

Two different kinds of documentation activities were presented. In activity 1 a group of children and two teachers were revisiting an activity through photos projected onto a wall. The analysis of this activity shows how the photos and the computer were involved in producing, and also controlling, narrative memories from the activity.

In activity 2 two children and a teacher were producing printed documents. The analysis of this activity shows that the printed paper and other material objects seemed highly important and desirable for children and teachers in different ways. The objects also, through intra-action, came to control how the documentation would be accomplished.

Thus, in both activities children's participation and influence was controlled by different material agents intra-acting in the documentation practice. In activity 1 the projected photos directed what could be talked about (and remembered). In activity 2 sticky dots determined what would be a good documentation practice and what the document should look like.

The conclusion was that, in order to understand the conditions for documentation, it is crucial not only to consider how the discourse of the good of visibility is competing with the discourse of the participant child, but also to take into account how material agents contribute to shaping the practice – how they play a part in power relations, controlling and producing different kinds of documentation practices together with the humans, making children's participation in documentation a highly complex pursuit. By taking material agents into account I have shown that documentation entails more than just evaluating earlier activities, it also involves how objects, such as projected photographs, papers and sticky dots, contribute to shaping the documentation activities. In two examples objects were shown to be of importance both to conditioning what could be documented and also in themselves, determining what documentation should be.

9 Discussion

In this final chapter I discuss and conclude the study. The overarching objective of the study was to gain knowledge about children's participation in preschool documentation practices since the preschool curriculum prescribes both documentation *and* children's participation in documentation. Through the study I have also gained insights into how material agents play an important part in preschool documentation practices and in children's participation in these practices. To reach these insights I have studied what goes on between children and teachers and different kinds of material agents in documentation practices. The thesis can also be seen as a document of my own research process, from focusing on children's participation through a lens of power relations to focusing on how material objects played a part in preschool documentation practices.

In article 1 the analysis focused on the intra-action between children, teachers and material objects, although in this article materiality in the form of body language and speech was slightly more central than material objects. The difference between the two articles also shows my progress in taking theory into account; in article 1 I just mentioned Barad. In article 2 Foucault's theories about power and governing were more present, in addition to Barad.

It was important to me to see participation not only as children's participation but as a relation that also included adults and things. This made it possible to discern that participation was not something that teachers could give to children or something that children obtained or had, but that it was *produced* in the intra-actions between children, teachers and things. Why was the focus on relations and on material agents important, then? To explain this I will paint a picture of the preschool: in preschools there are teachers, children, toys, tables, different crafting materials, chairs, mattresses, sometimes also cots, computers, telephones and so on. There are often several rooms, allowing for different activities, there is an outdoor yard, often with a sandbox, grass, gravel paths, asphalt areas, swings and so on. My point here is that a preschool consists of a number of different environments and things, and it is hard to imagine a preschool, or even childhood,

without all these objects. Objects play an important role for children (as for every human) and are an important part of the preschool practice, but they are often overlooked since they are usually taken for granted. The question that arose was how these objects could be of importance for children's participation in documentation, also because documentation itself involves a number of objects and produces objects (for example, documents). What could the relations involving these objects produce?

I have studied and analysed different kinds of documentation activities. What these had in common was that they were part of documentation *production* practices, although from different stages of the process, and that children were *participating* in this production, though in different ways. In the articles, a total of five examples of different situations were analysed in detail.

9.1 Children's participation in documentation is a complex pursuit

There are earlier studies focusing on children's participation, as well as studies on documentation in preschools and some on children's participation in documentation. Studies of children's participation presented in this paper focus on the complexity of the concept, the teacher's roles and how children's participation is accomplished (Emilsson & Folkesson, 2006; Karlsson, 2009; Bae, 2009; Westlund, 2011; Eriksen Ødegaard, 2007; Sheridan & Pramling Samuelsson, 2001; Hamerslag, 2013). Studies of documentation have also shown documentation to be a complex concept, focusing on documentation as assessment, surveillance or as a tool for democracy (Vallberg Roth, 2010; Lenz Taguchi, 2000; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010; Bjervås, 2011; Buldu, 2010; Vallberg-Roth, 2012). Studies focusing on documentation and participation have sometimes found children to be objectified and have seen teachers as onlookers (Vallberg Roth & Månsson, 2011; Garrick et al, 2010; Bath, 2012; Emilsson & Pramling Samuelsson, 2012; Lindgren, 2012).

Whether documentation itself, and especially pedagogical documentation, is beneficial for children's participation could not be determined from the results of this study, obviously, since it had a different focus. Still, the children in the study did not seem to be

objectified due to their, more or less, active involvement in the documentation process. Nevertheless, since the children were mostly the subjects of photography, the ones being looked at through the camera, they could in this sense still be seen as being objectified. This could be seen as a method of regulation, similar to the panopticon (Foucault, 2003). It could therefore be seen as a kind of governmentality, through documentality (Steyerl, 2003). On the other hand, in 'the lion adventures' (see Article 2) the teacher was also present in the photographs, since she too took part in the drama activity. In the discussion of this activity the teacher and the children could, *in this specific respect*, be seen as participating on an equal level. Both children and adults were put under surveillance. However, since teachers can be seen as being produced as more powerful, in terms of size and age as well as formal position (being teachers), this equality can be seen as quite fleeting.

An important result of this study was the *complexity* of children's participation. Different theoretical connotations of different documentation methods were, if not altogether insignificant, at least not the most important aspect for children's participation. Instead, a number of other aspects seemed to enable or restrict children's participation in documentation. The complexity is also inherent in the concept of participation itself. Participation could be anything from attendance to influence, from being a spectator to having an impact and changing the situation, which was obvious in article 1. Using *activity-integrated* as well as the *retrospective* documentation methods both improved and limited children's participation depending on other elements. This would imply that different documentation methods could be used in order to make sure that children are participating in documentation. Children could be participating in any of them, depending on teachers' and children's agendas, children's interest, teachers' flexibility and notions of what documentation is about. That said, I will not argue that *any* documentation method would be suitable for *all* documentation purposes, but that is a completely different question.

The complexity of children's participation in documentation was also obvious when teacher and children had *different agendas* on what to do. In one situation the focus on the child's participation led to a very different story being produced in the document (see article 1,

‘guitar making and vampires’). This story had little to do with what the teacher initially had in mind to document, and it could be questioned whether the situation should be seen as documentation or as a story-telling activity, since it was not altogether clear whether the boy had been playing vampire or made the story up when he saw the photo. However, this raises the question of what documentation is about. Documenting a story invented by a child on the spur of the moment, initiated by an interesting photograph, could be just as relevant as documenting a recent activity. In order to follow the curriculum suggestions about children’s influence, it might be important that the teachers stepped back from assumptions of what preschool documentation is about and as Luttrell says, ‘focused less on [their] own assumptions, preconceptions and concerns, and more on those of the young people with whom [they] work’ (Luttrell, 2010, p. 234). Even so, if documentation is supposed to evaluate preschool practices (as stated in the curriculum) an awareness of how to use the documents for this purpose would be necessary, or they might just as well be seen as any preschool activity, which is not to say that that kind of activity would be of less worth.

To be able to fully participate and have a real influence, in accordance with what is prescribed by the curriculum, children would need to be on equal ground with adults, which means that, for example, their agendas would need to match. How then could this be accomplished? There is a dilemma in focusing on documenting the individual child that is in line with Fraser’s thoughts on recognition (Fraser, 1995), as mentioned in section 4.1 above. The dilemma is that focusing on individual children in documentation would give them recognition, but at the same time it would create a divide between children and adults, counteracting the rapprochement that had been established between them in the documentation practice and that is needed in order for children to participate fully.

9.2 Documents and documentality– how materiality matters and how power relations affect children’s participation

Documentation produces records, often as printed documents, but also as memories, as in the case of the ‘lion adventures’ in article 2. These records produce certain ‘truths’, which, when saved as documents, and perhaps also as memories, will be preserved as these particular truths, and difficult to change; on the other hand, they could also be used to problematise dominant thoughts or truths (Steyerl, 2003). As a consequence documentality will govern the way teachers and children are able to act and talk. In the ‘lion adventures’ situation in article 2, as well as in other documentation practices involving photos, the photographs determined what parts of the drama activity the teacher and the children would focus on, talk about and remember. The photographs can be said to inspect certain parts of the drama activity, which then would be constructed as more important than other parts. Thus the photos, and the photographer, would, through the intra-actions between photographer, photograph, teacher and children, be constructed as very powerful. What is recorded can thus easily be seen as *the* preschool practice, which then would exclude other things, perhaps not as easily recorded. The documents themselves are therefore very much involved in power relations in preschool documentation practices. However, if power is conjoined with resistance (Foucault, 1978), the question arises of how this would work when material objects are involved. I would say that this depends on how ‘resistance’ is defined. In my opinion, a material object could very well resist forces from other objects or humans, as a heavy stone would resist being picked up, or a twig would resist falling off a tree until the wind is strong enough. Therefore, taking agential realism as a point of departure, I suggest that power relations can very well work, not only between humans and humans and animals, but also between humans and material objects.

In consequence, besides teachers’ and children’s agendas, children’s interest, teachers’ flexibility and notions of what documentation is about, in this study the *material objects* involved in the documentation practice were found to be important for children’s participation. Notions of (in addition to the actual materiality of)

documentation as placing papers in a binder affected how documentation was done, which in turn affected how it was possible for children to participate in documentation. Toys, children's crafts, computers, printers and other things also played a part in the situations. Using theories such as agential realism helps the discussion of how these things affect children's participation.

The intra-activity between the teacher, the children, the printed documents and the sticky dots in article 2 produced participation that was affected by the entanglement of material entities. Children's participation was not only a result of how teachers interacted with children, as pointed out in earlier research (see section 5.1), or which kind of documentation method was used, but it was also a result of intra-actions between things and humans. In the two articles in this study, children's participation also varied between attendance and influence. These could be seen as two sides of a power relation, where influence is produced as the more powerful position. Attendance and influence also shifted between teacher and child in one situation. An example of this is the 'vampire' example in article 1, where the teacher initially had the greatest influence but in the end could be said to merely have been attending to or assisting the child. Thus these power relations were certainly found to be reversible and unstable (Huckaby, 2011). In the 'vampire' example, the documentation changed, from being a retrospective description of an earlier activity to a fictional story about a vampire. It could be disputed whether this really is documentation or instead a story-telling activity. However, instead of describing the earlier activity, it could also be seen as describing the work with children's participation and influence, or describing the work on children's literacy. In this respect it could very well be seen as a part of preschool pedagogical documentation.

9.3 Documentation in relation to the curriculum

In order to fulfil the responsibility of taking children's participation seriously the teachers sometimes abandoned their objective of documentation in favour of the child's interest (see 'guitar making and vampires' in article 1). This completely changed the outcome of the documentation, as described above. If documentation is supposed to be

done for the purposes of evaluating, assessing and developing the preschool practice, the child, being able to fully participate in documentation, would have to be aware of why the document is produced, and for what purposes. This makes children's participation in documentation a highly complex pursuit. The curriculum prescribes that teachers need to obtain knowledge about how children develop and learn in order for them to develop preschool practice, and that children should also participate in this, which means that they also have to participate in teachers' obtaining this knowledge about themselves, whether they want to or not. How about knowledge about teachers themselves, or about teaching? The curriculum says nothing about documenting how teachers perform. The targets of documentation are individual children and the preschool as a whole: 'Evaluating the quality of the preschool and creating good conditions for learning requires that the child's learning and development be monitored, documented and analysed' (Swedish National Agency of Education, 2011, p. 14). If children are to fully participate in documenting and evaluating preschool quality, maybe they should also be able to document their teachers.

As shown in this study, not only teachers and children participated in and influenced documentation, but the material agents were also involved in producing the documents, whether it be a camera, paper and pencil, sticky dots, computers, printers or whatever, which further complicates the picture. It is thus crucial for preschool teachers to be aware of both their own views on documentation and participation as well as of what material agents are present and what all these mean for the documentation practice.

The Swedish preschool curriculum prescribes documentation and children's participation in documentation. Documentation is supposed to be used for evaluating and developing preschool practice. In the studied preschool children were participating in different ways in all of the stages of the documentation process that were studied. However, their agenda sometimes differed from that of the teachers. It could therefore be questioned whether they were aware of the objectives of documentation. The teachers could be considered to have two agendas – on the one hand, to document as required by the curriculum in order to evaluate the activities, and on the other hand, also in accordance with the curriculum, to make sure that children participated in

documentation. In most cases the children could also be considered to have two agendas – on the one hand, to participate in preschool activities (which could agree with the teacher's latter agenda), and on the other hand, to create something new (which would differ from the teacher's agenda). All these agendas can be present concurrently; they can also be created in the moment, in the intra-actions between the participant agents, and they can change during the activity. The children in the 'guitar making and vampires' and 'drawing lions' activities created new stories that interested them but that did not directly evaluate preschool practice. The persons responsible for evaluating and developing preschool practices are the teachers. What does focusing on children's participation in all stages of the documentation process do? What kind of documentation will children's involvement lead to? In order to use documentation for evaluation, should children be made aware of its purpose? Or maybe teachers' notion of what documentation is about needs to be (re)considered when children are involved in documentation production?

In this study, children were sometimes more interested in creating new stories instead of looking back at a previous activity or holding on to a previous opinion (see Article 1); in such cases, children's participation could be seen as in conflict with the objectives of documentation. Does documentation, as such, mean that what is important is to look back, to dwell on what has already happened, instead of being here and now, or is it to look forward to create something new? Formative assessment is said to focus on looking ahead, in contrast to summative assessment, which only looks back at what has been accomplished. Nevertheless, formative assessment also has to be based on what has happened. Another problem is that both forms of assessment are related to assessment in accordance with goals to *achieve*, which the Swedish preschool curriculum does not have. Transformative assessment might then be an alternative (Vallberg-Roth, 2012) and maybe it could be seen as a means for children's participation in documentation practices, but the problem with determining what is of importance still prevails.

Children's interest in looking forward, creating something new might still, in some ways, be in the way of any kind of assessment or evaluation. On the other hand, perhaps this study can be seen as an

account of children's inclination towards transformative assessment, since they seemed more inclined to look forward and create something new than to look back and evaluate what had already happened. It could also be seen as a way that children resisted being looked at, scrutinised – as a way of resisting the panoptic gaze (Foucault, 2003). Certainly, preschool practice needs to develop, and children and teachers need to learn from earlier experience, and certainly children need to be a part of this process, but maybe, sometimes, we need to think about what the documentation practice does, and what the documents, the photographs, the sticky dots, the computers, the drawing material do, and of what is most important, the here and now, the past or the future.

9.4 Further research

Working with this paper has raised new questions: My study has focused on children's participation in the production of documentation, but how are these documents used? And how do children participate in their use? How can the use of documents make documentation pedagogical? It would be interesting to further explore the proposed connections between pedagogical documentation, as well as other kinds of documentation, and children's participation when documentation is being *used* in preschool practice.

One element in my study was the production of captions to photographs. In order to take the visual into account it could be useful to focus on the photographs themselves: How are they produced? What is photographed, why, and by whom? And how are photographs used for evaluating and developing preschool practices? Some photographs are displayed by preschools on their websites. What kinds of photographs are used there? For what purpose, and what do they say about the preschools? What do these photographs do for preschool practice and for views on preschool and preschool children? How do photographs intra-act with children, teachers, parents and the preschool environment, the concrete, physical environment as well as the abstract, digital and/or internet based environment?

References

- Arnér, E. (2006). *Barns inflytande i förskolan – problem eller möjlighet för de vuxna?: En studie av ett utvecklingsarbete och dess betydelse för att förändra pedagogers förhållningssätt till barns initiativ*. Licentiate dissertation. Örebro: Örebro universitet, Pedagogiska institutionen.
- Bae, B. (2009). Children's right to participate: Challenges in everyday interactions. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 17(3), 391-406.
- Barad, K. (1996). Meeting the universe halfway: Realism and social constructivism without contradiction. In L. Hankinson Nelson, & J. Nelson, *Feminism, Science and the Philosophy of Science* (pp. 161-194). Dordrecht: Kluwer Press.
- Barad, K. (1998). Getting real: Technoscientific practices and the materialization of reality. *Differences. A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 10(2), 87-128.
- Barad, K. (1999). Agential realism: Feminist interventions in understanding scientific practices. In M. Biagioli, *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.
- Bartley, K. (1998). *Barnpolitik och barnets rättigheter*. Doctoral dissertation. Göteborg: Sociologiska institutionen, Göteborgs universitet.
- 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.
- Bergström, M., & Holm, I. (2005). *Den svårfångade delaktigheten i skolan*. Linköping: Linköpings Universitet.

- Bjervås, L.-L. (2011). *Samtal om barn och pedagogisk dokumentation som bedömningspraktik i förskolan*. Doctoral dissertation. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.
- Björk-Willén, P. (2012). Händelser vid datorn. Förskolebarns positioneringsarbete och datorspelets agens. *Barn*(3-4), pp. 75-92.
- Buldu, M. (2010). Making learning visible in kindergarten classrooms: Pedagogical documentation as a formative assessment technique. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(7), 1439-1449.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Corsaro, W. A. (2011). *The Sociology of Childhood* (3rd ed. uppl.). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Dahlbeck, J. (2011). On childhood and the logic of difference: Some empirical examples. *Children & Society*, 26, 4-13.
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Postmodern Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Davies, S., & Artaraz, K. (2009). Towards an understanding of factors influencing early years professionals' practice of consultation with young children. *Children and Society*, 23, 57-69.
- Deckha, M. (2008) Intersectionality and Posthumanist Visions of Equality. *Wisconsin Journal of Law, Gender & Society*, 23(2), 249-267.
- Dockett, S., Einarsdóttir, J., & Perry, B. (2009). Researching with children: Ethical tensions. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 7(3), 283-298.
- Dolk, K. (2013). *Bångstyriga barn. Makt normer och delaktighet I förskolan*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Einarsdóttir, J. (2005). Playschool in pictures: Children's photographs as a research method. *Early Child Development and Care*, 175(6), 523-541.
- Elfström, I. (2013). *Uppföljning och utvärdering för förändring – pedagogisk dokumentation som grund för kontinuerlig verksamhetsutveckling och systematiskt kvalitetsarbete i*

- förskolan*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Ellmin, B., & Ellmin Cederholm, U. (2012). *Portfolio i förskolan* (1 uppl.). Stockholm: Liber.
- Elvstrand, H. (2009). *Delaktighet i skolans vardagsarbete*. Doctoral dissertation. Linköping: Linköpings Universitet.
- Emilson, A. (2007). Young children's influence in preschool. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 39(1), 11-38.
- Emilson, A. (2008). *Det önskvärda barnet*. Doctoral dissertation. Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Emilson, A., & Folkesson, A.-M. (2006). Children's participation and teacher control. *Early Child Development and Care*, 176(3 & 4), 219-238.
- Emilsson, A., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2012). Jakten på det kompetenta barnet. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, 5(21), 1-16.
- Eriksen Ødegaard, E. (2007). What's up on the teachers' agenda? A study of didactic projects and cultural values in mealtime conversations with very young children. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 39(2), 46-64.
- Fleer, M. (2010). *Early Learning and Development: Cultural-historical concepts in play*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Flewitt, R. (2006). Using video to investigate preschool classroom interaction: Education research assumptions and methodological practices. *Visual Communication*, 5(1), 25-50.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller, *The Foucault Effect* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Övervakning och straff*. Lund: Arkiv.

- Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review*(I/212), 68-93.
- Gadda, A. (2008). *Rights, Foucault and Power: A critical analysis of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. UK: Sociology subject group of Social & Political Studies, University of Edinburgh.
- Gallacher, L.-A., & Gallagher, M. (2008). Methodological immaturity in childhood research? Thinking through 'participatory methods'. *Childhood*, 15, 499-516.
- Gallagher, M. (2010). Are schools panoptic? *Surveillance & Society*, 7(3/4), 262-272.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hadfield, M., & Haw, K. (2012). Video: Modalities and methodologies. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 35(3), 311-324.
- Hamerslag, A. (2013). *Barns deltagande och delaktighet. Projektarbete i en förskola med inspiration från Reggio Emilia*. Licentiate dissertation. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Hekman, S. (2010). *Material of Knowledge: Feminist Disclosures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press,
- Hill, M., & Tisdall, K. (1997). *Children & Society*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hindess, B. (1996). *Discourses of Power. From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell .
- Huckaby, M., F. (2011). Researcher/researched: Relations of vulnerability/relations of power. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24(2), 165-183
- Hultman, K. (2011). *Barn, linjaler och andra aktörer*. Doctoral dissertation. 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.
- Hultqvist, K., & Peterson, K. (1995). Nutidshistoria: några inledande utgångspunkter. In K. Hultqvist, & K. Peterson, *Foucault namnet på en modern och filosofisk problematik* (pp. 16-37). Stockholm: HLS förlag.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing Childhood*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Johansson, J. (1994). *Svensk förskolepedagogik under 1900-talet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 4(1), 39-103.
- Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Kallio, K. P. (2012). Desubjugating childhoods by listening to the child's voice and childhoods at play. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 11(1), 81-109.
- Karlsson, O. (2000). Praktikbaserad utvärdering i förskola och fritidshem, *Utbildning och demokrati*, 9 (2), 87-106.
- Karlsson, R. (2009). *Demokratiska värden i förskolebarns vardag*. Doctoral dissertation. Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Kjørholt, A. T. (2004). *Childhood as a Social and Symbolic Space: Discourses on Children as Social Participants in Society*. Doctoral dissertation. Trondheim: Dep. of education/Norwegian centre for child research.
- Komulainen, S. (2007). The ambiguity of the child's 'voice' in social research. *Childhood*, 14(1), 11-28.
- Krechevsky, M., Rivard, M., & Burton, F. R. (2010). Accountability in three realms: Making learning visible inside and outside the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 49(1), 64-71.
- Kummen, K. (2014). *Making Space for Disruption in the Education of Early Childhood Educators*. Doctoral Dissertation. Victoria: University of Victoria.
- Lee, N. (1998). Towards an immature sociology. *The Sociological Review*, 46(3), 458-481.

- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2000). *Emancipation och motstånd*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm: HLS.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). *Going Beyond the Theory/Practice Divide in Early Childhood Education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2013). *Pedagogisk dokumentation som aktiv agent. Introduktion till intra-aktiv pedagogik*, Malmö: Gleerups.
- 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., & Halldén, G. (2001). Individuella rättigheter; autonomi och beroende. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 10(2), 65-79.
- Lund, R. (2007). At the interface of development studies and child research: Rethinking the participating child. *Children's Geographies*, 5(1-2), 131-148.
- Luttrell, W. (2010). 'A camera is a big responsibility': A lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, 25(3), 224-237.
- Läraryrket (2014). *Förskolan framgångsfaktor enligt OECD – ger bättre Pisa-resultat i matematik och läsning*. (Rapport från Läraryrket 2014-05-14) Stockholm: Läraryrket.
- MacDonald, M. (2007). Toward formative assessment: The use of pedagogical documentation in early elementary classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 27, 232-242.
- MacLure, M. (2013). Classification or wonder? Coding as an analytic practice in qualitative research. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose, *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 164-183). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mannion, G. (2007). Going spatial, going relational: Why “listening to children” and children's participation needs reframing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 28(3), 405-420.
- Markström, A.-M. (2005). *Förskolan som normaliseringspraktik*. Doctoral dissertation. Linköping: Linköpings Universitet 2005.
- McKenna, D. (2003). Documenting development and pedagogy in the Swedish preschool: The portfolio as a vehicle for reflection,

- learning, and democracy. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 12, 161-184.
- Nordin-Hultman, E. (2004). *Pedagogiska miljöer och barns subjektskapande*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm: Liber.
- Pettersvold, M. (2013). Demokratiförståelser og barns demokratiske deltakelse i barnehagen. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 34, 127-147.
- Pramling Samuelsson, I., & Sheridan, S. (2003). Delaktighet som värdering och pedagogik. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 8(1-2), 70-84.
- Raby, R. (2012). Children's participation as neo-liberal governance? *Discourse: Studies in Cultural Politics of Education*, 35 (1), 77-89.
- Rogoff, B., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Cultural variation in young children's access to work or involvement in specialised child-focused activities. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(3), 264-274.
- Rolfe, S. A., & Emmet, S. (2010). Direct observation. In G. MacNaughton, S. A. Rolfe, & I. Siraj-Blatchford, *Doing Early Childhood Research, International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. (pp. 309-326) Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Sheridan, S., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2001). Children's conceptions of participation and Influence in pre-school: A perspective on pedagogical quality. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 2(3), 169-194.
- Sheridan, S., & Pramling Samuelsson, I. (2009). *Barns lärande - fokus i kvalitetsarbetet*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Sinclair, R. (2004). Participation in practice: Making it meaningful, effective and sustainable. *Children & Society*, 18, 106-118.
- Skolverket (2012). *Uppföljning, utvärdering och utveckling i förskolan: Pedagogisk dokumentation*. Stockholm: Skolverket
- SOU 1997:116. (den 12 may 2004). *Barnets Bästa i främsta rummet. FN:s konvention om barnets rättigheter i Sverige*. Retrieved from Regeringskansliet:
<http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/30/26/d403fd7f.pdf>
 den 11 august 2011

- SOU 1997:157. (1997). *Att erövra omvärlden*. Utbildningsdepartementet: Stockholm.
- Sparrman, A. (2005). Video recording as interaction: Participant observation of children's everyday life. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(3), 241-255.
- Sparrman, 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.
- Steyerl, H. (2003). *Documentarism as Politics of Truth*. Retrieved from http://republicart.net/disc/representations/steyerl03_en.pdf den 24 april 2012
- Steyerl, H. (2007). Dokumentation och dokumentalitet. In Konstfack, *Konst, makt och politik*. (pp. 214-237). Stockholm: Raster.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2006). *Curriculum for the Pre-School Lpfö98*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Swedish National Agency of Education. (2011). *Curriculum for the Preschool Lpfö 98. Revised 2010*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Svenning, B. (2011). *Vad berättas om mig? Barns rättigheter och möjligheter till inflytande i förskolans dokumentation*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- 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 Framtidstudier.
- Sørensen, E. (2009). *The Materiality of Learning. Technology and knowledge in educational practise*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, N. (2007). Towards a theory of children's participation. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 15 (2), 199-218
- Tullgren, C. (2004). *Den välreglerade friheten. Att konstruera det lekande barnet*. Malmö: Malmö högskola.
- UNICEF. (3 June 2011). *UNICEF - Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved from UNICEF: www.unicef.org/crc/

- Vallberg Roth, A.-C. (2010). Att stödja och styra barns lärande - tidig bedömning och dokumentation. In G. Åsén, *Perspektiv på barndom och barns lärande* (pp. 175-234). Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Vallberg-Roth, A. (2012). Different forms of assessment and documentation in Swedish preschools. *Nordisk Barnehaveforskning*, 5(23), 1–18.
- Vallberg Roth, A.-C., & Månsson, A. (2010). Visual documentation as a normalizing practice: A new discourse of visibility in preschool. *Surveillance & Society*, 7(3/4), 248-261.
- 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*, 1-15.
- Wall, J. (2008). Human rights in light of childhood. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 16, 523-543.
- Wehner-Godée, C. (2000). *Att fånga lärandet: pedagogisk dokumentation med hjälp av olika medier*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Wehner-Godée, C. (2012). *Lyssnandets och seendets villkor*. Stockholm: Stockholms Universitets förlag.
- Westlund, K. (2011). *Pedagogers arbete med förskolebarns inflytande. En demokratididaktisk studie*. Licentiate dissertation. Malmö: Malmö Högskola.
- Wyness, M. (2013). Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis. *Childhood*, 20(4), 429-442.
- Åsén, G., & Vallberg Roth, A. C. (2012). *Utvärdering i förskolan: en forskningsöversikt*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Norrköping den 4 november 2011

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 2

Norrköping den 4 november 2011

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 licentiat-avhandling) 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.

inte delta.

☐ **NEJ**, vårt/mitt barn får

Barnets

namn: _____

Målsmans/-mäns

underskrift: _____

Appendix 3

Appendix 3

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 FÖRSKARE PÅ
FÖRSKOLAN

Katarina Elfström Pettersson

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

VAD GÖR EN FORSKARE?

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

Jag ville titta i ett mikroskop på små, små

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

Men jag blev forskare istället och jobbade på en forskola i många,

många år. Jag tyckte det var jättekul! 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! Bland känner jag mig så här:

Det finns faktiskt forskare som blandar vätskor och tittar i mikroskop. 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 skriver jag på datorn. Det jag skriver kanske blir en bok, eller så kan det hända i en tidning.

ibland vill forskare veta vad andra forskare gör. Då kan vi träffas och prata med varandra om vad vi gör. Nästan som en samling i förskolan!

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 fröknarna och mammorna och papporna. Och så måste jag liksom 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 ångrar dig sen och inte vill längre. Då får du säga NEJ och då behöver du inte vara med mer!

Katarina

Part II

Publications included

- I. Elfström Pettersson, K. (2013). Children's participation in preschool documentation practices. *Childhood*, online first, DOI: 10.1177/0907568213513480.
- II. Elfström Pettersson, K. (forthcoming). Sticky Dots and Lion Adventures Playing a Part in Preschool Documentation Practices. Manuscript submitted to *International Journal of Early Childhood*.

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-112874>