Mobilizing Citational Practices as Feminist Curriculum-Making in Early Childhood Education

NICOLE LAND
Toronto Metropolitan University
MEAGAN MONTPETIT
Western University

WHEN WE THINK WITH CITATIONAL PRACTICES, we foreground the practices and relations we inherit and set in motion as we think with knowledges in our relations with early childhood educators and children. By foregrounding the colloquialism "citational practices," we presence the ongoing practices that we activate in our scholarship and in our work as pedagogists and researchers who collaborate with early childhood educators. Slowing down to articulate and figure out the contours and intentions of our citational practices, we want to take seriously how we think with other scholars, literature, and multidisciplinary provocations. In early childhood education (ECE) and associated academic spaces (for example: childhood studies, curriculum studies), we very often inherit an epistemological history where we are taught think citational practices as sequential and extractivist grounding for creating and supporting knowledges; "stand on the shoulders of experts," we are told. This familiar mode of citational practice builds upon foundational theories, in which we cite those who came before us to acknowledge our debt to their work and to extend their contributions toward other arguments, using their insights to legitimize the provocations and ideas that we are working to make public. We want to carefully name that what we are proposing in thinking with citational practices is not a break or an erasure; we will not propose citational practices as a severing from or forgetting the knowledges that have mattered intensely to ECE in the past, but we hope to offer ways in which citational practices are also integral to complex curriculum-making practices.

To do this, our questions are of a different ethical and political vein: how do we inherit domineering knowledges and their histories and consequences and then think citational practices as the work of answering for and doing otherwise with these epistemological establishment(s) that have mattered in early childhood education? When we think alongside particular contemporary feminist scholars, what becomes of our citational practices—how might we cite differently as a response to the provocations these scholars offer toward living well in damaged, inequitable,

ecological worlds? How might citational practices entangle with curriculum-making with children and educators?

In this article, we complexify our understanding of citational practices in early childhood education and offer provocations for how we might build novel, accountable, pedagogical citational relations as we read and think together with early childhood educators. We begin by speaking about our role as pedagogist-researchers in Ontario, Canada, to set the context for our thinking. Then, we think alongside the scholars who inspire us to think differently with citational practices and who pave the citational practices pathways we launch from. We offer three propositions toward doing citational practices as pedagogists, connecting to how citational practices and curriculum-making collide. It is important to be clear that we offer these three propositions in the company of the specific scholars with whom we think. This means these propositions are speculative responses to the provocations these scholars offer and to the ethical and political energies of their work. We do not aim for the propositions to be universalizable nor easily applicable; they are to be read as questions, gestures, and moves toward doing citing as curriculum-making otherwise. To conclude, we will visit a moment from pedagogist research, narrating and making visible our citational practices and their entanglements with curriculum-making in ECE.

In this final section of the article, narrating our citational practices is particularly important as we acknowledge that the stories that we tell in our research are intimately shaped by the people we read and talk to (in and well beyond academia). This extends beyond who we choose to cite when interpreting or analyzing data within our own research projects; who we read and think with also shapes the choices we make in our pedagogical work and the subjectivities we bring with us in constructing the pedagogical conditions that structure our work.

Who is a Pedagogist?

The role of a pedagogist in Canada is grounded in the leading-edge work of Drs. Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw, Cristina Delgado Vintimilla, B. Denise Hodgins, Fikile Nxumalo, Kathleen Kummen, Narda Nelson, and Randa Khattar (Hodgins & Kummen, 2018; Kummen & Hodgins, 2019; Land, Vintimilla et al., 2022; Nelson et al., 2018; Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2015; Vintimilla, 2018). Inspired by the role of the pedagogista in Reggio Emilia and the pedagogical or critical friend in Europe, projects in Ontario (*Pedagogist Network of Ontario*) and British Columbia (*Early Childhood Pedagogy Network*) actively work to reimagine the role as one that responds to the particular contexts of early childhood education in Canada. A pedagogist works in education contexts to create conditions to think pedagogically—to open up avenues toward engaging with questions of our ecologically precarious, politically fraught, inequitable, increasingly regulated and surveilled, and rapidly complexifying times with children and in our curriculum-making (Land, Vintimilla et al., 2020 Nelson & Hodgins, 2020; Nxumalo et al., 2018). The work of a pedagogist is collective (Land & Montpetit, 2019), and accordingly, a pedagogist never grapples with or enacts citational practices alone. How do we live well together; how do we make a life together? These are the questions a pedagogist holds dear (Vintimilla & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2020).

Drawing the role of the pedagogist in Canada into a research context, we often name our collaborations with educators as pedagogical inquiry research (Hodgins, 2019; Nxumalo, 2016; Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2016). As pedagogist-researchers, we—Nicole and Meagan—work closely with educators and children in long term, careful, slow pedagogical inquiry work. Always

with educators and children as our thinking companions, we work at inheriting and inventing pedagogical conditions as a mode of responding together to our times. Experimenting and speculating together, we generate momentary practices and possibilities that answer to the local worlds we are implicated in. We see this as curriculum-making (Berry et al., 2020; Nxumalo et al., 2018). Curriculum-making names the co-labouring (Vintimilla & Berger, 2019) that energizes creating conditions in a classroom (or any place) to respond to the situated concerns and complexities of this space. Curriculum-making and pedagogy are intensely entangled for a pedagogist, such that to live questions of pedagogy without deep consideration of curriculum or citational practices is impossible. For Vintimilla and Pacini-Ketchabaw (2020) pedagogy

> asks: What kind of human might be able to respond (response-able) to the conditions of our times? Pedagogy asks this question in relation to what a society might value, and which of those values might need transformation. What idea of the human do educational processes and curriculum-making enable? What subject formations are legitimised and delegitimised through them? What relational logics do they enact? (p. 632)

Relations, debts, mangles, histories, knowledges, ethics, politics, and futurities animate curriculum-making; to do curriculum-making with children and ecological worlds is to collectively learn to pay attention, to figure out how to respond, and to grapple together about how we might live well together. The questions that bind pedagogy, curriculum-making, and citational practices are not simple nor are they concerned with perfection or vindication. Rather, the questions we might ask from within constellations of pedagogy, curriculum-making, and citational practice are modest and serious, situated and vital, speculative and indispensable. As a pedagogist-researcher for my doctoral research, I (Meagan) worked with a childcare centre in London, Ontario, a mid-sized city with a blend of urban and suburban infrastructure on the lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak, and Attawandaron peoples. I (Nicole) collaborate with a childcare centre in downtown Toronto, Ontario, in the "Dish With One Spoon Territory," a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas, and Haudenosaunee. Both of us are white settlers.

We provide context for the work of a pedagogist and the intentions of the pedagogical inquiry researcher because, in this article and from this article, we want to spur thinking citational practices otherwise within pedagogical work in the field. That is, we want to tug citational practices beyond only the realm of academic concern and instead hold them in conversation with our ongoing interdisciplinary work with educator co-researchers, children, and other pedagogists. We position citational practices, and our propositions for doing citational practices, as matters of concern for pedagogists and educators. We hope these practices will take on a life whereby educators and pedagogists might imagine what possibilities for doing citations might be possible when we work to understand citational practices as they become entangled with pedagogical work and curriculum-making possibilities. We want to think citational practices as one thread of curriculum-making, where, following Nxumalo et al. (2018), "we think that it is pedagogically responsible to also find ways to sustain emergence through subsequent and multiple processes of lived curriculum making that educators *decide* to sustain" (p. 449). Put differently, we want to think with citational practices as a commitment to making visible the lived curriculum making decisions we participate in as we decide who to think with, as well as how and why to think with some scholars, authors, knowledges, stories, poets, or artists (and more) and not others.

Doing Citational Practices

We first met the ethic and politic of citational practices through the *Citational Practices Challenge* proposed by Eve Tuck, K. Wayne Yang, and Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández (n.d.). Drawing on Sara Ahmed's (2013) proposition of citations as a feminist world-making practice, Tuck, Yang, and Gaztambide-Fernández propose that citational practices require we ask who is represented, what knowledges are reproduced, and what knowledges are made peripheral or what ways of navigating the world are erased as we make choices about who and how to bring other scholars or writers' words alongside our own thinking and scholarship. They think carefully with identity politics: what kinds of scholars and knowledges are being centered, and why? How can we be accountable to the citational practice decisions that we make, knowing that silencing, diminishing, and destroying have been practices citations have for lifetimes, and continue to, enact in some academic spaces? Foregrounding identity politics from within a different discipline, Mott and Cockayne (2017) trace how citational practice happens in geography, thinking alongside Judith Butler to argue that "by suggesting that citation is performative, we highlight how citation is a technology of power implicated in academic practices that reproduce a white heteromasculinist neoliberal academy, but which also offers a model of resistance" (p. 964). They propose "conscientious citation" (p. 955) as a practice in attending to whom and how we are citing and point toward understanding citational practices as a process interested in reconfiguring how power and expertise happen.

Tuck, Yang, and Gaztambide-Fernández take up Sara Ahmed's (2013) proposal of doing citations as feminist practice. For Ahmed, citational practices are a process of world making—of creating and participating in imperfect alliances, relations, disruptions, ruptures, and dissent. Ahmed (2016) proposes that "perhaps citations are feminist straw: lighter materials that, when put together, still create a shelter but a shelter that leaves you more vulnerable" (p. 16). To do citational practices is both to chase down an idea and its history to think alongside and to intentionally refuse to centre certain ideas and certain histories. As Ahmed (2016) offers, "sometimes we need distance to follow a thought. Sometimes we need to give up distance to follow that thought" (p. 16). Sometimes navigating this distance might be a public project, emphasizing the collectivity of feminist citational practices and, traversing, as Russell (2016) suggests, the academic sphere to generously share public gratitude for those we think alongside. Following Ahmed and Russell, we learn to think with citational practices as a relation of humility, as seeing how we cobble together worlds with who we cite and why, and how those worlds can orient toward generous, affirmative, uncompromising, feminist politics.

Katherine McKittrick (2021) re-reads Ahmed's proposals toward citational practices, contending that to do citational practices we must think beyond only taking attendance based on identity of our reference lists. McKittrick grounds her analysis in Black studies and in world-making as a Black scholar. We do not intend to appropriate her analysis and instead work to take seriously what McKittrick's provocations for doing citational practices might mean for us, as pedagogist-researchers. Storying citational trends based on identity politics, whereby some scholars have moved away from citing "big" continental theorists (McKittrick uses the example of Derrida) or the problematic "titans" in their field, McKittrick asks, "Do we unlearn whom we do not cite?" (p. 22). This question feels critically important for a pedagogist to consider. We often speak, as pedagogists, of refusing child development (Vintimilla et al., 2020; see also Burman, 2016) because of how its instrumental, totalizing power devours the richness of thought in early childhood education. Vintimilla and Pacini-Ketchabaw (2020) understand the all-subsuming

sovereignty of child development through the logic of the plantation, where children become subjects imbued with economic value, such that conforming/preforming subjects are celebrated for their future contribution to capitalism, while children who do not reconcile themselves to child development are disciplined and devalued.

So—how do we cite child development as pedagogists? McKittrick (2021) makes clear that ignoring is impossible, as we do not unlearn nor erase the legacies of child development by omitting it from our ways of thinking. It lingers. That lingering matters. McKittrick offers that scholars whose citational practices she is interested in "are much more interested in *how* we know, and how we come to know, than in *who* we know" (p. 23). Here citational practices intersect with questions of process. *How* do we cite child development—and *why*? We learn from McKittrick that citational practices do not act as a blanket; there is no standing at the pulpit and articulating "this is my citational practice ethos as a pedagogist. Full stop." Rather, different works with different histories (violences, silences, possibilities, futures) demand different citational attentions from different people. As we cite them, they ask of us different accountabilities. For Vintimilla et al. (2023), a pedagogists' work is always political and ethical and is, therefore, a verb made of ongoingness. Pedagogists hold difficult, intense, and specific pedagogical commitments, and it is in how a pedagogist manifests—lives knowledges that populate—their commitments that a pedagogist's work moves from that of a critical friend, pedagogical leader, or consultant into the dense political and pedagogical terrain of a pedagogist (Vintimilla et al., 2023). Along the same thread, citational practices are, as McKittrick writes, about subject formation and the knowledges that disrupt and give life to our ways of being in the world. They are not rhythmic so much as they are responsive. McKittrick emphasizes that

> referencing is hard: we share our lessons of unknowing ourselves and, in this, refuse what they want us to be; we risk reading what we cannot bear and what we love too much and then we let it go, revise, and read again. (p. 34)

Following McKittrick, we learn to think of citational practices as a responsibility in reciprocity, where we might read and write such that we are in constant dialogue with histories, asking hard questions of the stories they tell, and always responding to the questions histories ask of us. We want to carry McKittrick's contention that citational practices are hard. There is nothing simple nor replicable nor redeemable nor even dependable about doing citational practices as ongoing work. As pedagogists, we need to sit with different knowledges and stories, feeling how they matter in our bodies and where they are in relation with our pedagogical commitments, and then figure out how to proceed. Pedagogists might learn to ask: this article, knowledge, or story is a part of the intellectual world I walk within, so *how* might I cite *this* piece?

Propositions for Doing Citational Practices as a Pedagogist

We now offer three propositions that compose how we tentatively do citational practices in our work as pedagogists. We intentionally craft these as proposals because we are not interested in professing a model for how pedagogists *must* do citational practices. Rather, we hope that pedagogists will take these propositions as invitations, emphasizing their ethical, political, and pedagogical character while nurturing a curiosity for what these practices might mean for curriculum-making.

Thinking Citational Practices with Isabelle Stengers

Proposal: Doing citational practices as a process oriented toward an unfamiliar, speculative, tentative interdisciplinarity

Isabelle Stengers (2018) offers forward a practice of "collective apprenticeship," an invitation for "putting into play what is meant, for each science, by the risk of establishing a relation" (p. 68). Thinking with Stengers and collective apprenticeship, we want to propose citational practices as the risk of establishing a relation—the work of proximity, but dangerous, risky, unfamiliar proximity. With Stengers, we imagine citational practices as the labour of sustaining an interdisciplinary collaboration that is uneasy, that does not rely on the knowledge-producing terms of interdisciplinarity the academy has come to laud. In taken-for-granted citational relations, compiling knowledge on knowledge, perspective on perspective, is a tactic to produce "better" or more robust knowledge. Traditional citational practices orient toward the pursuit of "truth" or infallibility and are concerned with evidencing the validity or feasibility of an argument—logics grounded in capitalism where knowledge is the currency and the "legitimate" currency is sparse. In relations of collective apprenticeship, Stengers proposes that different knowledges and disciplines are collected together in the name of learning the borders of varied knowledges, becoming more familiar with the worlds each knowledge comes from and makes possible, and tracing the concerns and lives that a particular knowledge can answer to. In an ethic of collective apprenticeship, how these knowledges meet and wrestle with one another also matters. It is here that Stengers points toward speculation: what worlds become possible when particular knowledges, places, stories, histories, ethics, politics, subjectivities, and bodies meet here, now?

With Stengers, we want to mobilize citational practices as the work of tracing the contours of the knowledges we think with and learning to take seriously that there might be knowledges we cannot think with, or refuse to think with, in our pedagogical relationships. In this same beat, a pedagogist might draw in a knowledge unfamiliar to the ECE canon, taking the risk of thinking alongside a story that is intentionally unfamiliar to the lexicon of developmentalism, progress, and anti-intellectualism that pervades ECE (Vintimilla et al., 2023). Stengers (2018) proposes that

> if we have to reclaim the risky business of honoring change, the assemblages we participate in, inversely, are to become a matter of empirical and pragmatic concern about effects and consequences, not a matter of general consideration or textual dissertation. (p. 107)

This makes us approach citational practices as the risk of caring for relations that undo any notion of interdisciplinarity as the production of better knowledge and that instead turn toward momentary, speculative, intentional constellations of knowledges that unsettle how and what each knowledge works to know. Interdisciplinarity is a risk, but the kind of risk that turns inherited curriculum on its head and incites curriculum-making otherwise. A pedagogist might debate what particular knowledges, together, set in motion as we work to respond to our worlds with children: if we think these knowledges together with this place, what becomes possible for living well together? What relations and worlds become impossible? Rather than trafficking in status, proving unassailable validity, or gaining traction by rooting an idea in a widely-validated trajectory, with collective apprenticeship citational practices orient toward, as Stengers argues is at the heart of collective apprenticeship, interdisciplinary collaborations that matter for how their local,

contextual consequences create possibilities for engaging with the complex contemporary worlds we inherit and inhabit.

Thinking Citational Practices with Haraway and Anna Tsing, Heather Anne Swanson, Elaine Gan, & Nils Bubandt

Proposal: Doing stories as citational practice

Following Donna Haraway (2016), we understand stories as world shaping: the stories we tell shape who we are and what we do. In early childhood education, developmental psychology has been *the* story (with different consequences in the Global North and Global South and always tied to ongoing settler colonialism), and this has shaped who educators and children are allowed to be. Following Haraway, we know that the stories we tell and the stories we do not tell matter. If we consider stories as citational practice, we might also think stories as companions, where it is impossible to be in the same dialogue with all our worldly companions always, at the same time. Stories have consequences in both their presences and absences; what stories do we choose to think with here and what stories do we choose not to think with here? How do we notice and answer for the foreclosures and reproduction of violent dominant discourses? When it feels as though child development (or environmental stewardship or school readiness or early intervention) is our only story, how can we invent practices of storying that do not ignore developmentalism, as per McKittrick (2021), but instead do stories in ways that dismantle the hubris dominant stories perform and assemble stories together, otherwise?

Tsing et al. (2017) argue that "some kinds of stories help us notice; others get in our way. Modern heroes—the guardians of progress across disciplines—are part of the problem" (p. M8). These scholars tell us that stories do different things; they may point us in a direction of something, encourage us to think about something in a particular way, but they may also conceal other ways of thinking. In the introduction to their book, *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*, Tsing et al. draw attention to citational practices that privilege masculinist scientific knowledge as dangerous acts that make invisible other ways of knowing the natural world. If we think this alongside "good" academic practices in which we are taught to cite "original" sources, we might find that we do not pay attention to how other stories become woven within and barred from our citational relations—and our curriculum-making. As a pedagogist, if we fail to pay attention, we run the risk of reinforcing logics of epistemological reproduction, where, as Tsing et al. (2017) illustrate, dominant stories often miss the rich complexities that multiple, interdisciplinary, unfamiliar, strange stories "help us notice" (p. 2019) when these stories are put into conversation across theoretical boundaries.

In early childhood education in Canada, to stand on the shoulders of experts is to reproduce the linear logics of developmentalism—sequential ways of thinking childhood, growth, and learning (Vintimilla & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2020). This operates as a cycle of legitimation and subject formation, curating the knowledges that can then dictate who a child, educator, and pedagogist can be in education spaces and in the world. As a pedagogist, we might find ourselves reproducing a micro-canon, whereby we return to the same scholars over and over, settling into a complacency that depends on the popularity or status of these scholars or the artfulness of their prose. Complacency and familiarity are not twins. Familiarity, as a pedagogist, might mean returning to the knowledges that fuel us to be pedagogists, that pull our hearts toward thinking curriculum-making and pedagogy. We would suggest, following Haraway (2016) and Tsing et al.

(2017), that a pedagogist should know the stories they refuse to give up on, be this the words of a particular scholar or writer, a social justice movement (like fighting against anti-Black, anti-Indigenous, and anti-Asian racism), an artist or poet, their own art-making, or a commitment to fostering less precarious ecological worlds. A pedagogist can think in the junctures between familiar and strange, learning to recognize the shadows their familiar stories cast. If, as a pedagogist, we refuse to only cite what we already know—to think with only the stories that are familiar to our particular disciplines—our citational practices might become strategies whereby we can hold ourselves accountable for what such stories do to our disciplines. We must remain with what flourishes (intended or not) in the fractures that the stories we choose to presence create. Doing stories as citational practices means that we might make more visible for ourselves and others the decisions that we make around which stories and knowledges to think with and how these decisions are ethical choices entangled with curriculum-making. By thinking with other stories, whether we seek them out or they tumble into our pathway and refuse to leave, we are transforming the stories that become perceptible within our field. More so than only diversifying the stories told in a neoliberal, "we need to hear multiple perspectives," way, what is absolutely critical is that we, as pedagogists, enact our citational practices as a commitment to answering to the consequences of the stories we choose to presence and silence as we do citational practices as storytelling and curriculum-making as storying.

Thinking alongside Alexis Shotwell

Proposal: Citational practices as unforgetting and remembering for the future amid ongoing settler colonialism

Thinking with a non-linear conception of temporality, where past-presents weave with futures, Shotwell (2016) works with/in the inheritances of ongoing settler colonialism in Canada to imagine what it might mean to create more liveable worlds together. Shotwell argues that

> unforgetting … is an activity, just as forgetting is an activity … . Forgetting is a core piece of colonial practice … . In our being, ontologically, we become who we are in part through what we know and what we are made (or made able) to forget. (p. 37)

Shotwell's argument positions forgetting and unforgetting as ethical and political practices that activate knowledge politics and hierarchies and that implicate us in our own forgetting and unforgetting, as well as systemic processes that ally with forgetting or unforgetting. As Shotwell goes on to argue, "unforgetting … can be an important part of resistance" (p. 37).

Unforgetting then, names necessary work within ongoing settler colonialism in Canadian early childhood education and postsecondary scholarship. To unforget histories of colonialism is to not ascribe to the privileged, insidious veiling of the systems of knowledge that produce the unequal realities that we inherit and must confront in early childhood education and university education. How might we think unforgetting as a citational practice? Thinking in the company of Shotwell (2016), we want to propose that, to do unforgetting as citational practice, as a pedagogist, is to not cite only into a future or not only into a future untethered from a history. We want to work to think citational practices where we do not cite only as a gesture forward to build something new, nor only as an acknowledgement of past scholarly work that we build upon, but to do citing to disrupt the entangled past-present-future erasures and violences of colonial knowledge systems.

This, we suggest, is a way to do citational practices as producing temporal relations—as weaving together powerfully relevant histories with tomorrow-oriented trajectories in the name of what Shotwell (2016) calls "remembering for the future" (p. 23). For what futures will our local, personal, citational practices remember? This moves citational practices beyond an only history-oriented practice whereby we cite the foundational scholars our work builds upon or we cite in the name of proving the legitimacy of a concept or a story. Rather, reinventing citational practices as remembering for the future requires that we make choices about who, how, why, and when we cite, knowing that those choices are not only technical nor only for building validity. Rather, as pedagogists our citational practices when remembering for the future are about acknowledging and answering for how our practices and our work implicates us in dominant and less-dominant knowledge hierarchies and traditions. Citational practices might here become, following Shotwell (2016), a method of forgetting rather than reproduction, of both intentional presences and absences, where forgetting can become a part of resistance. What if we invent ways to do citational practices where we are concerned with getting to know a past for how its relations endure into the present and citing in ways that both know and disrupt that present in the name creating conditions for more liveable worlds? What happens if, following Shotwell, as pedagogists we do citational practices as a memory grounded in a politics of impure responsibility? Shotwell makes us think of citational practices as always imperfect, never innocent, never apolitical, never atemporal world-making relations, practices that actively unforget in the name of, as Shotwell offers, remembering for the future.

Doing Citational Practices with one Moment from Pedagogical Inquiry Work

We move now to sharing a moment from Nicole's pedagogist-research work with preschool and toddler-aged children and educator co-researchers in Toronto. We want to think with this moment not for how to understand/analyze it, nor to position it as an especially illuminating moment, but to bring to the forefront the ways we grapple with what knowledges to bring to this moment to begin to think with it. This is a move toward making visible our citational practices in a public realm. We experiment with thinking through who we think with and who we cite—and, most importantly—how.

Wires, Holes, and Strangers

A group of children have been thinking with the question of how we get to know place through our movement and have been noticing and walking slowly with the quad—a large and grass-filled public area in downtown Toronto. For multiple weeks, there has been a small utility hole in a little green island between two highly-trafficked pathways that the children have been very interested in. We often pull the dark green plastic cover off the hole, looking in at the sweaty bundle of leaves and grass and one single black pipe. A group of children, an educator, and I were sitting around the hole talking about what happens when we pull green grass from the ground and sprinkle it into the hole—does the grass die? Sometimes we see spiders or caterpillars roaming the hole—who else lives here? Do they need grass? A woman, who we did not know, who was walking by stopped, picked the green plastic cover off the ground, covered the hole, and scolded the children that the hole was not for them. We were shocked.

Educators, children, and I have talked about that hole multiple times since then.

A few weeks later, we were in the quad and came across a different hole—one filled with tightly coiled coloured wires. It had no cover. As we began to get to know this hole, children, educator, and I were careful; holes, in this place, come with a history of being admonished by strangers. We knelt by the hole looking in. Why is it so colourful? Do the wires attach to anything? What are the wires doing? We tugged the wires out of the hole. We had many questions about these wires or this hole—who lives in this hole? Where is its lid? What do we do with this hole? Can we even be close to this hole; is that okay with other people around?

Meagan's Citational Practices

I enter into thinking about this story with trepidation. The moment Nicole chose to share with me is not one that I would commonly choose to think about in my research. This has me thinking about citational practices because the people I think with do more than just support analysis in my work; they also shape what ideas and moments that I tend to.

In this type of thinking, I am indebted to reconceptualist early childhood education scholars, such as Dalhberg et al. (2013) and feminist science scholars such as Haraway (1988) who reconstruct the role of researcher as one who cannot be removed from the situated contexts in which they work. To notice in this way is something that I have learned alongside my supervisor, Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw, through her work with Sylvia Kind and Laurie Kocher in their (2016) book *Encounters with Materials*. Pacini-Ketchabaw et al. draw on the work of feminist anthropologist Anna Tsing (who we thought with in proposition #2) to take seriously the work of noticing as something that draws attention to and amplifies agencies in the multispecies assemblages I attend to in my work. When I think about noticing and inhabiting, I take seriously that my noticing practices—how I attend—are entangled with my citational practices. To notice in a particular way is to cite; it is to lean on a knowledge and activate it in how I pay attention. I also do citational practices when I slow down to question how my attention concurrently overlooks. Curriculum-making cares about both sides of attention as citational practice because I might not have dwelled beside the open hole. Because of *how* I carry Dahlberg et al., Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., and Tsing with me, I might have invited the children to attune to the grass, the trees, the litter collectively. Here is the forceful mystery in doing citational practices as curriculum-making: this is not a moment to say that I would have "missed" what happened with the hole. This is not an indictment of my modes of paying attention. What matters is that, because of the ways my citational familiarities tangle with my ways of paying attention and my pedagogical commitments as a pedagogist, something different might have unfolded. That "something different" names the creative force in thinking citational practices intentionally towards curriculum-making.

As a pedagogist, I am interested in what I am not interested in in the moment with the open hole and cords. I am not interested in co-opting this moment through a developmental lens, and in this I am thinking with Shotwell's (2016) proposition of having a no. In my collective work across many contexts, my colleagues remind me that standing for something necessitates a refusal of certain logics. Here, I am again indebted to feminist scholars such as Stengers (2018), Haraway (2016), and Kathleen Skott-Myhre (2017) who draw attention to the erasure of minoritarian knowledges in the name of rational Scientific Truth. As I think with them in this moment, I am inspired to think outside the logics of rationalism. This means resisting certain logics (ex:

individualism, didactic reasoning, truth, reason) while concurrently recognizing the scars they leave on how I might engage this moment. If I foreground more-than-human relationality, I might wonder with the children about what the wires do with the soil under the grass in the big quad. My presencing of relationality is a non-innocent citational practice; it is grounded both in the hopeful, speculative theorizing of feminist scholars who think relationality expansively and in my citational refusal to draw on knowledges that rationally explain what the wires might do (ex: they are probably for the streetlights).

Nicole's Citational Practices

I have a firm no (Shotwell, 2016) to developmental knowledges here, like Meagan, as a pedagogist, I cannot stand for citing scholars or epistemological traditions of thinking "about" children that argue that the children cannot yet meaningfully engage with the hole and the wires or that this stranger lady who scolded us knows more than us simply because of age. This means that my first citational instinct is one of defiance. As a participant in this moment, I refuse to allow the impactful and confusing lived stories of the scolding lady to prevail.

Paying attention to the wires threaded in the subterranean worlds of the quad makes me think of chemicals and contamination. Contamination, an ethic I learned from Shotwell (2016), where we seek relations of imperfection and getting on together, rather than a romanticized primordial purity, keeps bubbling up in my brain as I think how I might respond with children to the hole and wires. I am genuinely curious what the wires do. I have no idea. I imagine, in a kind of tentative citational practice that draws on the very little I know about electronics, that the wires will be filled with a filament made of a precious metal. I start to think about how our proximity to these wires likely inculcates us in stories of mineral extraction and in the anthropogenic mess of the mined, commodified worlds we inherit with children (Nxumalo, 2017). Contamination returns as a familiar curriculum-making companion.

Do I want to think this moment with scientific knowledges with the children? What happens when I remember that wires are coated in rubber, and that rubber trees are cultivated oceans away in mass industrialized farming. I cannot, this means, think with feminist science studies without thinking about land—which in this place means thinking about ongoing settler colonialism. When I think of feminist science studies scholars who think with chemicals, I think of Michelle Murphy's (2017) and Max Liboiron's (with Tironi & Calvillo, 2018) work on chemical lives. Both Murphy and Liboiron are scholars in Canada who think with anti-colonial relations to scientific inquiry. I am a white settler. How can I think with Murphy and Liboiron's work well—in ways that acknowledge the deep connections between land and knowledge, and that answer to the ways that early childhood education continues to be implicated in ongoing settler colonialism? Here my citational practice requires that I pay attention to all the lively bits that compose a knowledge—the histories, the places, the stories, the relations, the refusals, the care. What matters is that I need to figure out *how* I might think with this knowledge—is it for me? How might I do citational practices with curriculum-making as a process of setting in motion how we (children, educators, pedagogist) might think, together and with equity, care, and specificity with particular knowledges? How do I do citational practices against extraction, where I work hard and imperfectly to translate any question of "does this theory/theorist make sense here" into "what do I need to do to engage this knowledge with reciprocity and specificity"? Curriculum-making, then, enlivens this second question as one to grapple with alongside children and educators: how do we

learn well and care, collectively, with the knowledges we carry into this moment with the hole and wires, here and now?

Taking Citational Practices as an Experiment and Response

In the spirit of our tentative, speculative, but intentional experiments with citational practices, we resist offering any semblance of "best practices." We do not want to argue for overarching citational practices that can apply across every context or citational practices that are meaningful outside of the answerabilities and accountabilities of any pedagogist who engages in a particular citational relationship. What, then, might our proposals for doing citational practices as a pedagogist open toward in early childhood education? We want to offer that pedagogists *must* consider how doing citing is an ethical and political endeavour that extends far beyond the technical or collegial work of providing citations in academic conventions; rather, citational practices *must* ask us to undertake difficult moves that pull those we think in the company of into conversation, rather than a strategy to resolve tensions. To cite *must* be read as the questions we are making possible and impossible, and the gestures we are making public and covert. How we cite *must* activate our pedagogical commitments. In the spirit of the tentative proposals that we have shared, we want to offer a question to conclude: what possibilities for curriculum-making might we open up when we refuse to hold early childhood education's traditional citational conventions intact and instead trace, share, craft, and risk the situated knowledges that we are implicated in?

References

Ahmed, S. (2013). Making feminist points. *feministkilljoys*. https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/

Ahmed, S. (2016). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.

Berry, A., Delgado Vintimilla, C., & Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. (2020). Interrupting purity in Andean early childhood education: Documenting the impurities of a river. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *53*(3), 276–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2020.1785974

Burman, E. (2016). *Deconstructing developmental psychology* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (2013). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Languages of evaluation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575–599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Hodgins, B. D. (2019). *Gender and care with young children: A feminist material approach to early childhood education*. Routledge.

Hodgins, B. D., & Kummen, K. (2018). Transformative pedagogical encounters: Leading and learning in/as a collective movement. In S. Cheeseman & R. Walker (Eds.), *Pedagogies for leading practice* (pp. 110–124). Routledge.

Kummen, K., & Hodgins, B. D. (2019). Learning collectives with/in sites of practice: Beyond training and professional development. *Journal of Childhood Studies, 44(*1), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.18357/jcs.v44i1.18785

Land, N., & Montpetit, M. (2019). Doing pedagogical conversations (with spirituality and fat) as pedagogists in early childhood education. *Journal of Pedagogy*, *9*(2), 79–100. https://doi.org/10.2478/JPED-2018-0012

Land, N., Vintimilla, C. D., Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Angus, L. (2022). Propositions toward educating pedagogists: Decentering the child. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *23*(2), 109–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949120953522

Liboiron, M., Tironi, M., & Calvillo, N. (2018). Toxic politics: Acting in a permanently polluted world. *Social Studies of Science*, *48*(3), 331–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312718783087

McKittrick, K. (2021). *Dear science and other stories.* Duke University Press.

Mott, C., & Cockayne, D. (2017). Citation matters: mobilizing the politics of citation toward a practice of 'conscientious engagement'. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *24*(7), 954–973. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1339022

Murphy, M. (2017). *The economization of life*. Duke University Press.

Nelson, N., Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Nxumalo, F. (2018). Rethinking nature-based approaches in early childhood education: Common worlding practices. *Journal of Childhood Studies*, *43*(1), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.18357/jcs.v43i1.18261

Nelson, N., & Hodgins, B. D. (2020). Unruly voices: Growing climate action pedagogies with trees and children. In S. Elliott, E. Ärlemalm-Hagsér, & J. Davis (Eds.), *Researching early childhood education for sustainability* (pp. 150–165). Routledge.

Nxumalo, F. (2016). Storying practices of witnessing: Refiguring quality in everyday pedagogical encounters. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *17*(1), 39–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949115627898

Nxumalo, F. (2017). Geotheorizing mountain–child relations within anthropogenic inheritances. *Children's Geographies*, *15*(5), 558–569. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2017.1291909

Nxumalo, F., Vintimilla, C. D., & Nelson, N. (2018). Pedagogical gatherings in early childhood education: Mapping interferences in emergent curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *48*(4), 433–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2018.1522930

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Kind, S., & Kocher, L. (2016). *Encounters with materials in early childhood education*. Routledge.

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Nxumalo, F., Kocher, L., Elliot, E., & Sanchez, A. (2015). *Journeys: Reconceptualizing early childhood practices through pedagogical narration*. University of Toronto Press.

Russell, C. (2016). Farewell editorial: On open access, the politics of citation, and generous scholarship. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *21*, 5–12. https://cjee.lakeheadu.ca/article/view/1529/858

Shotwell, A. (2016). *Against purity: Living ethically in compromised times*. U of Minnesota Press.

Skott-Myhre, K. (2017). *Feminist spirituality under capitalism: Witches, fairies, and nomads.* Routledge.

Stengers, I. (2018). *Another science is possible: A manifesto for slow science*. Polity Press.

Tsing, A. L., Bubandt, N., Gan, E., & Swanson, H. A. (Eds.). (2017). *Arts of living on a damaged planet: Ghosts and monsters of the Anthropocene*. University of Minnesota Press.

Tuck, E., Yang, W., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (n.d.). *Citational practices tumblr*. https://citationpractices.tumblr.com/

Vintimilla, C. D. (2018). Encounters with a pedagogista. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *19*(1), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949116684886

Vintimilla, C. D., & Berger, I. (2019). Colabouring: Within collaboration degenerative processes. In B. D. Hodgins (Ed.), *Feminist research for 21st-century childhoods: Common worlds methods* (pp. 187–196). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Vintimilla, C.D, Land, N., Kummen, K., Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. & Khattar, R. (2020). Offering a question to early childhood pedagogists: What would be possible if education subtracts Itself from developmentalism? *Early Childhood Pedagogy Network*. https://www.ecpn.ca/blog/reflection/what-would-be-possible-if-education-subtracts-itself-developmentalism

Vintimilla, C. D., & Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. (2020). Weaving pedagogy in early childhood education: On openings and their foreclosure. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *28*(5), 628–641. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2020.1817235

Vintimilla, C. D, Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Land, N. (2023). Manifesting living knowledges: A pedagogists' working manifesto. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *20*(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2021.1955051