Journal of Childhoods and Pedagogies
School of Education and Childhood Studies
Vol. 1, No. 1, 2016

Can You Tell Me That Story Again? The Need for a Counter Story of the Teacher-Child Relationship

Claudia Diaz-Diaz

University of British Columbia, Canada
E-mail: claudiadiaz.rss@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the pedagogical relationship as conveyed by a particular body of literature: the teacher-child relationship in the early years, particularly in early childhood education (ECE) settings (from preschool to elementary classrooms with children up to 8 years old). I critique this body of literature by asking two simple questions: What is the role of children and teachers in informing this body of research? and how does this body of literature refer to the role of children and teachers in the enhancement of positive relationships? I draw on the concept of performativity used by Stephen Ball (2003) to develop this analysis of a review of the teacher-child relationship literature that includes studies published from 1992 to 2015 mostly, but not solely, in North American journals. I analyze how this body of literature works as a vehicle of dominant discourses in which I highlight mainly two narratives: the child as voiceless and the teacher as a hero. This paper argues that the study of the teacher-child relationship in ECE research reinforces the discourse of performativity embedded in a neoliberal governance model and reforms not only teachers' practices but also their identities. A critical examination of the research literature encourages researchers and teachers to interrupt narratives that promote a superficial engagement between educators and young children and that overlook important considerations regarding the role of the wider socio-political context of schools in children and teachers' lives. The purpose of this paper is twofold: 1) to contribute to the debate on the role of academia in reinforcing or contesting dominant discourses in educational policy and teaching practices in ECE by 2) initiating a dialogue on why a counter-story of the relationship between teachers and children is needed.

Keywords: *teacher-child relationship, early childhood education, pre-service and in-service early childhood teacher education, performativity.*

In the last two decades, early childhood education (ECE) has become a policy priority, receiving increasing attention from governments, international organizations, and academia. The provision of high-quality ECE is expected to close the achievement gap that affects children living in contexts of poverty. For instance, in the US context, policies such as *No Child Left Behind* or the *Head Start* program target children living in contexts of poverty and aim to improve their opportunities for healthy child development. The role of early childhood (EC) teachers in establishing positive relationships[1] with young

[1] A positive relationship is an extremely broad and overused concept to refer to generally nurturing, caring, and respectful, and stimulating relationships. It is not the purpose or the scope of this paper to expand a definition of a positive relationship because its definition varies from place to place, time to time, person to

ISSN: 2368-948X

children, affected by disadvantaged contexts, has been central in pre-service and in-service ECE teacher education. In a nutshell, the teacher-child relationship literature asserts that close and supportive relationships between EC educators and young children lay the groundwork for children's future school success through a healthier cognitive development and balanced socio-emotional life (Birch & Ladd, 1997; Mortensen & Barnett, 2015; O'Connor & McCartney, 2007; Pianta, Mashburn, Downer, Hamre, & Justice, 2008).

The role of EC teachers in closing young children's achievement gap has been strongly emphasized by dominant discourses that appeal for greater accountability, increased regulation, and efficiency in ECE practices (Osgood, 2006). A number of ECE critical scholars have drawn attention to the adverse consequences on educators and their practices that may result from control and assessment of teaching outcomes approaches to ECE systems (Burnard & White, 2008; Dahlberg and Moss, 2004; Murray, 2012; Osgood, 2006). As has been the case for EC educators in the UK, policies for "improving teaching practices" have had potentially harmful effects on teaching, learning, and ultimately, teachers' confidence in their professionalism (Osgood, 2006). A number of scholars argue that the language of "achievement gap" and "at risk children" overlooks class, gender, and racial patterns in ECE practices that label, prescribe, and exclude children and their families from the ideal model of the child and family (Swadener, 2000). In this rhetoric, the implicit argument is that the cause of the achievement gap resides in the "at-risk" child and thus the solution for it is a child-centered intervention. This line of argument takes one symptom of inequality, the achievement gap, and turns it into an entire child-centered intervention, as has been the case in the US of *No Child Left Behind* (Hursh, 2007) and *Head Start* (Ellsworth & Ames, 1998). The language of the "achievement gap" and "at-risk children" then justifies the implementation of a standardized assessment system to evaluate teachers' practices as means to assure the efficiency of child-centered interventions.

The discussion that Ball (2000, 2001, 2003) brings into the academic debate through his paper trilogy devoted to market, management and performativity in the UK educational reform is relevant to ECE. Through his trilogy, Ball (2000, 2001, 2003) discusses how the values, principles, and procedures of the private system have been introduced in the public educational system as a mechanism to improve its efficiency and increase educational outcomes. The UK educational reform put in place goals, targets, and procedures with the intention that teachers control themselves under the predicaments of the new managerial-educational system through practices that are measurable and replicable for the expected results. The reform discourse, full of contradictions, exposes a discourse that promises a devolved authority and more flexibility to educators. However, Ball (2003) demonstrates that the reform discourse, far from fulfilling the promise of deregulation of the UK educational system is, indeed, re-regulating teachers' practices and identities in a new way. This neoliberal[2] governance model is at stake when Ball (2003) exposes "the terrors of performativity and teachers' souls".

Ball (2003) defines performativity as:

A technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition, and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual

person, and thus a universal definition is not possible. Nel Noddings's ethics of care has been widely used in education to define what is a positive relationship between teachers and students. Broadly, I use positive relationship in this paper generally to refer to those relationships that provide the foundations for a sense of belonging to a school community, meaningful children's learning experiences, and collaborative relationships among children, teachers, and families. My assumption is that positive relationship can lay the groundwork for more ethical and democratic ECE practices.

[2] I use 'neoliberal' as used by Penn (2011) to refer those policies based on a politic and economic model that favors free trade, privatization, minimal government intervention in business, and reduction in government spending.

subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. The issue of who controls the field of judgement is crucial (p. 216).

A number of scholars have critically examined the discourse of performativity and its impact on teachers' pedagogical practice and the education system as a whole (Ball, 2003; Burnard & White, 2008; Murray, 2012; Osgood, 2006) through the creation of new standards of excellence for teachers. A rigorous system of targets, indicators, and assessment has arisen to assess teachers' knowledge and practices, changing how teacher education is conceived (Murray, 2012), how teachers' practices are evaluated (Ball, 2003), and how professionalism is defined (Osgood, 2006). These standards of excellence affect pedagogical practices and curriculum in such a way that what counts in education needs to be measurable, leaving out those teaching practices for social and emotional development with no immediate means of verification or assessment (Ball, 2012). In response to a discourse of performativity and an increased control over teachers' practices and education, Osgood (2006) urgently calls for counter-narratives that problematize the imperatives for control and regulation over the process of collaborative and critical reflection among EC teachers. A counter-narrative might lay the groundwork for more ethical and democratic ECE practices (Dahlberg & Moss, 2006). Following Ball's (2003) argument, I argue in this paper, that the study of the teacher-child relationship in ECE research reinforces the discourse of performativity embedded in a neoliberal governance model and reforms teachers' practices and ultimately their identities.

The intensity of the EC teacher and child performance testing requirements in the early years in Canada is not comparable with the testing requirements in the US context as they are much higher in the US. However, it is important to note that some childcare advocates are concerned about an increasing marketization of childcare in Canada (Beach & Ferns, 2015). Pacini-Ketchabaw and Pence (2005) argue that US ECE scholarship has had a significant influence on Canadian ECE. However, ideas that aim to problematize these dominant discourses and reconceptualize the purpose, curriculum, and practices of ECE are growing in Canada. My paper seeks to contribute to this growing debate in the field of ECE by problematizing dominant and academic discourses on the teacher-child relationship that appeal to more control over teachers' practices in the context of neoliberal educational policies.

Contextualizing the Critique: Background and Research Method

For eight years, I worked as a Community Psychologist and social manager of socio-educational programs in inner-city public schools in Chile. In many of the conversations I had with children, their families, and their teachers, the social relationships embedded in those school communities were highlighted as having a significant impact on children's learning and their social and emotional lives. My ongoing inquiry focused on the existing elements of a school community that could be a fertile terrain to support children in achieving more meaningful, lasting, and useful learning. This professional experience was critical in developing my sense that this relationship has to be carefully considered and researched.

In researching the teacher-child relationship and its influence in children's lives, I encountered an extensive body of literature concerning the relationship between educators and children and its connections with young children's learning. The study of the teacher-child relationship has been defined as a field of inquiry (Hughes, 2012) with strong empirical support to show the effects that a close relationship between teachers and students has on children's behaviours and academic achievement. However, this body of research did not provide me with the answers that I was striving to find: the role of relationships between children and adults in early childhood settings and how the teacher-child relationship can contribute to promote more inclusive school communities. I found,

ISSN: 2368-948X

instead, a prolific body of postpositivist[3] literature, mainly from the discipline of developmental psychology, with a focus on measuring the quality of teacher-child relationship through testing. This body of research claims that testing the quality of the teacher-child relationship can contribute to a better understanding of the underlining patterns of this relationship. With this knowledge, researchers, practitioners, and policymakers can enhance the teacher-child relationship through appropriate interventions aiming to improve teacher education and strengthen professional development (Amini, Masyn, Thomson, Conners-Burrow, & Whiteside Mansell, 2013; Mortensen & Barnett, 2015; Zan & Donegan-Ritter, 2014).

For this critique, I conducted an extensive ERIC and Google Scholar search with the following search criteria: "teacher-child relationship," "children's learning," "children's perspectives." I obtained more than 65 results from the combination of teacher-child relationship and children's perspectives. First, I included all the studies developed with children ages 3-8 years old in ECE, kindergarten, and primary classrooms. Then I looked for studies that included young children's reports of their relationships with their teachers. Due to the limited amount of studies about teacher-child relationships from children's perspectives, I included those studies that, although they did not primarily focus on the teacher-child relationship, they did refer to teacher-child relationships from young children's perspectives. For example, I included a couple of studies about 'learned-centered practices' because they provided relevant information about how children perceive their relationships with their teachers based on their teaching practices. Those studies that measured solely children's emotional development, or academic outcomes, instead of their perceptions, opinions, and ideas about teacher-child relationship, were not considered in this review. The selected sources were published in English between 1992 and 2015, and most of the research was developed in North American contexts (The United States and Canada). A few of these studies were developed in Nordic-European and Australian contexts.

Theoretical Underpinnings: Developmental System Model and Attachment Theory in the Teacher-Child Relationship

The academic discourse plays a role in both reinforcing and contesting the discourse of performativity. Harris, Carney, and Fine (2001) argue that the Academy is a telling example of a terrain where dominant and counter stories are in permanent development and contestation: "[t]he academy is no less committed to dominant scripts than the larger culture" (Harris et al., 2001, p. 15). Following this argument, bodies of research literature contain dominant and counter stories and as such they can be examined to assess whether their narratives reinforce or contest dominant discourses. In this paper, I analyze the study of the teacher-child relationship to make explicit how the literature reinforces dominant discourses that favour both the standardization and assessment of teaching practices and the persistence of overlooking children's perspectives in research. This body of literature can indeed influence how pre-service and in-service educators conceptualize and embody their relationships with their students, how they implement their curricular and pedagogical practices, and how they perceive their professionalism. I argue that some of the knowledge offered by the study of the teacher-child relationship,

[3] Postpositivism has been defined as the reformation of positivism as the result of the acknowledgment that the reality cannot be apprehended completely because of the researchers' bias (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In other words, postpositivism accepts that researcher's theories, background, knowledge, and values influence what is observed. However, postpositivism does not question the existence of an objective truth, a scientific method to access to the reality, and an experimental methodology.

unfortunately, reinforces discourses of performativity by providing a rationale for increasing attention on primarily EC teachers' standardized assessment.

The study of the relationship between young children and teachers draws on two main conceptual frameworks: the developmental system model and attachment theory. The developmental system model, also referred to as the contextual system model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Guralnick, 2011), provides an approach that explains the multiple influences on the teacher-child relationship. These influences include, for instance, the parent-child relationship (e.g. Chung, Marvin, & Churchill, 2005; O'Connor & McCartney, 2007) or the child's characteristics (e.g. Birch & Ladd, 1998; Coplan & Prakash, 2003; Koles, O'Connor, & McCartney, 2006). For example, some studies have researched how the mother's level of education affects her child's socio-emotional and cognitive development (Goelman, Forer, Kershaw, Doherty, Lero & LaGrange, 2006; Peisner-Feinberg, Burchinal, Clifford, Culkin, Howes, Kagan, & Yazejian, 2001), or how the child's characteristics affect the teacher-child relationship (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Coplan & Prakash, 2003).

Research on teacher-child relationships also draws from attachment theory (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1965; Bowlby, 1977) to better understand the functions and mechanisms of teacher-child relationships (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Mashburn, Pianta, Hamre, Downer, Barbarin, Bryant & Burchinal, 2008; Vu & Howes, 2012). According to attachment theory, children and adults alike established social relationships based on their early experiences of proximity with their significant adults. Significant adults, such as parents and teachers, can support children to regulate their emotions in stressful situations, helping them, in the long-term, to build a safe foundation for multiple social relationships. According to Pianta (1999), children who become "securely attached" to their teachers most likely have better interpersonal relationships with peers, as well as with other teachers throughout their school trajectory, and they are also more liable to show interest in learning.

Both the developmental system model and attachment theory focus on the child and her/his development to argue what the best conditions are that parents and teachers need to provide to children for future academic results and healthier social-emotional development. For instance, Pianta and colleges (1997) examined the relation between measures of child-mother and child-teacher relationships and whether these measures predict early school outcomes. Similarly, O'Connor and McCartney (2006) studied the relationships between children with their mothers and their teachers to know whether the quality of children-mother attachment predict children's relationship with their teachers. Imbued with a postpositivist paradigm, the word "predict" shows the aspiration of predicting children's future trajectories in school by measuring the quality of these child-adult relationships. Absent from these theoretical frameworks is the consideration of how the wider socio-political and historical contexts where children live and grow are involved in the production of social and educational inequalities. As Harry, Carney, and Fine (2001) remind us, the Academy can reinforce discourses that promote the assessment and the over-control of teaching practices, and that overlook the absence of children's perspectives in research.

The Child as Voiceless

The word "relationship" defined as the way in which one person relates to another, presupposes two essential conditions: first, at least two people are involved, and second, a connection between them exists. Indeed, the study of the teacher-child relationship focuses on two individuals, the teacher and the child, and their interaction. However, one aspect that drew my attention in this body of literature was the absence of young children's perspectives on their relationship with their teachers. Most research on teacher-child relationships in ECE settings is primarily informed by adults' perspectives, either by teachers' perceptions of their relationships with their students or by researchers' observations of classroom dynamics or dyadic relationships. Although the Convention of

ISSN: 2368-948X

the Rights of the Child's (1989) acknowledgement of children as competent social actors has provided substantive rationale to incorporate children's perspectives in research on matters that affect them, the study of the teacher-child relationship has not yet done so (Cannella, 1997; Clark, 2005; Davies, 1984; Einarsdóttir, 2007; Harcourt & Einarsdottir, 2011; Rhedding-Jones, Bae, & Winger, 2008; Soto & Swadener, 2005).

Mantzicopoulos (2005) relates the lack of young children's perspectives in the literature to researchers' concerns about the validity of young children's self-reporting. Young children are considered to display limited verbal expression and comprehension skills, which might influence the reliability of young children's responses (Mantzicopoulos, 2005). Hughes (2011) argues that the concern of researchers for the reliability of young children's perspectives is grounded in the notion that young children are unable to report "objectively" on their social relationships. Hughes (2011) explains that "the self-concepts of children younger than eight years of age tend to be more global, or unidimensional, and reflect a positive rating bias than more objective indexes" (p. 40). In contrast to young children, older children can report more objectively on their social relationships because of their ability to use social comparison in their judgments (Hughes, 2011).

Although young children have the right to be listened to and heard and are willing to express their views on school, researchers rarely consider their perspectives in research. Perry and Weinstein (1998) long ago argued that this gap may be related to the lack of developmentally appropriate research methods to access young children's perceptions on their relationships with their teachers. Due to this gap, researchers have stressed the need for designing age-appropriate research methods that meet the criteria of validity and reliability within a post-positivist paradigm while also providing access to young children's perspectives on their relationships with their teachers (Ladd & Burgess, 2001; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; Spilt, Koomen, & Mantzicopoulos, 2010).

Most measures used to access young children's perspectives on their relationships with their teachers have been a replication of tools for assessing teachers' perceptions of their relationships with their students. Children's responses to these measures are classified in the categories proposed initially by Pianta (2001): closeness, dependency, and conflict, which allow researchers to compare teachers' and children's responses. For instance, Mantzicopoulos and Neuharth-Pritchett (2003) drew on closeness, dependency, and conflict to design the Young Children Appraisal Support (Y-CATS). Similarly, the Kindergartner-Teacher Interaction Computer Test (KLIC) – a 10-minute, computer-based tool – measures children's perceptions of their relationships with their teachers based on the same three main categories (Spilt, et. al., 2010). Although these instruments seek to compare children's and their teachers' perceptions of the quality of their relationships based on these three dimensions, what young children may think outside of these categories has been overlooked to date by this body of research.

A number of researchers in the field of ECE advocate for acknowledging young children's views (Cannella, 1997; Clark, 2005; Davies, 1984; Einarsdóttir, 2007; Harcourt & Einarsdottir, 2011; Rhedding-Jones, Bae, & Winger, 2008; Soto & Swadener, 2005). These scholars claim that young children are competent and knowledgeable to speak about their interests, and to express their ideas and opinions. Children socially construct meaning and knowledge and thus children's perspectives on their relationships with their educators deserve attention. The question is then how do researchers create innovative research methodological tools to query children about their perspectives? Although some researchers (e.g. Harrison, Clarke, & Ungerer, 2007) are working to include children's perspectives in the study of the teacher-child relationship, children's perspectives are still underrepresented in this body of literature reinforcing the image of young children as voiceless. As a consequence, the EC teacher still remains as the main, if not the only responsible adult in ECE settings, in assuring positive relationships with children. In the following section, I argue that understanding the "teacher as a hero" reinforces the discourse of performativity in favour of more control and regulation of curricular and

pedagogical practices. Consequently, framing “the teacher as a hero” draws attention away from the influence of other stakeholders in ECE institutions, such as policy makers and administrators, on the teacher-child relationship.

The Teacher as a Hero

In the teacher-child relationship literature, the teacher is portrayed as primarily responsible, and even as important as parents in promoting a caring, nurturing, and respectful relationship with children (Howes & Hamilton, 1992; O'Connor & McCartney, 2006; Pianta, Nimetz, & Bennett, 1997). Based on attachment theory, a number of researchers have compared the teacher-child relationship with the parent-child relationship (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Mashburn et al., 2008; Vu & Howes, 2012), grounded on the premise that "young children also form relationships with their teachers that share features of child-parent attachment relationships" (Mantzicopoulos, 2005, p. 116). For instance, Peisner-Feinberg and colleagues (2001) concluded that the teacher-child relationship tends "to be a similar or stronger predictor of children's behavioural and social skills in the classroom compared with maternal education" (p. 1550).

It is not new that adults may act as positive models for children's social relationships with other children and adults. However, the teacher-child relationship literature not only states that this relationship influences children's social-emotional development, but also emphasizes the influence of this relationship on children's school outcomes, especially when children are younger and when they come from disadvantaged backgrounds (e.g., poverty, exposure to violence, discrimination, socio-cultural minorities) (Goelman et al., 2006; Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Pianta, 1999). Research conducted in ECE settings investigates the associations between adults' perspectives (teachers' perceptions and/or researchers' observations of the teacher-child relationship) and children's academic performance (children's grades or socio-emotional test results) to show that the relationship between educators and young children is a crucial predictor of later academic success and school adjustment (Alfaro & Rex, 2008; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Hamre, 2005; McCombs et al., 2008; Palermo, Hanish, Martin, Fabes, & Reiser, 2007; Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Perry & Weinstein, 1998; Tsai & Cheney, 2011).

The assessment of the quality of the teacher-child relationship based on the dimensions of closeness, dependency, and conflict is given a privileged position in relation to other ways of studying the relationship between educators and young children. An exclusive attention to assessment might draw attention away from a more comprehensive account that acknowledges cross-cultural differences in the definition of a positive adult-child relationship. For instance, to study the different meanings and experiences of close teacher-child relationships across cultural contexts could potentially provide valuable insights in how to enhance this relationship. Or examining the process by which ECE communities build relationships among educators, children, families, and staff may offer insights to understanding in context the quality of the teacher-child relationships beyond the three categories of close, dependent, and conflictive relationships. Moreover, the importance given to the correlation between the quality of the teacher-child relationship and children's future school attainment draws the attention to the teacher's capacity and distracts attention from how the school context supports (or not) teachers in enhancing positive relationships with their students. Drawing on the study of the teacher-child relationship, Hughes (2012) provided three recommendations for pre-service and in-service educators: 1) to instruct teachers to create a positive social and emotional climate for learning; 2) to assess the teacher-child relationship as a standard component for the identification of students "at risk" for social and academic difficulties; and 3) to measure teachers' performance in their relationships with students. As part of her recommendations, Hughes (2012) succinctly stated: "what gets inspected, gets expected" (Hughes, 2012, p. 325) which reveals the widely accepted assumption that teachers' practices must be "inspected" by standardized assessment. The study of the teacher-child relationship validates teachers' evaluation as a strategy to improve teaching practices and

ISSN: 2368-948X

their relationships with children. This example illustrates how performativity can change "what academic work and learning are!" (Ball, 2003, p. 226), by reinforcing current dominant discourses about assessment in education (Murray, 2012; Osgood, 2006).

The emphasis on training and assessment shows a paradox (Osgood, 2006) in the performativity discourse. On one hand, teachers are seen as central agents of change in the classroom (Sabol & Pianta, 2012, p. 222), but on the other hand, they are passively involved in that change mostly as recipients of training, coaching, and assessment. Osgood (2006) has argued, "that as a consequence of policy reform, teachers have experienced an intensification of workload with an emphasis on technical competence and performativity" (p. 188) preventing teachers to practice their autonomy and creativity. Also, Murray (2012) points to the fact that performativity discourses overlook much of teacher education work related to teaching and partnership practices and modes of engagement in scholarship and research. Teaching practices that show autonomy, creativity, and somehow engage with the production of knowledge, are not apprehendable by assessment. The discourse of the teacher as a hero is intimately entangled with neoliberal governance that frames education as outcomes, teachers as means, and children as mere reservoirs. Following this line of argument, what ultimately matters is children's educational outcomes, and thus, inspecting teachers' performance is an acceptable method to achieve those expected results.

One of the greatest absences in the study of the teacher-child relationship has been the study of the role of the school's social context and the involvement of the school community in supporting the teacher-child relationship. While teachers are compelled to overcome children's maladjustment and school failure by establishing positive relationships with their students, the literature has not emphasized enough the causes of school failure that reside beyond schools or ECE. Some scholars might argue that, since the focus on the teacher-child relationship is not the school's social context, this body of literature does not have to study social factors implicated in children's school failure. Nonetheless, I argue that the acknowledgement of social factors that influence the quality of this adult-child relationship is key to support it.

Conclusion: A New Story Needs to be Told

Through a critical examination of the study of the teacher-child relationship in ECE settings, I demonstrated how this body of literature acts as a vehicle of dominant discourses through two implicit narratives: the child as voiceless and the teacher as a hero. To promote the enhancement of the relationships between children and educators, the study of the teacher-child relationship has relied heavily on evidence-based research that measures the teacher-child relationship through mainly adults' perspectives, excluding children's perspectives on this important relationship during their early years of care and education. In this body of literature, the language used to report research findings, as is the case for much of the micro-level research carried out in the field of developmental psychology, is highly technical and does not capture teachers' and children's everyday social contexts of living where their relationships are embedded. The language used to report research may be misleading and thus requires willing ECE and Kindergarten teacher education instructors and analytical students to translate research into meaningful knowledge for practice.

Some of the questions that prompted this analysis of the literature include: Who/what informs this body of literature? Which findings are considered relevant and which are overlooked? What is the role of EC teachers in enhancing their relationships with children? What is the role of the ECE community in building meaningful relationships with children? These questions, along with many others, may also be useful for an analysis of other implicit narratives in research. Discussing these two narratives (i.e. the teacher as a hero and the child as voiceless), I outlined some tensions that appear

in viewing the child as passive and the teacher as strongly regulated by assessment. These tensions call for a counter-story about the relationships between teachers and young children: a story that acknowledges children's perspectives on their relationships and learning in ECE settings and a story that contests “the terror of performativity on the teacher’s soul” (Ball, 2003).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Deirdre Kelly, Dr. Mona Gleason, Emma Chartrand and Patricia Silva for their critical and insightful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

ISSN: 2368-948X

References

Ainsworth, M., & Bowlby, J. (1965). *Child care and the growth of love*. London: Penguin Books.

Alfaro, R., & Rex, L. (2008). Influences of teacher–child social interactions on English language development in a Head Start classroom. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *36*, 187–193. doi:10.1007/s10643-008-0267-y

Amini, E., Masyn, K., Thomson, R., Conners-Burrow, N., & Whiteside Mansell, L. (2013). Early childhood mental health consultation: Promoting change in the quality of teacher-child interactions. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *34*(2), 156–172. doi:10.1002/imhj.

Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards the performative society. *Australian Educational Researcher, 17*(3), 1-24.

Ball, S. J. (2001). Grandes politicas, un mundo pequeño: Introducción a una perspectiva internacional en las políticas educativas. In M. Andrada, M. Narodowski & M. Nores (Eds.), *Nuevas tendencias en politicas educativas: Alternativas para la escuela pública* (pp. 103-128). Buenos Aires: Granica.

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, *18*(2), 215–228. doi:10.1080/0268093022000043065

Birch, S., & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, *35*(1), 61–79. doi:10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00029-5

Birch, S., & Ladd, G. (1998). Children's interpersonal behaviors and the teacher-child relationship. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*(5), 934–946. doi:10.1037//0012-1649.34.5.934

Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. I. Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. An expanded version of the Fiftieth Maudsley Lecture, delivered before the Royal College of Psychiatrists, 19 November 1976. *The British Journal of Psychiatry: The Journal of Mental Science*, *130*(3), 201–210. doi:10.1192/bjp.130.3.201

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed.) (pp. 535–584). New York: Wiley.

Burnard, P., & White, J. (2008). Creativity and performativity: Counterpoints in British and Australian education. *British Educational Research Journal*, *34*(5), 667–682. doi:10.1080/01411920802224238

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

Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989). Retrieved from http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/ b/k2crc.htm

Chung, L.-C., Marvin, C., & Churchill, S. (2005). Teacher factors associated with preschool teacher-child relationships: Teaching efficacy and parent-teacher relationships. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *25*(2), 131–142. doi:10.1080/1090102050250206

Clark, A. (2005). Listening to and involving young children: A review of research and practice. *Early Child Development and Care*, *175*(6), 489–505. doi:10.1080/03004430500131288

Coplan, R., & Prakash, K. (2003). Spending time with teacher: Characteristics of preschoolers who frequently elicit versus initiate interactions with teachers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *18*(1), 143–158. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(03)00009-7

Dahlberg, G. & Moss, P. (2004). *Ethics and politics in early childhood education.* New York: Routledge Falmer. doi:10.4324/9780203463529 (Taylor & Francis eBooks)

Davies, B. (1984). Children through their own eyes. *Oxford Review of Education*, *10*(3), 275–292. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0305498840100305

Einarsdóttir, J. (2007). Research with children: Methodological and ethical challenges. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *15*(2), 197–211. doi:10.1080/13502930701321477

Ellsworth, J & Ames, L. (Eds.) (1998). *Critical perspectives on project Head Start: Revisioning the hope and challenge*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Goelman, H., Forer, B., Kershaw, P., Doherty, G., Lero, D., & LaGrange, A. (2006). Towards a predictive model of quality in Canadian child care centers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *21*(3), 280–295. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2006.07.005

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Guralnick, M. J. (2011). A System Perspective. *Infants & Young Children*, *24*(1), 6–28.

Hamre, B. (2005). Can instructional and emotional support in the first-grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? *Child Development*, *76*(5), 949–67. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00889.x

ISSN: 2368-948X

Harcourt, D., & Einarsdottir, J. (2011). Introducing children's perspectives and participation in research. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *19*(3), 301–307.

Harris, A., Carney, S., & Fine, M. (2001). Counter work: Introduction to "uncover the covers: theorising the politics of counter stories." *International Journal of Critical Psychology*, 6–18.

Harrison, L. J., Clarke, L., & Ungerer, J. A. (2007). Children's drawings provide a new perspective on teacher–child relationship quality and school adjustment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *22*(1), 55–71. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2006.10.003

Howes, C., & Hamilton, C. E. (1992). Children's relationships with caregivers: Mothers and child care teachers. *Child Development*, *63*, 859–866.

Hughes, J. N. (2011). Longitudinal effects of teacher and student perceptions of teacher-student relationship qualities on academic adjustment. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(1), 38–60.

Hughes, J. N. (2012). Teacher – student relationships and school adjustment: Progress and remaining challenges. *Attachment & Human Development, 14*(3), 319–327. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2012.672288

Hursh, D. (2007). Exacerbating inequality: The failed promise of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Race, Ethnicity & Education 10*(3), 295-308.

Koles, B., O'Connor, E., & McCartney, K. (2009). Teacher–Child relationships in prekindergarten: The influences of child and teacher characteristics. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *30*(1), 3–21. doi:10.1080/10901020802667672

Ladd, G. W., & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development*, *72*(5), 1579–601. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11699688

McCombs, B. L., Daniels, D. H., & Perry, K. E. (2008). Children's and teachers' perceptions of learner-centered practices, and student motivation: Implications for early schooling. *The Elementary School Journal*, *109*(1), 16–35.

Mantzicopoulos, P., & Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2003). Development and validation of a measure to assess Head Start children's appraisals of teacher support. *Journal of School Psychology*, *41*(6), 431–451. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2003.08.002

Mantzicopoulos, P. (2005). Conflictual relationships between kindergarten children and their teachers: Associations with child and classroom context variables. *Journal of School Psychology*, *43*(5), 425–442. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.09.004

Mashburn, A. J., Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., Downer, J. T., Barbarin, O. A., Bryant, D., & Burchinal, M. (2008). Measures of classroom quality in prekindergarten and children's development of academic, language, and social skills. *Child Development*, *79*(3), 732–749. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01154.x

Mortensen, J. A, & Barnett, M. (2015). Early education and development teacher – child interactions in infant/toddler child care and socioemotional development. *Early Education & Development*, *26*, 209–229. doi:10.1080/10409289.2015.985878

Murray, J. (2012). Performativity cultures and their effects on teacher educators' work. *Research in Teacher Education*, *2*(2), 19–23.

O'Connor, E., & McCartney, K. (2006). Testing associations between young children's relationships with mothers and teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *98*(1), 87–98. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.87

O'Connor, E., & Mccartney, K. (2007). Examining teacher-child relationships and achievement as part of an ecological model of development. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*(2), 340–369. doi:10.3102/0002831207302172

Osgood, J. (2006). Professionalism and performativity: The feminist challenge facing early years practitioners. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, *26*(2), 187–199. doi:10.1080/09575140600759997

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. & Pence, A. (2005). Contextualizing the reconceptualist movement in Canadian early childhood education. In V. Pacini-Ketchabaw & A. Pence (Eds.), *Research connections Canada: Supporting Children and Families,* (pp. 5-20). Ottawa: Canadian Child Care Federation.

Palermo, F., Hanish, L. D., Martin, C. L., Fabes, R. A., & Reiser, M. (2007). Preschoolers' academic readiness: What role does the teacher–child relationship play? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *22*(4), 407–422. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.04.002

Peisner-Feinberg, E. S., Burchinal, M. R., Clifford, R. M., Culkin, M. L., Howes, C., Kagan, S. L., & Yazejian, N. (2001). The relation of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development*, *72*(5), 1534–1553. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00364

Penn, H. (2011). Policy rationales for early childhood services. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, *5*(1), 1–16.

Perry, K. E., & Weinstein, R. S. (1998). The social context of early schooling and children's school adjustment: The social context of early schooling and children's school adjustment. *Educational Psychologist*, *33*(4), 177–194. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3304_3

ISSN: 2368-948X

Pianta, R. C., Nimetz, S. L., & Bennett, E. (1997). Mother-child relationships, teacher-child relationships, and school outcomes in preschool and kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *12*, 263–280. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(97)90003-X

Pianta, R. C., Mashburn, A. J., Downer, J. T., Hamre, B. K., & Justice, L. (2008). Effects of web-mediated professional development resources on teacher-child interactions in pre-kindergarten classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *23*, 431–451.

Pianta, R. C. (1999). *Enhancing relationships between children and teachers*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pianta, R. C. (2001). *STRS Student–Teacher Relationship Scale. Professional manua*l. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Rhedding-Jones, J., Bae, B., & Winger, N. (2008). Young children and voice. In G. Macnaughton, P. Hughes, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Young children as active citizens* (pp. 44–59). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sabol, T. J., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Recent trends in research on teacher-child relationships. *Attachment and Human Development*, *14*(3), 213–231. doi:10.1080/14616734.2012.672262

Soto, L.D. & Swadener, B.B. (2005). *Power and voice in research with children.* New York: Peter Lang.

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Mantzicopoulos, P. Y. (2010). Young children's perceptions of teacher–child relationships: An evaluation of two instruments and the role of child gender in kindergarten. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *31*(6), 428–438. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2010.07.006

Swadener, B. B. (2000). "At Risk" or "At Promise"? From Deficit Constructions of the "Other Childhood" to Possibilities for Authentic Alliances with Children and Families. In L. Diaz-Soto, *The politics of early childhood education* (pp.117-134). New Work, NY: Peter Lang

Tsai, S.-F., & Cheney, D. (2011). The impact of the adult-child relationship on school adjustment for children at risk of serious behavior problems. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *20*(2), 105–114. doi:10.1177/1063426611418974

Vu, J. A., & Howes, C. (2012). Examining Mexican-Heritage Children's Representations of Relationships With Mothers and Teachers in Preschool. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *26*(1), 91–106. doi:10.1080/02568543.2011.632068

Zan, B., & Donegan-Ritter, M. (2014). Reflecting, coaching and mentoring to enhance teacher-child interactions in Head Start classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *42*, 93–104. doi:10.1007/s10643-013-0592-7

ISSN: 2368-948X

Author: Claudia Diaz-Diaz

PhD student, Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia, Canada

Claudia Díaz-Díaz is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Studies, at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Claudia earned a MEd in Early Childhood Education in UBC and currently her doctoral research focuses on the role early childhood education practices in socio-spatial segregated neighbourhoods in young children's educational opportunities. For ten years, Claudia has worked as a social-manager in socio-educational programs and as educational and policy consultant in poverty-reduction programs for inner-city schools. Some of her research interests include early childhood education policies for children living in context of disadvantage, spatial theories of education, and critical approaches in research with children.