Sherry Rose

and

Pam Whitty
University of New Brunswick

"Where do we find the time to do this?"
Struggling Against the Tyranny of Time

For the past five years, the University of New Brunswick (UNB) Early Childhood Centre, working with childcare educators, has been researching, piloting, and developing curriculum materials and workshops for infants, toddlers, and other children. As we move in and out of university and daycare spaces where "people are not equally located" (Eyre, 2007, p. 99), our work is rifled with contradictions and ethical tensions. Out of this complex and contradictory landscape, we hear and ask many recursive questions. The question we problematize in this article is: Where do we find the time to do this? (Foucault, 1984; Marshall, 2007). Questions such as this incite experiments and interpretations that enliven and invigorate our pedagogical co-authorings in order to reimagine ourselves and our worlds (Olson, 2005). Our critical examination of experimentations and interpretations provoked through three communally produced texts uncovers how educators both slide into and disrupt cultural orientations toward individualism, deficit, and the tyranny of clock time.

Depuis cinq ans, le centre de la petite enfance de l'Université du Nouveau-Brunswick, en collaboration avec des spécialistes de la garde d'enfants, entreprend de la recherche et des études pilotes, et développe du matériel didactique et des ateliers pour des nourrissons, des tout-petits et d'autres enfants. En nous déplaçant de l'université aux garderies où «les personnes ne sont pas sur un pied d'égalité» traduction de Eyre, 2007, p. 99), notre travail est truffé de contradictions et de tensions ethniques. De ce paysage complexe et contradictoire ressortent plusieurs questions récurrentes. Celle sur laquelle nous fondons notre problématique est la suivante : Où trouvons-nous le temps de le faire? (Foucault, 1984; Marshall, 2007). Les questions comme celles-ci provoquent des expériences et des interprétations qui animent et revigorent nos collaborations pédagogiques de sorte à se réinventer soi-même et à réinventer notre monde (Olson, 2005). Trois textes produits en communauté ont soulevé des essais et des interprétations sur lesquels nous avons posé un regard critique. Notre examen a révélé que les éducateurs réagissent aux orientations culturelles tendant vers l'individualisme, le déficit et la tyrannie de l'horloge de deux façons : ils s'y insèrent et ils les dérangent.

In March 2005, the Government of New Brunswick approached the University of New Brunswick (UNB) Early Childhood Centre to research, pilot, and develop curriculum materials for infants, toddlers, and young children (funded through the New Brunswick Department of Social Development and the New Brunswick Early Learning and Childcare Trust Fund http://www.gnb.ca/0017/Promos/0003/curriculum-e.asp*). From the beginning, this work was deeply influenced by reconceptualist perspectives in early childhood educa-

Sherry Rose is a doctoral student.
Pam Whitty is a professor and Director of the Early Childhood Centre.

tion (Dahlberg & Moss, 2005) and curriculum theorizing and practices embedded in Reggio Emilia (Rinaldi, 2006), Te Whariki (Carr & May, 1993), and the Tasmanian curriculum (Department of Education, Tasmania, 2004). Reconceptualist literature and reconceptualized practice in concert with overlapping scholarship on children's rights (Burr, 2004; Friendly, 2006), equity research (Delpit, 1995; Derman-Sparks & the Anti-Bias Task Force, 1989, 2001; MacNaughton, 2001; Ramsey, 2004), and a valuing of children's daily lives (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Penn, 2005; Rinaldi, 2006) deeply informed the production of the *New Brunswick Curriculum Framework for Early Learning and Child Care—English* (NBCF, Early Childhood Centre, UNB, 2008). The NBCF introduced broad based learning goals, values and narrative documentation as the heart of learning and assessment for young children, educators, families and communities.

These broadly based learning goals, clearly influenced by the New Zealand and Tasmanian curricula, include well-being, play and playfulness, communication and literacies, and diversity and social responsibility (http://www.gnb.ca/0017/Promos/0003/curriculum-e.asp). The values such as a zest for living and learning, creativity and play, and living democratically overlap with aspects of the goals and stress the distinctiveness of childhood as a time in its own right rather than merely a preparation for school life. Narrative documentation in the context of curriculum development provided critical spaces for cultivating a "'postmodern sensibility' (Tom Popkewitz, 1998, as cited in Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 27) … to be more sensitive to the importance of focusing on questions … [being] fully aware that we are all inscribed in modernist discourses" (Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 28).

Following national, international, and local consultations, extensive literature reviews, and the piloting of a draft curriculum with eight childcare centres, the *New Brunswick Curriculum Framework for Early Learning and Care-English* (NBCF) and the *Well-Being Professional Support Document* (*Well-Being*) were published in 2008 (Early Childhood Centre). These publications were produced through a continual process of questioning, dialogue, reflection, and meaning-making that took place in workshop spaces, team meetings, daylong institutes, site visits and the co-authoring of multiple drafts of the documents. This provincial early childhood initiative in its various forms, whether print, image, video, or dialogue, continues to open critical curricular spaces that disrupt taken-for-granted notions of children, childhood, and curricula privileged and produced by dominant neoliberal and modernist discourses (Cannella, 1997; Dahlberg et al., 1999; Edmiston, 2008; MacNaughton, 2005).

In this curriculum initiative, we (Sherry and Pam) work "towards a dissolution and/or transgression of the modernist theory-practice binary that dominates Early Childhood Education (ECE) and teacher education practices" (Taguchi, 2007, p. 275). We strive to listen for, respect, question, and respond to the lived particularities of localized educators, children, and their families. Our aim is to encourage an affirming and experimental attitude (Dahlberg & Moss, 2009, as cited in Olsson, 2009; also see Taguchi, 2009), difficult to achieve when producing and implementing an "official" curriculum framework mandated by government timelines. Working through a post-foundational sensibility commits us to the cultivation of dialogic spaces that generate opportunities to

investigate complexities and multiplicities—to unearth rhizomatic connections (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Rinaldi, 2006; Schwab, 1969, 1973, 1978) that instigate new possibilities for thought and action. In these dialogic spaces, our intention is "to be more sensitive to the importance of focusing on questions … [being] fully aware that we are all inscribed in modernist discourses" (Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 28).

As we focused on questions and dialogue, other questions not so easily answered were echoed back to us: Where do I/we find the time? How do I/we find the time to follow one child's interests? How can I/we document narratives and be with children at the same time? How do I/we fit this all in? Often as new practices were introduced and long-held assumptions challenged, we felt we risked leaving early childhood educators and coordinators anchorless— floating in a now-what space sometimes articulated in declarations such as If I/we can no longer do calendar time what do I/we do? How do I/we plan weekly or monthly programs if I/we are following the lead of the child? Emotions were tangled and tangible as educators shared stories of pedagogical experimentation. Some expressed anxiety as they began to think about transforming power relations so that children could affect institutional practices including temporal structures (Wien, 2004). Others expressed energizing changes in mood, tone, learning, and relationships as their newly authored practices disrupted taken-for-granted "clocked" scripts (Wien, 1996).

It is out of localized questions, participation, and experimentation that we endeavor to understand the modernist governance of clock time and its perpetuations of "normalized" constructions of children, families, educators, relationships, learning, and curriculum. How was clocked time governing learning, identities, relationships, and curriculum planning? With this question, our curiosity as curriculum writers was sparked. What would we uncover by foregrounding time in our critical rereading of both the NBCF and the *Well-Being* documents? How had time been authored?

Time being on our minds, and because we were aware that the Chatham Day Care Centre director had experimented with the removal of clocks, we wondered what insights her fellow educators might offer out of their clockless experiences. Other time-related insights from educators, somewhat less direct, had been discussed by workshop participants in their viewing a video documentation produced by an educator. In this article, we foreground the tensions of time in each of these three texts: currently published official curriculum documents; field notes from semistructured focus groups; and field notes from educators' responses to the video, to interpret how clock time governs the relational subjectivities of children, families, and educators. But first, in recognition of the longstanding power of time as a governing force, we bring in the writings of others to illuminate the social construction of time.

Constructing Clock-Bound Worlds

> Mechanical timekeeping devices have been with us for more than two thousand years. Their history began with geared clockwork instruments in ancient times and they would reach a turning point when cumbersome weight-driven clocks of fourteenth century Europe began to strike twenty-four more or less equal hours a day. Improvements in clock-making would

> eventually make it possible to tell the time to the minutes and to the second. (Mccready, 2001, p. 158)

Infringements of clock time on people's lives and freedoms are longstanding. In the late 13th century, particular European monasteries began calling monks to prayer at prescribed times (Mccready, 2001). Hoffman (2009) notes that early in the 14th century, the telling of time shifted from natural signs or events to measuring it by the clock. By the 17th century, clock-measured time "had enormous consequences for the regularization of all human activity" (p. 133). The continuing standardization of time and its links with human efficiency spread into the 20th century and is epitomized by Taylor's industrial ethos (Levine, 2006).

> The new man and woman were to be objectified, quantified, and redefined in clock work and mechanistic language … Above all, their life and their time would be made to conform to the regime of the clock, the prerequisites of the schedule, and the dictates of efficiency. (Rifkin, 1987, p. 111)

By the 21st century, in many parts of the world, the clock in its multiple analog and digital forms calls people to work, to work efficiently, to work faster, and to work more productively. It calls us to standardize work with time, with our bodies and with others' bodies—sometimes propelling us at speeds that feel beyond our control.

We are not the first to problematize the governance of time, and its perpetuation of normalized subjectivities (Foucault, 1984; Marshall, 2007). Jonathan Swift's (1726) Lilliputians considered Gulliver's watch to be his god, an object of worship, to be attended to (Gleick, 1999). In the late 19th century, Warner (1884, cited in Gleick) cautioned: "The chopping of time into rigid periods is an invasion of freedom, and makes no allowances for differences in temperament and feeling" (p. 44). This invasive standardization of people, work, and time is prevalent in the school system where a "modern industrial conception of time is strongly present … where timetabling symbolizes the finite, ordered and scarce nature of 'school time'" (Ball et al., 1984, p. 41, cited in Wien, 1996, p. 398).

Challenging this construction of time, in early learning and care sites, Wien and Kirby-Smith (1998) articulate the connection between "an integrated curriculum, unhurried time, and sustained complex activity" (p. 8) as it appears historically in early childhood. Calling forward the pedagogical thinking of Montessori (1912/1965), Isaacs (1930, 1968), Bredekamp (1987), Katz and Chard (1989), Elkind (1990), Bredekamp and Rosegrant (1992), and Jones and Nimmo (1994), Wien and Kirby-Smith (1998) note that despite this historical line of thought, there exists a lived contradiction between educators' pedagogic values and the linear, lockstepped scheduling that undermines these values. Wien theorizes that the *schedule* and its component parts become taken-for-granted scripts for organizing time. Passed on from one year to the next, ritualistic routines such as calendar time, snack time, outdoor time, and field trips remain embodied and unchallenged (Wien, 1996) because "no one has the time to think consciously about how time undermines what educators value" (Wien & Kirby-Smith, p. 9). When Kirby-Smith invited two educators "to remove the clocks and watches from their classroom" they discovered that

removing the timepiece as the decision-maker allowed them to break open the old scripts and imagine new possibilities (Wien & Kirby-Smith, p. 11).

Cultivating Time in the Curriculum Framework

> We live in a world that is increasingly time-governed, driven by new technologies and demands for increasing productivity. We are saturated with information. We demand and expect instant answers and quick fixes. We do not make time for other things, not least reflection, dialogue, critical thinking, working the tensions between theory and practice. Perhaps one answer to **"What can we do?" is to say that we will struggle against the tyranny of time governance;** we will risk crises by choosing to work with complexity, finding ways to think critically and searching for new questions; by doing so we will open up the possibility of new understandings and practices. (emphasis added, Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 17)

What can we do to struggle against the tyranny of time governance? How did the UNB team collectively story time inside the NBCF (2008) and the *Well-Being* document (Ashton, Hunt, & White, 2008)? Examination of the NBCF reveals that we valued long blocks of time for learning as well as learning over time, particularly in literacies, play, nature, and community. We encouraged a slowing down to allow for and value children's joys and initiatives, spontaneous events, and the cultivation of relationships with children and families. We wrote of the importance of designated reflection, dialogue, and critical thinking time—time to work with complexity. In the document, we asked reflection questions directed to the educators hoping to open new possibilities, for example, "How does your centre's scheduling interfere with time to play and create? Think about flexible scheduling, time allotted to play routines, and adult directed activities" (NBCF, p. 33). We acknowledged that people have their own tempos and rhythms and invited educators "to think about playful conversation during clean-up and snack time routines to make them more relational" (p. 43).

As co-authors of this article, we now see our lived temporal challenges as represented in the language in the NBCF as it both opens possibilities and slides into the language of time as a commodity, a product for the adult to organize and dispense. In the NBCF, we direct and hold educators accountable to take the time, think about time, provide sustained interactive time, schedule time, have the time, provide the time, create the time, organize time, designate reflective time, and schedule time. Using language such as "educators step back to allow time for children to work things out, providing materials and perspectives when necessary" (NBCF, 2008, p. 114), and "be prepared to wait" (p. 79), we risk maintaining the binary of adult and children, with the adult governing the ultimate control of time. Hoffmann (2009) writes, "human time … is in important ways subjective. But it is also, just as importantly, relational and intersubjective" (p. 119). In the NBCF, we neglected to invite adults to value, respect, and reflect on their own and children's subjective, relational, and intersubjective experiences of time. We had inadvertently constructed the educator as an expert portioning out time to the children. In these ways, we enact Edmiston's (2008) critique constructing the educator as provider, privileging children with time and space while leaving the watching, fully

developed adult silent with nothing to learn from and with children. Not our intention at all!

Dahlberg et al.'s (1999) question: What can we do to struggle against the tyranny of time governance? opens the possibility to value subjective, relational, and intersubjective experiences of time. The NBCF has been a "multistoried process" (Olson, 2000, p. 286) documenting curriculum in action among children, families, and communities. As a way to animate this curriculum in action, each of the four goals is detailed with small narratives. One particular narrative that illuminates both the tensions of how children and adults might experience time and a possible response/action comes from Gillian Bateman's teaching practices.

> Noticing that the children are still engaging in dress-up play after Halloween, the educators purchase a variety of costumes on sale. The children play at being princesses, knights, princes, dragons, pirates, and transformers for extended periods of time. Soon children dictate stories and illustrate their own books with their favourite characters. Fairy tales from the library extend the children's explorations of these characters. (UNB Children's Centre, NBCF, 2008, p. 152)

Gillian's sensitivity to children's desire to play and replay Halloween respects how children and adults subjectively experience time inside this cultural event.

Although we continually "work the tensions between theory and practice" in our work, we acknowledge that "educational practice, whether it be authoritarian or democratic, is always directive" (Freire, 2004, p. 66). A permeable, negotiable curriculum is difficult to achieve in a printed format. In spite of our efforts to textualize and affirm curriculum-making as an ongoing and changing encounter among people, environments, materials, and relationships, we are continually reminded how difficult it is to disrupt curriculum as directive in the context of officially mandated processes and products. What form such a document can take continues to be a question for members of the UNB team. How possible is it to disrupt authoritarian directives when creating and implementing an official curriculum in a culture ruled by hierarchical systems of knowledge production? How might continual conversations and a return to the texts challenge and re-author official documents?

Cultivating Time in the Well-Being Support Document

> The practical aspect of theorizing cannot be merely the doing of it. Surely it must include making sense of the doing in a public forum where its application and significance are debated. This presentation is not an easy task. It invites the theorist to step out of the buzzing confusion of daily life in order to see more clearly, only to bring her back into a murky conversation turgid with the pursuits of power. That moment in theory is rarely addressed, but it is public speech and it calls for the arts of rhetoric and persuasion. (Grumet, 2009, p. 223)

As part of the process of curriculum implementation and during the revisions of curriculum documents, the public forums of curriculum workshops, institutes, and site visits contributed to ongoing debate of curriculum-making including the cultivating of time as we co-author curriculum support documents.[1] Curriculum support documents for the NBCF have been, and continue to be, co-authored out of the practices of early childhood educators

and children. These curriculum support documents are intended to be quite different in presentation than the NBCF. They are full-color documents, playfully designed, offering the reader/viewer multiple points of entry on any double-page spread (Moss, 2003). They explicitly depict how educators and children enact the curriculum and deliberately include the work of numerous centres.

As we and other members of the UNB team created and participated in curriculum workshops across the province, we became conscious of repeated narratives that provoked much debate and discussion. These workshop spaces continue to open pre- and post-publication spaces of inquiry where educators "articulated, examined, confirmed and/or transformed their narrative knowledge" (Orr & Olson, 2007, p. 829). Subsequently, we placed two of these narratives on transition times and open snack in the *Well-Being* document. In these discursive spaces, varying theoretical/cultural perspectives of time and its effects on learning, children, and relationships were hotly debated. As Levine (2006) points out, "cultural beliefs are like the air we breathe, so taken for granted that they are rarely discussed or even articulated but provoke volatile reaction when these rules are violated" (p. 123).

Our past school teaching experiences have taught us that inside institutional spaces it is customary for the clock to signal a single start time. This usually means lots of wait time for children who rely on adults to signal transition times. The transitions-times narratives chosen for the *Well-Being* support document model the valuing of children's subjective, relational, and intersubjective experiences of time. Gillian Bateman's and Leigh White's depiction of a morning transition time at the UNB Children's Centre invites 4-year-olds to sign in; collect their name tags; wash their hands; and read notes, surveys, or documentation. This type of meaningful engagement lengthens start-up time (Ashton et al., 2008). Children and families arrive over a 15-20-minute period with family members lingering to share a few relational moments. The institutional standardized clock is loosened as families pace their own arrival and separation times. Similarly, Maria Gillis of Unicorn Children's Centre disrupts the abstraction of schedules by creating a photographic depiction with and for children of the rhythms of their day. These transitions between arrival, play, washing, meals, and outdoor play fit with those transitions of domestic time, times shifts that are more familiar to children (Mace, 1998).

An additional example of challenging the tyranny of clock time involves the implementation of open snack. Inside institutional spaces, time for eating is often clocked, which interferes with children's abilities to listen to their own bodies and make decisions about what, how much, and when to eat. This clocked time typically situates the adult in a surveillance role, hovering above, directing, and cleaning up after children. The option of open-snack time is presented from Angela Thompson's practice at the Sussex Early Learning Centre (Ashton et al., 2008). Through her narrative, she invites educators to listen to the implicit messages in their own practices about food consumption. She challenges educators' taken-for-granted embodiment of clock time that results in the governance of children's participation in food preparation, sharing, and decision-making in relation to eating. Angela's narrative exposes how adults serve and clean up after children, watching children rather than sharing

food practices with them. Loosening the clock's governance opened the space for Gillian, Leigh, Maria, and Angela to work in and respond to children's subjective, relational, and intersubjective experiences of time.

Insights From One Centre — "There was no time to spend time"

> When time compresses and shortens, it strangles pleasure; when it diffuses into aimlessness, the self thins out into affectless torpor. Pleasure exists in middle time, in time that is neither too accelerated nor too slowed down. (Hoffman, 1989, p. 279)

Our relationship with Chatham staff began with the inception of the curriculum initiative in 2005. These educators work with toddlers to after-school children and have taken up the NBCF thoughtfully. Given this staff's openness and generosity, we were able to engage in a semistructured focus group on their problematization of time. Earlier, Linda Gould, the director of this centre had invited these educators to remove clocks and watches for a two-week period. This provocation caused the educators to step back from a way of acting or reacting, to detach from their embodiment of clock time as a problem of thought; to question its meaning, conditions, and goals. By establishing clock time as an object, they reflected on it as a problem to open up new possibilities (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, cited in Marshall, 2007).

To call forward memories of life in the centre before the clock removal, we asked: "Can you remember what life was like in the centre before the removal of the clocks?" As they eloquently told of their work life before these weeks, their voices sped up; hands moved quickly, a sense of urgency was palpable. As listeners, we felt close to panic ourselves. Conditions of their clock-bound work were detailed with multiple examples of moving children through time and space as efficiently and as uniformly as possible—be it snack, the bathroom, and preplanned activities indoors and out—everyone moved at the same time. The efficient movement of children and educators became the overriding priority: the more activities the better for the children, and more also contributed to a perceived successful measure of educators' performance.

Their clock-bound work created stress and in the worse cases, a kind of frenzy: a running to be on time. It is little wonder that we have been continually confronted by the question: Where do I find the time? The tensions beneath this question resonate with Mace's (1998) words, time is "a commodity, to be calculated, bought, sold, wasted, saved, and spent. We speak of it like a possession, so that there is the idea of 'having' time or 'not having' time'" (p. 16). When one educator said, "It was us doing that, but we knew it wasn't us doing that—if you know what I mean" (A. Savoy, personal communication, August 25, 2009), many heads nodded in agreement with this articulation of a split sense of being.

As Chatham stayed on schedule, "activities and the intensity of involvement was led by time allotted on the clock. Activities would stop and start based on the clock, not based on interest or depth of exploration" (L. Gould, personal communication, August 25, 2009). Most of the educators reported that there had been much waiting for snack, lunch, and hand-washing; there was much frustration on the part of the children and stress on the part of the adults. In the face of the reported frustration of their clocked lives, we raised the

question: "What do you think the children were learning when so much attention was being paid to the clock?" Their cacophonous call-out was immediate: "We were teaching the kids to stay on schedule, to be ready for school, to rush through everything." And as one childcare educator sadly lamented. "There was no time to spend time" (J. McGraw, personal communication, August 25, 2009). The educators discovered that they were "programmed and programming. The children were learning how to rush though life. They were learning how 'live their dash! You know—you are born, you dash, and then you die'" (S. Karasek, personal communication, August 25, 2009).

To engage the focus-group discussion beyond the literal removal of the clock and uncover the complexity of their problematization of time, we asked, "What other practices were you engaged in that might have influenced this transition from clock time to relational time?" The clock removal was provocative, but it became apparent that there were accompanying changes in practice that slowed the educators. A focus on the children rather than the clock meant that the educators were letting the children know that they mattered. Educators reported that they slowed down, wrote positive documentation notes, noticed where the learning occurred, and listened to what occupied the children. They reported that they let the children know that they mattered. They sat with the children, relaxed, listened, and recorded their observations: actions that changed their mindset. This image of a listening educator runs counter to modernist notions of good use of time and in particular how silence is valued in teaching practices. "When silence is valued, it ceases to be wasted time. It no longer drags on the clock" (Levine, 2006, p. 42). When educators welcomed children as contributors to both curriculum and community responsibilities, they valued children serving meals, setting tables, cleaning up by stacking chairs, washing tables, sweeping floors, and determining their own bathroom and hunger needs. "And respecting children's participation in community responsibilities takes time and requires the respect of the time it takes to learn communal responsibilities" (A. Savoy, personal communication, August 25, 2009).

Educators narrated specific examples of new actions. "I became more resourceful. I used community members as resources instead of doing my own research on line. For example, when we hatched chickens, I drew in the local farmer and his expertise for weekly visits" (J. McGraw, personal communication, August 25, 2009). This practice calls to mind Levine's (2006) point that "every technical advance seems to be accompanied by a rise in expectations" (p. 1) and anthropologist Harris' observation that "labor saving devices don't save work" (cited in Levine, p. 13). Challenging the governance of technology, this educator turns to community by inviting in a local farmer with whom the children can work weekly. In this way, she expands learning and relational opportunities while recognizing that she does not have to find all the answers or depend on the authority of the digital world.

As their work deepened, these educators reported that they found ways to avoid future thinking: stressing about what comes next, thinking about time, and rushing to get something done in a certain time frame. "We began to use time for what we valued and we began to really think about what we valued instead of planning the whole year in advance like we were 'super' teachers

who planned tight schedules and the whole year in advance" (A. Savoy, personal communication, August 25, 2009). They shifted out of what might be recognized as time-card mentality and began to invest some of their own time (arriving early, using some of their lunch hour, doing things at home). In the excitement of their own learning, they invested in personal cameras and laptop computers and managed their time with support from their team including: brainstorming meetings, sharing their free time, and solving problems together. This sense of reciprocity is one that we as researchers also experienced in our work across child care sites. "Because UNB listened and respected what we were doing, we felt appreciated and this helped us think about what we valued" (L. Comeau, personal communication, August 25, 2009).

Video Text: "It felt like we could take all the time in the world"

> When I first saw Donna put all those prepared ingredients out on the table and saw those two year olds just jump in—dumping and mixing—I thought to myself, this is going to result in chaos. But soon I found myself relaxing and thinking how wonderful it felt. It felt like we could take all the time in the world to finish this activity. (Workshop participant, personal communication, March 2009)

Inside institutional spaces, desire, time, and health regulations clash, governing educators' reluctance to prepare food with young children. In the *Well-Being* document, educator Donna Baisley narrates baking with 2-year-old boys (Ashton et al., 2008). To deepen her understanding of the learning that occurred when she baked with 2-year-olds, Donna invited a colleague to video-tape a cake-making activity. Subsequently, Sherry and Donna presented this documentation to be reviewed, analyzed, and reinterpreted through numerous theoretical lenses in 10 workshops with approximately 300 educators. What began as sharing video documentation led to uncovering how time is a subjective, relational, and intersubjective experience for children, families, and educators.

In the video, Donna invited a group of six 2-year-old boys to bake by placing a tray of premeasured ingredients and a hand-drawn recipe on their table. As soon as the ingredients were laid down, the boys began cracking, pouring, scraping, stirring, mixing, and reading their way through baking a cake. Moments of learning, often simultaneous, included discovering that not all brown liquids are tea, the challenge of pouring butter, the persistence needed to crack an egg, the physical changes in the properties of vanilla, milk, flour, sugar, and eggs as they are combined, and what happens when you drop cake mix from a spoon held high. Moments of fantasy (Paley, 2009) included the children's plan to turn this cake into a "fancy cake" by burying jellybeans in the batter. Moments of friendship (Paley) included two boys approaching Donna for hugs; one boy withholding some jellybeans to share with his friends; and solidarity as they recited their version of *The Little Red Hen*: Who made this cake? Who will bake this cake? And who will eat this cake? Moments of fairness (Paley) included negotiating turn-taking, sharing jellybeans, and chanting the names of each participant and child in the class who would enjoy eating the cake.

This audiovisual rendering and the ensuing conversations enabled a more layered telling where educators could "find and relate to the unpredictable, incorrigible, uncontrollable, unmanageable disobedient aspects that are *also* part of the pedagogical relationship" (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 7) while linking it to their theoretical and practical understandings of a baking episode. Our viewing, interwoven with critical face-to-face dialogue, allowed us to take "seriously enough the conditions of teaching as well as the perspectives" (Craig & Ross, 2008, p. 301) of others. In these workshop settings, time slowed down, became "a time of reflectiveness, of pauses, memory, and interior listening" (Edwards & Rinaldi, 2009, p. 14). Educators recalled their childhood memories of baking with family members. They reflected on how viewing this video challenged their own constructions of time. As one educator stated, "When I first saw Donna put all those prepared ingredients out on the table and saw those 2-year-olds just jump in—dumping and mixing—I thought, to myself, this is going to result in chaos. But soon I found myself relaxing and thinking how wonderful it felt. It felt like we could take all the time in the world to finish this activity." Other educators commented on Donna's ability to respect the time children took when dumping the butter, determining their own stirring time, taking time to reread the recipe, while all the time making time for relational moments: enjoying a hug or a chat. Some educators said that they found the 22-minute video difficult to watch because they could feel their own inner desire to speed up cracking the egg and dumping the butter, thereby disrupting the children's subjective rhythms.

In this dialogic space, recursively over time, we were afforded opportunities to question how clock time contributes to our construction of docile bodies, boys with short attention spans, scientific methods of cooking, binaries of care and education, and developmental milestones. Tensions confronting our subjective experience of time include: the desire to taste; sitting on the table top, sitting on the table top, and sitting on the table top, as three boys test this limit; passing around a warm Pyrex rectangular cake pan to feel; washing hands that touched the egg; rewashing the pan; a child sneezing or coughing over the bowl; children cracking the egg; children putting fingers in the batter, making marks across the table top with a dollop of cake batter; children tempted to taste the raw dough; a brief physical altercation that involved pinching and hollering. These "[subjective], relational concepts—dialogue, conversation, negotiation, encounter, confrontation, and conflict" (Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 58) are difficult to depict in the printed formats of learning stories (Carr, 2001) and official curriculum documents. Reflecting on the documented work of other educators in a public forum, we can find "inspiration to break out of old assumptions and unproductive thought patterns that block our capacity to see the beauty of what is before us in everyday events of teaching and learning" (Moonja Oh, cited in Edwards & Rinaldi, 2009, p. 5).

Disrupting Discourses

Each of the communally produced texts on which we report in this article—the curriculum publications, the focus group, and the video—disrupt at least three interconnected governing discourses. These include: individualism; deficit orientations toward children, educators, and families; and the tyranny of clock time. In this section, we describe these disruptions and how they might open

possibilities for disrupting normalized constructions of children, families, educators, relationships, learning, and curriculum.

Disrupting cultural orientation toward individualism. Levine (2006) names individualism as a contributing factor to living a faster-paced life. The work of the educators suggests that when a space is created for subjective, intersubjective, and relational time, the pace of life slows. Similarly, the narratives included in the curriculum documents deliberately demonstrate how educational practices such as transition times and free-flow snack value the children, families, and educators' subjective and relational living of time. The curriculum documents highlight narratives that value individual contributions with and in community through a network of photographs, narratives, quotes, book lists, children's drawings; and word lists from educators, children, and researchers invite readers to enter the text at multiple points.

As educators in the Chatham Day Care Centre left their clocks behind, they disrupted individualism when they reported a greater willingness to help each other, be generous with their own time, take risks, get to know each other, and share materials. This shift from individualism to community was articulated in the statement "It is our centre instead of our room." The hierarchy was flattened as educators depended on each other for assistance and problem-solving. Donna's courageous sharing of her video disrupted individualism in at least three ways. By bringing her practice in video form to a public forum, she invited and participated in a community response to both her work and the work of the children. As we view Donna's video, our gaze bounces from child to child, child to educator, child to material repeatedly in no given order. We cannot help but encounter these children and their educator as a community. Such an encounter shifts us from an individual gaze to an in/be/tween gaze. We begin to pay attention to how educators, children, and materials encounter each other, influencing and redirecting curricular intents as "their individual contributions are taken up by the group creating a collective culture" (Olsson, 2009, p. 100). It is also important to note that before this public forum, Donna had sought parental permission for use of the video. This individualistic permission process ironically invited families to witness their children's community, and we imagine, created greater community among these families.

The curriculum documents, the focus group, and the video workshop are collaborative texts, disrupting the notion of individual authorship. Even as we struggle to value and respect collective influences that shape our meaning-making, we face the grip of modernist constructions of academic authorship (Peters & Besely, 2007) and the knowledge that many unnamed contributors and contributing events are behind each identified influence in any of these textual interpretations.

Disrupting cultural orientation toward deficit. The NBCF authors, influenced by reconceptualist thought and practice (Cannella, 1997; Dahlberg et al., 1999; Dahlberg & Moss, 2009; Edmiston, 2008), deliberately disrupted a deficit approach to the early learning and care of young children in making these official provincial curriculum documents. For example, rather than focusing on developmental milestones and school readiness as markers of learning, the NBCF takes up a social/pedagogical/cultural approach to children's and educators' knowledge and know-how, one that values children and educators as curious

co-constructors of curriculum. This curriculum work represents a shift from a framework of conformity to a framework of inclusiveness and diversity (Ashton & Whitty, 2007; Goldschmied & Jackson, 1994).

The inclusion of "little narratives" in the curriculum documents, an idea borrowed from the Tasmanian curriculum (Department of Education, Tasmania, 2004), acts to disrupt grand narratives that all too often coalesce to perpetuate pathologies in children and families. The experiences of children and educators told in the little narratives move beyond theory and words into multiple practices that can be debated, tried out, and revised. As possibilities, these narratives interrupt a one-size-fits-all tendency that calls up deficits. The inclusion of narrative work in the NBCF and the *Well-Being* publications provides a space to honor educators and children as producers of knowledge, values, and text: each a cultural production that contributes to local communities. By including images, photographs, and narratives representing children of all ages, the publications try to disrupt learning/time as a linear narrative. Also, the openness of the page design suggests that more is to be co-constructed, while the photographs of New Brunswick children and educators call forward relationships. This local familiarity invites the possibility, "Hey, I could try that."

The public documentations, presentations, and conversations of the Chatham educators, and the educators who viewed Donna's video, reveal their "abandonment of these grand narratives, [which] Lyotard argues leaves the way open for 'little narratives,' forms of local knowledge, which are internal to the communities within which they occur, self-legitimating in that they determine their own criteria of competence, sensitive to difference and tolerant of incommensurability" (Dahlberg et al., 1999, p. 24). By honoring educators' interactions, relationships, and learning with the time it takes to engage fully and foster visibility of their negotiations of time, curriculum, and relationships, these educators reveal how "accountability is being built into the process of curriculum—it's a part of a continuing narrative that has real meaning for children, families" [and educators] (Holt, 2005, n.p.). This investing of time disrupts the notion of a universal developmental path for all children, a discourse that sorts and divides children and their families.

Disrupting cultural orientation toward clock time. As Levine (2006) notes, "A focus on people … is often at odds with a tempo dictated by schedules and the time on the clock" (p. 19). The clock tends to herd whereas a focus on people and community builds relationships. The overlapping broad-based learning goals and values of the NBCF focus on a sense of place, thereby localizing curriculum and relationships in the here and now. Instead of simply learning to stay on schedule, planning for novelty every 15 minutes, rushing to complete predetermined activities, practicing school readiness skills, and conforming to a pre-set curriculum, the NBCF provides examples, suggestions, and questions to encourage educators to value and engage with children's accomplishments, questions, and theories about the world.

Removing the clock, negotiating the governance and control of schedules and regulation check lists, Linda Gould and the educators of the Chatham Day Care created a space to trouble their interactions and reactions to each other, to children, and to the material spaces where they live and work. Having clocks

and removing clocks slides dangerously into a tidy dualism that fails to recognize, value, and understand the complex non-linear layers of influences that collide to enable this kind of individual and collective problematization and meaning-making. It is important to note that "the psychological clock, or the speed with which time is perceived to move, is distorted by a host of psychological factors, each of which may have profound effects on how the pace of life is experienced" (Levine, 2006, p. 28). In other words, the experience of time is highly subjective, making the negotiation of time both a fundamental and complex process. The Chatham educators spoke about the pace of life at the centre slowing down as more meaningful engagement picked up. The viewers of Donna's video also articulated a slowing down of time when they viewed the video and reflected on their subjective sense of time. "It felt like the children could take as long as the job needed to get the cake baked."

Donna's video serves as one example of a series of baking projects that she has undertaken with children. Her change in practice through examination of her ritualistic weekly practice of making play-dough reveals how baking in this case can be intensified and extended across weeks, months, and even years. When an educator such as Donna videotapes herself and shares her learning in multiple public fora, other educators can discuss this documented learning about children. They can experience how children's questions about specific topics shift and branch curriculum in new directions. They can consider how they might examine specific rituals in their own rooms and in engage in longer, slow-time activities that are real and relational.

In Closing

> We believe that "[t]heory is ongoing, contingent and experimental as well as dependent on an interaction with an environment and materials that it does not control … [N]o practice is free of theoretical dependencies" (Williams, 2007, p. 1, cited in Taguchi, 2009, p. 20). We live the conflicting yet transformative power of practice as it confronts, informs and re-forms theory.

How do we invest in processes that productively support curriculum work as an engaging, contingent, unpredictable, intense, collective, and dialogic process. What practices might value educators as initiators of the in-between spaces of theory and practice that enliven local affirmation and experimentation (Olsson, 2009)? How might we further investigate how to listen for and value people's subjective use of time? This article details only a partial and initial telling of these processes and possible practices.

As revealed here, when people are valued more than the clock, more than the scheduled curriculum, our individual and collective desires to understand, be inspired, and be in community are enlivened and affirmed, thereby diminishing the standardization of life in daycares and beyond. Our challenge is "how to be productive enough to be comfortable, to minimize the temporal stress on which this achievement is built, and to simultaneously make time for caring relationships and a civilized society—this is the multi-temporal challenge" (Levine, 2006, p. 223).

Our commitment to curriculum as co-constructed in local relational spaces inspires this work. We desire relational work where encounters with spaces, materials, and thinking can provoke *becomings* that are silently at work, that are

almost imperceptible because "movement always happens behind the thinker's back, or in the moment when he blinks" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, cited in Olsson, 2009, p. xxiv). Although it may be tempting to repeat Linda's experiment, for example, it is not our intention to propose this, but rather to provoke ourselves and possibly you the reader to consider how scheduled time governs and controls in your own relational and learning spaces. What problems, experiments, and interpretations might we find in our own work that would enliven and invigorate our pedagogical co-authorings in order to reimagine ourselves and our worlds (Olson, 2005)?

In narrating these events, we risk removing them from history, context, and relationships that all contribute in both known and unknown ways. According to Rabinow (1994), "Foucault did not want to replace one certitude with another. He wanted instead to cultivate an 'attention to conditions under which things become "evident," ceasing to be objects of non-attention and therefore seemingly fixed, and unchangeable'" (Olsson, 2009, p. xxv). The challenge is how to keep the problem of time alive so that educators may follow the lines of flight that inquiry might take. We find ourselves thinking about how the critical problematization of time in relation to ritualized practices such as show-and-tell might open this ritual to enliven children's, families', researchers', and educators' cultural participations and productions in varied ways. In this work, we suspect that a diversified community, a broadened audience to the work of children, families, researchers, and early childhood educators disrupts busi-y-ness as usual.

Note

1. The NB Curriculum Framework (English) will eventually have eight support documents as part of the curricular repertoire. These include a support document for each of the goals of *Well Being, Play and Playfulness, Communication and Liter aces,* and *Diversity and Social Responsibility.* Four additional documents will focus on *Infants and Toddlers, Young Children—Three and Four, Documentation and Assessment, and First Nations.* http://www.gnb.ca/0017/Promos/0003/pdf/Section4-e.pdf

References

Ashton, E., Hunt, A., & White, L. (2008). *Well-being: Support document.* Fredericton, NB: UNB Early Childhood Centre.

Ashton, E., & Whitty, P. (2007, May). *What counts as public knowledge in early learning and care: Shifting theoretical-textual-visual landscapes.* Paper presented at the Canadian Critical Pedagogy Association, Canadian Society for Studies in Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1987). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Bredekamp, S., & Rosegrant, T. (Eds.). (1992). *Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Burr, R. (2004). Children's rights: International policy and lived practice. In M.J. Kehily (Ed.), *An introduction to childhood studies* (pp. 145-259). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Cannella, G. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education: Social justice and revolution.* New York: Peter Lang.

Carr, M. (2001). *Assessments in early childhood settings: Learning stories.* London: Paul Chapman.

Carr, M., & May, H. (1993). Choosing a model reflecting on the development process of Te Whariki: National childhood curriculum guidelines. *New Zealand International Journal of Early Years Education, 1*(3), 7-21.

Craig, C.J., & Ross, V. (2008). Cultivating the image of teachers as curriculum makers. In M.F. Connelly, M. Fang He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 282-305). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Dahlberg, G., & Moss, P. (2005). *Ethics and politics in early childhood education*. New York: Routledge.

Dahlberg, G., & Moss, P. (2009). Foreword. In L.M. Olsson (Ed.), *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood educations* (pp. xiii-xxvii). New York: Routledge.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1999). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflicts in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Department of Education, Tasmania. (2004). *Framework 1 and 2 overview, essential learnings framework. Key resource to support the essential learnings curriculum*. Hobart, Tasmania: Department of Education. Available: www.ltag.education.tas.gov.au/references.htm#ELresources

Derman-Sparkes, L., & the Anti-Bias Task Force. (1989, 2001). *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Early Childhood Centre, UNB. (2008). *New Brunswick curriculum framework for early learning and child care—English*. Fredericton, NB: Department of Social Development.

Edmiston, B. (2008). *Forming ethical identities in early childhood play*. New York: Routledge.

Edwards, C., & Rinaldi, C. (Eds.). (2009). *The diary of Laura: Perspectives on a Reggio Emilia dairy*. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Elkind, D. (1990). Academic pressures—Too much, too soon: The demise of play. In E. Klugman & S. Smilansky (Eds.), *Children's play and learning: Perspectives on policy implications* (pp. 3-17. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eyre, L. (2007). Whose ethics? Whose interests? The Tri-Council Policy and feminist research. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Summer*, 91-102.

Foucault, M. (1984). Polemics, politics and problematizations. P. Rabinow (Interview) May (1984). In L. Davis (Trans.), (1997), *Ethics of essential works of Foucault* (vol. 1). Available: http://foucault.info/foucault/interview.html

Friendly, M. (2006). *Canadian early learning and childcare and the Convention on the Rights of Children*. Toronto, ON: Childcare Research and Resource Unit, University of Toronto.

Friere, P., & Friere, A.M.A.. (2004). *Pedagogy of hope*. London: Continuum.

Gleick, J. (1999). *Faster: The acceleration of just about everything*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Goldschmied, E., & Jackson, S. (2004). *People under three: Young children in day care* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Grumet, M.R. (2009). Curriculum inquiry, theory and politics. *Curriculum Inquiry, 39*, 221-234.

Hoffman, E. (1989). *Lost in translation*. New York: Penguin.

Hoffman, E. (2009). *Time*. New York: Picador.

Holt, M. (2005). *The nature and purpose of education*. Available: http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/rsl/maurice-holt.html

Isaacs, S. (1930/1968). *Intellectual growth in young children*. New York: Schocken.

Jewett, C., Moss, G., & Cardini, A. (2007). Pace, interactivity and multimodality in teachers' design of texts for interactive white boards in the secondary school classroom. *Learning, Media and Technology, 32*(3), 303-317.

Jones, E., & Nimmo, J. (1994). *Emergent curriculum*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Katz, L., & Chard, S. (1989). *Engaging children's minds: The project approach*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Levine, R. (2006). *A geography of time: The temporal misadventures of a social psychologist, or How every culture keeps time just a little bit differently*. Oxford, UK: Oneworld.

Mace, J. (1998). *Playing with time: Mothers and the meaning of literacy*. London: UCL Press.

MacNaughton, G. (2001). Beyond othering rethinking approaches to teaching young Anglo-Australian children about indigenous children. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 2*(1), 83-93.

MacNaughton, G. (2005). *Doing Foucault in early childhood studies: Applying post-structural ideas*. New York: Routledge.

Marshall, J. (2007). Michel Foucault: Educational research as problematization. In M.A. Peters & T. (A.C.) Besely (Eds.), *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research: Studies in Postmodern theory of education* (pp. 15-26). New York: Peter Lang.

McCready, S. (2001). The triumph of the clockmakers: Counting the minutes and the seconds. In S. McCready (Ed.), *The discovery of time*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Montessori, M. (1912/1965). *The Montessori method*. New York: Schocken.

Moss, G. (2003). Putting the text back into practice: Junior age non-fiction as objects of design. In C. Jewitt & G. Kress (Eds.), *Multimodal literacy* (pp. 73-87). New York: Peter Lang.

Olson, M. (2000). Curriculum as a multistoried process. *Canadian Journal of Education, 25*(3), 119-125.

Olsson, L.M. (2009). *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood educations*. New York: Routledge.

Orr, A.M., & Olson, M. (2007). Transforming narrative encounters. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*(3), 819-838.

Paley, V. (2009, March). *Valuing children's stories and play.* Seminar held at the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton.

Penn, H. (2005). *Unequal childhoods: Young children's lives in poor countries*. New York: Routledge.

Peters, M.A., & Besely, T. (A.C.). (2007). (Eds.). *Why Foucault? New directions in educational research: Studies in postmodern theory of education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Ramsey, P. (2004). *Teaching and learning in a diverse world: Multicultural education for young children*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rifkin, J. (1987). *Time wars: The primary conflict in human history*. New York: H. Holt.

Rinaldi, C. (2006). *In dialogue with Reggio Emilia: Listening, researching and learning*. New York: Routledge.

Schwab, J. (1969) The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review, 78*, 1-23.

Schwab, J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *School Review, 81*(4), 501-522.

Schwab, J. (1978). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*(4), 493-542.

Taguchi, H.L. (2007). Deconstructing and transgressing the theory-practice dichotomy in early childhood education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 39*(3), 275-290.

Taguchi, H.L. (2009). *Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early childhood education: Introducing an intra active pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Wien, C.A. (1996). Time, work, and developmentally appropriate practice. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 11*, 377-403.

Wien, C.A. (2004). *From policing to participation: Overturning the rules and creating amiable classrooms*. National Association for the Education of Young Children. Available: http://www.fcs.utah.edu/info/cfdc/5170/PolicingToParticipation.pdf

Wien, C.A., & Kirby-Smith, S. (1998). Untiming the curriculum: A case study of removing clocks from the program. *Young Children, September*, 8-13.