

Ideas of Early Childhood and Their Interface with Policy and Practice in Early Years Work in Scotland

Synopsis of PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2013

Dr Carolyn Martin, Retired Early Years Service Manager, City of Edinburgh Council

Overview

Assumptions are made by policy makers, service planners and providers that their aspirations for early childhood are shared by professionals, parents and children. Policy makers consistently use words such as *holistic*, *integration*, *partnership* and *collaboration* to describe the ways they wish early years practitioners to engage with children and families. In order to explore these assumptions and expectations, I gathered data from four early years settings in Scotland to critically examine the connections between participants' ideas of childhood, Scottish Government policies and staff roles/responsibilities. I utilised the experiences of staff, parents and children in these settings to critique the Scottish Government's key policy document, the *Early Years Framework* (2008).

I concluded that there was a measure of shared aspiration for young children between participants in my research and the *Framework* document in relation to the importance of building family and community based experiences. However, there were also wide differences in expectations relating to existing capacities of families and communities to support young children. In particular there was a lack of recognition in the *Framework* of the considerable pressures experienced by families and communities from wider economic and social forces driven by a neo-liberal marketised economy. This finding has enabled the identification of gaps and mismatches between policy objectives relating to family and community strength and the lived experiences of children, families and communities in Scotland.

I have identified how such mismatches impact significantly on the ways in which services are organised and the ways in which practitioners understand their roles and responsibilities. Current professional responses are based in an assumed power and authority emanating from a restricted sense of professional identity. As such, they may act in a detrimental way on the development of collaborative, strengths-based relationships between staff and parents and children.

I have argued that the implications of the Scottish Government's wider social and economic policy goals go unrecognised in its own key early years policy document and yet resulting social and economic pressures are reported by my research participants as central to their experience of family and community life. Such pressures are perceived to impact negatively on family and community capacity to meet their own and the Scottish Government's aspirations for young children. The result is a policy document that is constrained in its ability to deliver on its own objectives.

1. Underpinning Research Ideas

In my research I set out to address a fundamental question about aspirations for childhood in Scotland and the extent to which there is a clear conceptual underpinning for the *Early Years Framework*. In particular I was interested in the extent to which the policy conveys any explicit view of childhood, and to what extent that might align with views of parents, frontline staff, and especially children.

In addition, in understanding how any disharmonies have occurred between ideas held by parents, staff and children, and ideas expressed within the *Early Years Framework* policy, I was keen to explore the policy development process itself.

Finally, my research was driven by the notion that an understanding is required of the impact of Scottish Government objectives for the early years on the experiences of parents, children and staff in early years settings.

2. Conceptual Underpinnings for Early Childhood

My research focussed on bringing together what are considered to be the structural commonalities of childhood with the experiential uniqueness for each child across four areas of experience.

2.1 The child in her family: A private life in the home

The homogeneity of the structural age of modernism, based in coercive relationships between adults and children, has given way to new understandings and experiences of relationships within diverse family situations. These are built on ideas of participation, choice, individualism, and the democratisation of the adult-child relationship (Moss and Petrie, 2002; Kjørholt, 2007).

The ways in which the child experiences family life were key areas for investigation in my research, particularly in relation to the capacity of families to deliver positive childhood experiences.

2.2 The child in her community: Participating actor in her social environment

Children's capacity to participate in the wider life of their communities is socially and culturally contingent. In a postmodern world the individual child is an active participant in a dynamic and ever changing social environment (James et al, 1998). The extension of democratic principles of engagement to children in the early years of the twenty first century has created conditions where it is argued, children should be able to participate and make their voices heard through the use of the range of discursive spaces they occupy (Lansdown, 2001; Moss and Petrie, 2002; Thomas, 2005).

Perceptions about the child as a civic actor and participant in her own community and the ways in which she is enabled to realise her potential were of central importance to my research.

2.3 The child and her peers in the wider world: Competence and power

Developmental theories for children's learning and social competence are based on notions of childhood dependency and adult power (MacNaughton, 2003, Qvortrup, 2005). They are also a long way removed from the postmodern notion of the importance of the 'now' of childhood over its 'futurity' (Jenks, 1996; Moss and Petrie, 2002). The idea of a powerful child who is competent and able to make decisions about her own life, using her own agency to develop her own independent sense of self (James et al, 1998) is, at once, both a threat to and a necessity in the continuation of society.

My research explored children's experiences in exercising their right to freedom and responsibility in the use of their own spaces along with their peers.

2.4 The child in her imagination: Development of self-image

Perceptions about opportunities for the development of the imagination relate to ideas of a socially constructed and dynamic child living in a pluralist society where there may be few enduring images of childhood (James et al, 1998; Moss and Petrie, 2002; Stainton-Rogers, 2001; Mayall, 2009).

My research considered a child's use of her imagination, and its reflection in the development of her own self-image; particularly in the context of the pressures and influences she comes under from the commercial world and from family and community.

3. Policy Development

I considered the policy environment in Scotland that surrounds ideas of early childhood and the framework it provides in which lived experiences of childhood can be understood. I raised questions regarding how policy is formulated, in whose interests, the place of children within the process of policy development, and their ability to influence it.

3.1 Policy and devolution in Scotland

The advent of devolution in Scotland has seen divergence from England in relation to health, social welfare and education policies designed for social inclusion, and a continuing emphasis in Scotland on ideas of social justice (Hill et al, 2004; Tisdall, Davis and Gallagher, 2008; Mooney and Scott, 2012).

However, Scottish conceptual understandings of social and economic priorities are also inescapably and deeply affected by global economic forces. These are driving developed world governments towards ever-greater consideration of world markets and key strategic and transnational economic alliances (Dahlberg and Moss, 2005; Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2006; Smith, 2011).

Conceptual ideas about the relationship between what are neo-liberal economics (Hayek, 1944 and 1998; Friedman, 1990 and 2002) and the ways in which society organises itself to support its children and families were the focus of my research. They are ideas that are closely allied to ideas of children's power, agency and participation.

3.2 Policy and Integration of Services

The burgeoning of early years services in Scotland in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries is directly correlated with the mass entry of women into the labour market, giving rise to a corresponding increase in the need for childcare (see General Household Surveys, 1980-1997). The resulting policy emphasis is on the creation of more childcare places to support wider neo-liberal policy objectives in the field of employment (Cohen et al, 2004).

However, for integration to have a clear and unified meaning, it must involve both coherent conceptual and structural aspects, associated with the integration of care and education (Cohen et al, 2004; Davis and Hughes, 2005; Davis, 2011).

3.3 Policy and Power Relationships

Where the power balance lies in relationships between parents, children and professionals and the development of policy, it is dependent on perceptions about the interests of children and how to meet them. An emphasis on building partnership with parents acknowledges not only their intrinsic knowledge and expertise but also the importance of their continuing contribution (Moss and Petrie, 2002; Cohen et al, 2004; Moss, 2007; Davis, 2011). This requires a bringing together of learning, values and perspectives from the home, the school and the world of work through a complex system of inter-subjectivity (Fleer, 2006) which, in turn, requires an integrated response.

3.4 Policy, the Early Years Workforce and Integration

Staff working in early years services operate within a cultural, social and political context which impacts on expectations of their role and the professional value base that underpins it (MacNaughton, 2003; Tucker, 2003). Market values perpetuate divides between care and education in early years and create schisms in professional perceptions of roles and responsibilities. These present difficulties for the development of integrated working and partnership approaches to family and community capacity building. They create power relationships and professional value bases that seem incompatible with the mutually respectful relationships required (Moss and Petrie, 2002; MacNaughton, 2003; Broadhead et al, 2008; Dussel, 2010; Davis, 2011). This is reflected in staff training and shared professional practice (Davis, 2011).

Holistic approaches require training and practice that is based in listening to children and their families. They require a flexible and collaborative approach to building on already existing capacity within families and communities (Tucker, 2003; Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 2006; Tett, 2006; Broadhead et al, 2008), which acknowledges the dynamic and diverse ways in which children live their lives (Davis, 2011). A fundamental recognition is required of the strengths of children, families and communities and a belief in their capacity to find solutions for themselves (Pinkerton, 2001, Tett, 2006; Broadhead et al, 2008; Davis, 2011).

My research addressed the extent to which ideas about childhood and the lived experiences of children and families using and working within early years services are reflective of a service aspiring towards an integrated, strengths based, collaborative response.

4. Operationalising the Research

My fieldwork, conducted from February to May 2010, used the storied accounts of both adult and child participants from four early years settings across Scotland. These ranged across both urban and rural environments, across a range of socio-economic situations, and in both targeted and universal provision.

I used the narratives of participants to analyse the interplay between the policy agenda in Scotland around early childhood experiences, the way that services are structured and professional roles and responsibilities for staff perceived, and how these are ultimately experienced by children and their families. The research was qualitatively based and therefore necessarily small scale. However, data was obtained which allowed a new depth of analysis and the development of original perspectives based in actual experience. It can be seen alongside and is complementary to other more quantitatively based research in the same or similar policy areas in Scotland.

All settings I used worked with children under the age of five and their families, and all offered year round, extended day care provision. Only three out of the four worked with children under the age of three, where they provided targeted services for families facing considerable challenge. Three of the centres had part time input from teachers and one did not. Three were part of local authority provision and one was a community facility.

I ran a total of eight focus groups for staff and four for parents. Each of these focused on ideas and experiences of childhood and involved forty-seven staff and thirteen parents.

Individual interviews with twenty four staff in a range of staff roles were designed to understand how they felt about their jobs, the roles and responsibilities they held and about the services they operated within.

Interviews with seventeen parents were designed to establish their experiences of using early years services, the relationships they held with staff and their perceptions about staff roles and responsibilities.

I also worked with fourteen children gaining their stories about their childhoods through the use of their own photographic accounts of their lives at home. The data collection method was essentially an activity/play based one, over which the children themselves had a large amount of control. This made the process a meaningful one for them and reflected an approach that saw them as data gatherers rather than simply as research "subjects" (Clark and Moss, 2001).

5. Discussion

5.1 The child in her home and family

Parents and staff, and children themselves, generally described family lives that were rich and diverse. However adult participants expressed concern that they were unable to achieve the kinds of experiences they wished for children because of pressures over which they perceived they had no control and no say. These emanated from the drives of a market driven economy which made parents feel they needed to leave their families and go out to work long hours to pursue a certain level of material wealth. This resulted in perceived severe constraints on time available for family life.

These pressures were not necessarily felt to be constraining by children. They reported many ways in which they took responsibility for themselves and contributed to a family life. However, it was clear they had considerably less opportunity for independent play with peers out of sight of adults than their parents reported from their own childhoods, and they spent their lives under constant surveillance.

The Scottish Government looks to create strong, self-reliant and resilient family environments, yet, in its *Framework* document, it fails to acknowledge the real pressures and challenges faced by families in achieving this. In addition, it appears not to have sufficient mechanisms by which it can hear directly from families what those pressures and challenges are. The Scottish Government's *Early Years Framework* needs to recognise the considerable difficulties a market driven frame of reference causes for families in providing the kinds of experiences for their children they would wish.

Both parents and staff in my study were concerned at the lack of organisational capacity in mainstream early years services to provide a holistic response to families. This lack of capacity was perceived to be reflected in the professional roles and responsibilities currently held by staff. Parent participants reported a general sense that nursery staff considered their primary and, in some cases only, responsibility was to children. Staff themselves considered they did not have the expertise or the resource and time to consider a holistic response, even where they were key workers and would have wished to. The Scottish Government sets out in the *Framework* an expectation that such expertise will grow and roles and responsibilities will change to reflect new and more holistic ways of working. Both staff and parents were highly sceptical of how that might be achieved in reality.

Where parent participants reported facing a level of challenge in their family lives which required them to seek professional support they experienced professional responses based in assumptions of professional power. Whilst this was not necessarily perceived to be detrimental and, for a number of parents, was simply an accepted aspect to the relationship, it was understood by others to get in the way of building family capacity. The Scottish Government requires to make a conceptual adjustment towards building a genuine collaboration between staff and parents that acknowledges the power of the parental role and supports it for all families, in the interests of rich, varied and complex childhood experiences for all children.

5.2 The participating child in her neighbourhood community

The Government's aspirations for community strength and resilience may be similarly misplaced since they take little account of lived experience. The Government outlines objectives for building capacity within communities without appreciating or acknowledging the detrimental impact of its wider social and economic policy agenda on the abilities of local communities to respond. Again, it assumes a professional role within communities that is driven from the need to identify weakness rather than strength, which creates the same power imbalances as it does with families, and which ultimately acts against collaborative forms of interaction with people.

In addition, there is a conceptual conflict at the heart of the Scottish Government's *Framework* document between a recognition of a child's right to the use of her own agency in the pursuit of her own life aspirations, and a set of goals for children which are framed to create stability, continuity and the protection of their welfare. These latter assume as necessary a level of adult control over children's lives which runs counter to the development of capacity in children themselves (Prout, 2000; Mayall, 2000).

There is a resulting confusion in values at the heart of the document between those values which would support a child's right to participate in the development of the policy environment of which she is both a subject and a consumer (Apple, 2011), and those welfare inspired values which would regard the adult as protector and the child as necessarily incompetent (Kirby and Woodhead, 2003; Hill et al, 2004; Lancaster, 2010). The degree of commitment to a concept of the child as participating citizen is dependent on how the Scottish Government deals with power relationships between adults and children (Hendrick, 2005; Thomas, 2005 and 2007; Smith, 2011). Children's voices in the development of policy are one significant way in which the Scottish Government can ensure that its policy objectives in early years are properly reflective of children's own ideas and the lives they live (Moss and Petrie, 2002; Dunne, 2006). Without their voices, a disconnect between policy and lived experience is almost inevitable.

5.3 The competent, powerful and independent child

The connection between a child's opportunities to exercise her capacity as an independent decision maker through assessing and managing risk in her everyday life, and a recognition that this capacity has application in the wider civic arena is important (Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008). Where the child's capacity to act independently is substantially denied out of adult fears for her safety her power to make choices and decide for herself are taken away from her. Her confidence in her ability to negotiate the wider world is eroded as she becomes fearful of her own social and physical environment. She is the dependent child rather than the independent, competent and powerful child. She is stripped of any opportunity to take part in wider social discourse, particularly in the democratic political arena. She becomes the silenced child who has no political say and no political identity beyond that of her family (Thomas, 2005).

Even though children in my study found ways of taking responsibility, of developing independence and being powerful in their lives, these were restricted to the private world of the family. Even though adult participants understood the impact of imposing

restrictions on childrens' opportunities for independent play and decision making, their assumed responsibility for keeping children safe from generalised dangers perceived to be presented by the modern world was regarded as paramount.

In this instance, too, it is my conclusion that the Scottish Government has not acknowledged or taken account of the wider pressures families and professional staff experience and which impact on their sense of responsibility for children (Little, 2006; Waters and Begley, 2007; Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008). It has set out its commitment to increasing opportunities for risk taking for children but without then considering how children might use their competency as independent decision makers in a wider world; a wider world that still continues to work against their agency.

Without Government recognition of generalised adult fears for childrens' safety postmodern discourses of agency, choice and self-determination for children (James et al, 1998; Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008) are in danger of being effectively silenced.

5.4 The child, her imagination, and self-image

The postmodern idea of multiple self-images refracted and reflected through social connection and experience sits comfortably with an idea of childhood that is informed by plural ideas of family life and of community diversity. The child builds and then uses multiple images of herself as she constantly renegotiates her understanding of her place in her family and community. It is a dynamic space she occupies where she continually demonstrates her competence as a social actor, including as part of a consumerist society, in which she is an important player.

Yet, adults appear to have considerable difficulty in considering her demonstrated competence as an enabling and life enhancing quality. They express concern for the potential loss of her innocence, in the context of their own perceived responsibility to protect. This is most particularly felt in relation to their fears of commercial attempts through the media to entice children towards the market and the commodification of childhood itself. Childhood innocence is equated, for parents, with play in the natural world using natural materials. Manufactured toys, especially new technology, and the power of the media are viewed with suspicion and yet parents feel compelled to comply with the commercial imperatives of the market.

It seems to me that the Scottish Government makes no acknowledgement of this area of childhood experience in the *Framework* document. It shows no understanding of the concerns expressed by adult participants and has no answers for them when they outline their thoughts about what they perceive to be theoretical responsibilities to protect children and yet a sense of powerlessness to act against the perceived powers of the market and the media.

Equally, the *Framework*, by making no explicit reference to the role of imaginative play in the development of a child's self image and therefore not recognising it when creating policy goals, has created a policy vacuum which has allowed the potential commercial exploitation of the world of children's play feared by adult participants.

6. Implications of the Research

The Scottish Government, through the *Early Years Framework* document is unlikely to affect fundamental and positive change in the area of early childhood experiences without, first of all recognising and taking account of a considerably more subtle and diverse notion of childhood and childhood experiences than is currently reflected in the document. Implicit in that recognition should be an acknowledgement of the importance of the immediacy of childhood experience and its role in determining how children develop a sense of self. A sense of self underpins children's own understandings of the contribution they are able to make, not just as adults of the future but in the 'here and now' of childhood. An emphasis on investment in the future must therefore give way to a new emphasis on the present which honours the importance of childhood to children themselves, and which recognises both the richness and diversity of their experience and the unique contribution they, as children, are able to make.

Although the relationship between economic and social investment in early years and economic and societal strength in Scotland is recognised in the *Framework*, it is future oriented and therefore takes no account of the economic and wider social challenges faced by families and communities in the present. Its objectives do not acknowledge wider social and economic influences that affect, in a very fundamental way, the capacity of staff, families and local communities to deliver. The *Framework* is therefore too limited in its current focus. Whilst a separate policy focus on early childhood is important and a very positive development, the early years needs to be placed at the centre of all Scottish Government policy. It is the place where, in the interests of children at the very start of their life journey, both social and economic policy must come together in the context of family and community life. There is no more important place for that to happen.

The understanding of professional roles and responsibilities implicit within the *Framework* is reflective of assumed professional power and authority over families and communities. This is especially the case where families and communities are deemed to be weak. Such understandings of role are counter productive to the collaborative relationships necessary for holistic ways of working, and to the development of the kind of partnerships with families and communities the Scottish Government envisages.

So long as sharp conceptual distinctions are made between health, care and education in the organisation and development of services and amongst professionals themselves, they are likely to lead to professional protectionism and to restricted understandings about roles and responsibilities. In such a climate collaborative working with families and communities is only a limited possibility. A continuing emphasis on such separation of roles will work against Government priorities for more holistic and collaborative approaches that are based in acknowledgement of power within families and communities themselves. A cultural shift in professional perceptions is therefore required. Understandings based in separation of functions and roles need to be replaced with professional roles and responsibilities that recognise the wider ecology of the child and take account of the need to work collaboratively with families and communities.

The Scottish Government's work to establish a 'common core' training for all those wishing to engage in working with young children and their families and communities is but a start to addressing this issue. It needs to be supported by an examination of ways in which other structural, service based and professional barriers to new approaches might be addressed.

7. Recommendations Based on the Research Outcomes

7.1 Research

The key issue for the Scottish Government is to consider what the pre-requisites are which make partnership work, based in strengths-based collaborative approaches, not just effective but possible within the current constraints, and how it might be built into universal approaches in early years work in Scotland.

The Scottish Government should therefore

- Commission research with staff, parents and children to identify values, principles and elements of practice which underpin successful, strengths based collaborative approaches
- Consider how to incorporate such approaches in universal provision across Scotland so that all families and communities may benefit.

7.2 Policy

Policy connects with those it affects through the identification and involvement of key stakeholders to ensure it is properly reflective of their lived experience. The Scottish Government, in developing a policy for early years that parents, children and staff can commit to, must therefore first identify and then take proper account of their views. My research indicates that parents, and frontline staff have not been sufficiently included in the policy process to date and young children, not at all.

The Scottish Government should

- Consider how to develop effective mechanisms for the participation in the policy development process of all key stakeholders, including young children
- Develop a collaborative and inclusive process involving all identified key stakeholders to create shared aspirations for childhood in Scotland
- Look to see how economic and wider social policy priorities in Scotland tie in with these aspirations, so that they are mutually informing and reinforcing
- Make revisions and extensions to the *Early Years Framework* based in the outcome of such a process.

7.3 Services

Research evidence indicates that the most effective way to create strong, resilient and self-reliant families and communities is to build collaborative working arrangements between professional staff and families, and to use approaches which acknowledge and work with the whole ecology of the child.

As adult research participants indicated, the service in operation in Scotland, particularly for those under the age of three, is not currently resourced to provide effective early intervention in a mainstream context. Neither is it one where all families and staff work together to ensure their own continuing strength. Collaboration between professionals and families is impeded by almost inevitable inequalities in power relationships.

The Scottish Government, along with key partners, including frontline staff, parents and children, should

- Consider how to locate additional support for younger children and their families within all universal services over the longer term.
- Consider how to integrate additional support, wherever possible, within mainstream work with parents and families and how to create staff capacity
- Use collaborative models such as family learning and PEEP to begin to create learning communities across all nurseries and centres and into neighbouring communities

7.4 Professional Roles and Responsibilities

The creation of a holistic approach to working with young children, families and their communities requires recognition of the agency of individual children and their power to influence their own lives. It requires recognition, too, of the agency of parents themselves and their ability to work from their strengths to create childhood experiences for their children which match up, as far as possible, to their ideal. Recognising such agency of both children and parents requires staff to build the capacity to work in a fundamentally different way with families, particularly as this affects assumptions about the power relationships between them. The confusion at the heart of the *Framework* document between pursuing a strengths based or a deficit-based model for working with children and families I believe needs to be resolved.

Those responsible for education and training of staff working in early years settings should

- Build on existing work to establish a 'common core' training for all staff in early years, and encourage a cultural shift amongst professionals working with families and communities from perceptions of professional identities based in assumptions of professional authority, knowledge and skill to ones based in mutual regard and collaboration with families and communities
- Revise initial training for all staff working with parents and communities, using the common core to create new perspectives and understandings on collaborative working in an effort to alter the existing unequal parent/professional/child power relationships.

In addition, those responsible for the professional certification and employment of early years staff should

- Work with key stakeholders to develop roles and responsibilities for all staff working in universal services which are based in these new understandings, and which take account of the wider environment of the child
- Consider merging the key worker role with the 'named person' role (*Getting it Right for Every Child*) and ensuring that all children accessing early years provision across all sectors have an identified key worker/named person who has the capacity to take a holistic view of the child's environment
- Develop the key worker/named person role so that it includes responsibilities for full case management with families.

Finally, even such fundamental shifts as the recommendations above signify can only be of limited value in creating the kinds of childhood experiences professed by my research participants as the aspiration, without a resolution of the conflicts at the heart of the Scottish Government's early years policy. These conflicts manifest themselves in pressures on families and on staff working with families which cut across all attempts to support children in family and community life. Ensuring the *Early Years Framework* is at the very heart of the Scottish Government's policy agenda will at least force a review of the relationships between the *Framework* and the full range of social and economic policy, which should expose these conflicts and allow resolution.

THE THESIS of which the above is a synopsis is available from the University of Edinburgh Library.

REFERENCES

- ALDERSON, P. 2008. *Young Children's Rights: Exploring Beliefs, Principles and Practice*, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- APPLE, M. 2011. Democratic Education in Neo-liberal and Neo-conservative Times. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, Vol 21, p21-31.
- BROADHEAD, P., MELEADY, C. & DELGADO, M. A. 2008. *Children, Families and Communities*, Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- CHRISTENSEN, P. & MIKKELSEN, M. R. 2008. Jumping Off and Being Careful: Children's Strategies of Risk Management in Everyday Life. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, Vol 30, p112-130.
- CLARK, A. & MOSS, P. 2005. *Listening to Young Children: The Mosaic Approach*, London, National Children's Bureau.
- COHEN, B., MOSS, P., PETRIE, P. & WALLACE, J. 2004. *A New Deal for Children? Reforming Education and Care in England, Scotland and Sweden*, Bristol, Polity Press.
- DAHLBERG, G. & MOSS, P. 2004. *Ethics and Politics in Early Childhood Education*, London, Routledge.
- DAHLBERG, G., MOSS, P. & PENCE, A. 2006. *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care, 2nd Edition*, London, Routledge.
- DAVIS, J. 1998. Understanding the Meanings of Children: A Reflexive Process. *Children and Society*, Vol 12, p 325 -335.
- DAVIS, J. & HUGHES, A. 2005. Early Years Workforce Competencies Review, Edinburgh. Edinburgh.
- DAVIS, J. M. 2011. *Integrated Children's Services*, London, Sage.

- DUNNE, J. 2006. Childhood and Citizenship: A Conversation Across Modernity. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, Vol 14, p5-19.
- DUSSEL, I. 2010. Pt 1 Ch 2 'Foucault and Education' in *Routledge International Handbook of Sociology of Education*. Edited by apple, Michael, Stephen Ball and Luis armando Gandin, p27-36 London, Routledge.
- FLEER, M. 2006. The Cultural Construction of Child Development: Creating Institutional and Cultural Intersubjectivity. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, Vol 14, p127-140.
- FRIEDMAN, M. 2002. *Capitalism and Freedom*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- FRIEDMAN, M. & FRIEDMAN, R. 1990. *Free to Choose: A Personal Statement*, San Diego, Harvest Books.
- HENDRICK, H. 2005. Pt 1 Ch 2 'Children and Social Policies' in *Child Welfare and Social Policy*. Edited by Hendrick, Harry, p31-49, Bristol, Policy Press.
- HILL, M., DAVIS, J., PROUT, A. & TISDALL, K. 2004. Moving the Participation Agenda Forward. *Children and Society*, Vol 18, p77-96.
- JAMES, A., JENKS, C. & PROUT, A. 1998. *Theorising Childhood*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- JENKS, C. 1996. *Childhood*, London, Routledge.
- KIRBY, P. & WOODHEAD, M. 2003. Ch 6 'Children's Participation in Society' in *Changing Childhoods: Local and Global*. Edited by Woodhead, Martin, Rachel Burr and Heather Montgomery, p233-283, Chichester, John Wiley and Sons.
- KJORHOLT, A. T. 2007. Childhood as a Symbolic Space: Searching for Authentic Voices in the Era of Globalisation. *Children's Geographies*, Vol 5, p29-42.
- LANCASTER, P. 2010. Ch 6 'Listening to Young Children: Enabling Children to be Seen and Heard' in *Contemporary Issues in the Early Years (5th Edition)*. Edited by Pugh, Gillian and Bernadette Duffy, p79-94, London, Sage.
- LANSDOWN, G. 2001. Ch 9 'Children's Welfare and Children's Rights' in *Children in Society*. Edited by Foley, Pam, Jeremy Roche and Stanley Tucker, p87-97, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- LITTLE, H. 2006. Children's Risk Taking Behaviour: Implications for Early Childhood Policy and Practice. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, Vol 14, p141-154.
- MACNAUGHTON, G. 2003. *Shaping Early Childhood: Learners, Curriculum and Contexts*, Maidenhead, OU Press.
- MAYALL, B. 2000. The Sociology of Childhood in Relation to Children's Rights. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, Vol 8, p243-259.
- MAYALL, B. 2007. Ch 11 'Generational Relations at Family Level' in *Handbook of Childhood Studies*. Edited by Qvortrup, Jens, William Corsaro, Michael-Sebastian Honig, p175-186, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- MOONEY, G & SCOTT, G. 2012 *Social Justice and Social Policy in Scotland*. Edited by Mooney G and G Scott, Bristol, Policy Press
- MOSS, P. 2007. Bringing Politics into the Nursery: Early Childhood Education as a Democratic Practice. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, Vol 15, p5-20.
- MOSS, P. & PETRIE, P. 2002. *From Children's Services to Children's Spaces: Public Policy, Children and Childhood*. Edited by Moss, P and P. Petrie., London, Routledge.
- OFFICE OF NATIONAL STATISTICS 1980-97. General Household Surveys. Economic and Social Data Service.
- PINKERTON, J. 2001. Ch 27 'Developing Partnership Practice' in *Children in Society: Contemporary Theory, Policy and Practice*. Edited by Foley, Pam, Jeremy Roche and Stanley Tucker, p249-258 Basingstoke, Palgrave.

- PROUT, A. 2000. Children's Participation: Control and Self-Realisation in British Late Modernity. *Children and Society*, Vol 14, p304-315.
- QVORTRUP, J. 2005. *Ch 1 'Varieties of Childhood' in Studies in Modern Childhood: Society, Agency and Culture*, p1-20, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT 2008. Getting it Right for Every Child. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT 2011. A Consultation on the Common Core of Skills, Knowledge and Understanding and Values for the Children's Workforce in Scotland. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT & COSLA 2008. The Early Years Framework *In: SKILLS, D. O. E. A. (ed.)*. Scottish Government.
- SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT & COSLA 2008. The Early Years Framework Part 11. *In: SKILLS, D. O. E. A. (ed.)*. Scottish Government.
- SCOTTISH OFFICE 1990-2000. Statistical Bulletins: Education Series. Edinburgh.
- SMITH, K. 2011. Producing Governable Subjects: Images of Childhood Old and New. *Childhood*, Vol 19, p24-37.
- STAINTON ROGERS, W. 2001. *Ch 3 'Constructing Childhood, Constructing Child Concern' in Children in Society: Contemporary Theory, Policy and Practice. Edited by Foley, Pam, Jeremy Roche and Stanley Tucker*, p26-33, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- TETT, L. 2006. *Community Education Lifelong Learning and Social Inclusion*, Edinburgh, Dunedin Academic Press Ltd.
- THOMAS, N. 2005. *Ch 9 'Children, Parents and the State', in Child Welfare and Social Policy*, p157-176. *Edited by Hendrick, H*, Bristol, The Policy Press.
- THOMAS, N. 2007. Towards a Theory of Children's Participation. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, Vol 15, p199-218.
- TISDALL, K., DAVIS, J. & GALLAGHER, M. 2008. Reflecting on Children and Young People's Participation in the UK. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, Vol 16, p343-354.
- TISDALL, K. & HILL, M. 2005. *Ch 17 'Children and Health' in, Child Welfare and Social Policy*, p301-322. *Edited by Hendrick, H.*, Bristol, The Policy Press.
- TISDALL, K. & HILL, M. 2010. Policy Change Under Devolution: The Prism of Children's Policy. *Social Policy and Society*, Vol 10, p29-40.
- TUCKER, S. 2003. Interprofessional Education: Working with Children and Young People. *Children and Society*, Vol 17, p137-148.
- VON HAYEK, F. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom*, London, Routledge Classics.
- VON HAYEK, F. 1988. *The Fatal Conceit*, Chicago, Chicago Press.
- WATERS, J. & BEGLEY, S. 2007. Supporting the Development of Risk-Taking Behaviours in the Early Years: An Exploratory Study. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, Vol 35, p365-377.