

Children's Drawing as a Language and a Way of Knowing: Artistic Conversations with Young Children for a Learning Journey

Yuko Shimomura

Affiliation: Capilano University and University of British Columbia

E-mail: yukoshimomura@my.capilanou.ca

Abstract

In this article, I argue that drawing should be considered as a language to communicate with others in an early childhood educational setting. Rethinking children's drawing as more than the completion towards the final product or an activity that they do alone, my focus is that listening to children's drawing pedagogically supports our practice, particularly when we pay attention to small moments and the action of drawing to search for a collective inquiry in our continuous pedagogical journey. Understanding children's drawing is valuable not only for a simple representation of objects, but also as a communicative way of knowing something that the drawers have not yet known. Children draw to tell special stories, exchange personal ideas, and construct unique theories in multiple ways with others to open and re-open new possibilities in their meaning-making process. Drawing perhaps is no longer a simple art-making practice that children do unaccompanied in an educational setting, but rather children, adults, materials, and the environment co-exist in a classroom and interdependently construct new knowledge. This social and cultural practice, drawing, is a process of artistic engagement, educational movement, communicative event, and a way of knowing and encountering the new.



Educators actively join this convivial learning journey with children to arrange situations for fresh thoughts, insightful investigations, and dynamic actions to generate. Drawing goes beyond art activities solely to reveal children's artistic skills; it is a compelling language and a way of knowing self, others, and the world around us.

Keywords: *artistic language; drawing; art as a social practice; cultural practice; convivial learning.*

Memoir of Drawing - Conversation

I remember a particular moment at an outdoor market. My story opens with a boy coming up to me and beginning to talk. Yet, responding to him was challenging at first because of his peculiar way of telling his story, at least to me. Lots of hand gestures and movements overwhelmed my eyes. However, a moment later, my puzzled face softened since my memory and consciousness matched. He was one of the children from a school for hearing impaired persons where my sister worked. Feeling his strong desire to let me recognize his identity made me think of a way to respond. Pulling out my little notebook, I began to draw, since written words would not have helped. Drawing connected our hearts and my anxiety faded while the boy and I drew together not only to share our feeling of excitement, but also to know each other. It was a powerful moment.

Opening Thoughts

In this article, I demonstrate how children's art, particularly drawing, considered as a language, vigorously acts to construct personal meanings with others through an artistic process in order to make sense of the world while adults listen to and respond to children's drawing to open up new learning possibilities. In the moment narrated above, drawing worked as a language to communicate for a personal feelings or information exchange. Thinking of art as a language in an early childhood educational space, how does this type of language play its role? Sunday (2015) describes how art acts as a communicative language to express and understand one's meaning. Thompson (2015) explains that languages intertwine in both contemporary art and the classroom because images in art link words or gestures to thoughts. Kind and Lee (2018) write that drawing must be considered as a social communicative way of knowing one another while drawing also is valued as social activity in which the drawers converse and exchange ideas. This article will explore how we can rethink children's drawing by looking into different theoretical points of view to deeply think what drawing as language might mean, what happens between the drawers and materials, and what or how things emerge from the drawing experience with others.



Human Communication and Language

In relating to others, one of the most crucial key words is ‘communication’. When I hear this word, I immediately think of the nature of my work. As an early childhood educator, I work with a group of colleagues and a large group of children in the same space together. Having adequate and meaningful communication with others is a means to maintain the harmonized relationship. The Canadian Oxford dictionary defines communication as “[t]he imparting or exchanging of information by speaking, writing, or using some other medium”. We constantly speak to and listen to each other, write concerns, and sometime use body language to deliver, share, receive, and exchange our thoughts, difficulties, questions, curiosity, and feelings. Communication, according to Cabrera and Weckert (2013), is necessary for humans to become social beings by acknowledging our experience and beliefs with group members. To do so, the role of language is placed in an important position. Rastall (2017) articulates that language exists for humans to communicate to each other in order to convey expressions among communicators rather than simply passing information from one to another in point form. Language, therefore, is a fundamental way of knowing each other in a social setting. This is a story of what communication might mean in general; however, what about in an early childhood educational setting? What are the ways in which children communicate with each other or educators? What are their purposes? Young children may or may not speak or write in the same way that adults do. As the Oxford dictionary suggest, if we use this ‘other medium’ to communicate, what would be the alternative way of communicating with each other and with young children?

Children’s Drawing as a Language

Binder and Kind (2017) claim that Steele, who recognized the importance of children’s drawing as a language in 1980s, reminds us to take seriously children’s drawing as a language. Kind and Lee (2017) note that children’s drawing as a language is comprehended as both social and cultural actions. While children are drawing, thoughts, narrations, investigations, communications, and certain experiences are all related (the authors are referring to Loris Malaguzzi’s notion of the hundred languages of children).

Kind and Lee (2017) write that the hundred languages of children, for Malaguzzi, is a metaphorical “theory of knowledge” (p. 101). The knowledge comes in the abundance of forms, different ways of knowing, seeing, communicating; hence, the word ‘hundred’ refers to multiple modes of meaning making. Binder and Kind (2017) add that children’s drawing means: “thinking of even every young children’s marks as intentional, investigative, relational, communicative, and a conventional act” (p. xx). They further explain that even the early stage of children’s drawing can be considered as a language to understand their way of knowing the world. Steele asserts during his interview with Binder and Kind (2017), that children tell their stories by using drawing as a communicative action. Kind and Lee (2017) also claim that concentrating solely on verbal language limits understandings of children’s theory or their learning process. Binder and Kind (2017) are concerned that today’s education tends to become more homogenized by a standardized way of viewing children’s knowledge, yet drawing can be the “language of communication” which matters to educators and children’s everyday lives and learning. In the learning, if we say that children are making meanings, then we must seriously see and acknowledge what children are doing as “inventive moments of thinking through drawing” (p. xxi).

Listening Pedagogically

In a field of early childhood education, several scholars such as Rinaldi, 2006; Thompson, 2009; Vecchi,; Davies, 2014; Moss, 2014; Pacini-Ketchabaw, Kind, & Kocher, 2017, recognize the significance in listening to children pedagogically. Referring to an educational system in Reggio Emilia, Italy, Moss (2014) explains that their education has gone beyond other educational systems’ notion of listening by putting theories into practice. For Reggio Emilia education, listening is “process of co-constructing meaning” (p. 100) in constant relationship amongst others as building and re-building personal theories while carefully listening to each other. Rinaldi (2006) calls it “pedagogy of listening” (p. 64). According to her, listening involves co-construction, which refers to teachers and learners working together through a pedagogical process to investigate new meanings. Drawing upon Rinaldi’s notion of listening, Thompson (2009; 2015) discusses Rinaldi’s idea and claims that listening requires multi-physical sensory awareness because it is a communicative way of viewing thoughts. Thompson (2015) emphasises that in such bodily listening, educators must pay attention not only to catch words or voices, but also to feel and to accept time, space, emotions, movements, thoughts and so forth from moment to moment. Vecchi (2010) suggests that such listening can be difficult; however ,this way of



listening to children is a vital practice that needs to be learned. Additionally, listening is a process that is supported by the particular aesthetics offered by children's art, the connections that children make in relation to others, the humorous way that children express their theories, and the provocative indeterminacy that educators seek. Vecchi (2010) also asserts that we listen to how children build their particular theories during their artistic experience. Another significant aspect in pedagogical listening that Pacini-Ketchabaw et al. (2017) suggest is an importance of learning from the unknown; the listeners search for "new ways of perceiving" to meet a different 'new' every time. In doing so, such "difference requires hospitality and openness", which "is imbued with the act of listening" (p. 36). Listening to children are "encounters with others" (Davies, 2014, p. 1). Listening to children welcomes a two-way relationship to construct knowledge together as a whole bodily event to meet new, to explore new, to think and wonder in the new. Pedagogical listening, hence, is not a one-way practice of transmitting a hegemonic truth. Considering drawing as language, listening is about being receptive, which allows us to open multiple entrances to intensify one's ideas and knowledge (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2017). After all, children are not the only protagonists of the learning journey (Thompson, 2009). Listening is perhaps an absolute accomplishment of interrelation.

Drawing as Representation

Drawing often can be understood as representation. Representation means, according to Eisner (2002), transforming the images or senses existing in human consciousness by working with the affordance or even constraints that materials offer. In this case, representation stabilizes the thoughts or the image once the representation is made. The changes can be made in this type of representation by editing the work. Lather (2007) might say editing as "cure towards better knowing" (p. 17). Another idea of representation that Eisner (2002) introduces and calls *mimetic* (p. 15), contains the art maker's tendency to represent. Children draw objects, such as animals, wishing them to look like what they see in real life. For instance, young children may draw the house in which they wish to live; hence, the drawn house does not necessarily look like the actual house in which they live. They are more interested in drawing the events or the story of their own rather than "mastering the ability to create verisimilitude" (p. 16). They may not be as interested in representing a given object to draw as they are in copying a random given-object, yet they are representing their wishful thoughts as an image. Steele, in the

discussion with Binder and Kind (2017), claims that children draw to tell stories by using lines. The more lines they use, the deeper it gets with the description of their details. In the process of making such drawing stories, children create meaningful symbols, but “not naturalistic representations” (p. 3) unconsciously. He adds; even if a child has a clear understanding that the symbol s/he creates represents her/his mother, s/he also recognizes that the symbol does not look like her/his mother in real life. In this case, children also use their words to clarify what their thoughts are on their drawing. Children, more specifically, tell the viewers their drawing is representative of their thoughts. For Steele, “children draw to tell a story or describe a situation or ‘a thing’”(p. 3). He asserts that drawing, for humans, is a way to reform “our perceptions, thoughts, feelings and memories’ (p. 5). He claims that “the articulation is in the brain; expression is the act of drawing” (p. 4). Adams (2018), while being based on Steele’s idea, further explains that children’s drawing as marks contains meanings, which is representative of their thoughts in various forms of symbols. These symbols can be understood as communicative language where meaning might be personal and only applicable to the drawer, or perhaps become “a public language” (p. 54) so that others are able to understand the drawer’s thoughts, emotions, and perception as being represented in their drawings.

Drawing as an Encounter

I remember in my kindergarten art class that a teacher put a flower in a vase and everyone drew the flower by staring at it. I often wonder what my teacher’s intention was: perhaps to know the materials? How to articulate the shape, lines, colours of the flower, or to represent it ‘well’ on the paper? Nonetheless, it is one way of making art. Yet, what if I drew in the kindergarten art class a flower that I grew with my grandmother, and had a discussion during the experience of drawing? What would have emerged from the experience rather than focusing on the end product? The way of making art, according to my kindergarten art class experience, might have been considered as what children could draw, but not what drawing could do. Pacini-Ketchabaw, et al. (2017) argue that representation may include children’s interests or even desires during their artistic engagement, yet “a depth of conceptual understanding” takes our learning through art beyond “liberal representations of self, experience, or knowledge”(p. 3). What, then, might be an alternative way? My discussion shifts to another possibility of drawing: drawing as an encounter. To engage with this idea, the notion of intra-action (Barad, 2007; Lenz Taguchi, 2010) supports further understanding.



According to Barad (2007), “the neologism ‘intra-action’ signifies the mutual constitution of entangled agencies” (p. 33). The difference between ‘interaction’ and ‘intra-action’ is whether there are direct predictable influences to the individual agencies. Whereas the former goes through a linear process, the latter emerges through complex rhizomatic relationships. Referring to Barad’s notion of intra-action, Lenz Taguchi (2010) articulates that humans are merely a part of the world, thus the knowledge construction occurs interdependently with others in the world around us. Furthermore, Lenz Taguchi suggests that we cannot separate ourselves from the world; we are “*of the world in a co-independency*” (p. 47 – italics in original). Meaning-making, in fact, does not happen without depending on non-humanistic materials as co-existing. Both human and other than human agencies compel the learning. Kind (2018), who works with young children in a studio as an atelierista, shares that the children’s interests in particular substances move from a place to another within their world. For instance, a character in children’s literature which previously appeared in their past experience, such as a monster in a book they read in a classroom, reappears during their exploratory gathering in the studio. This experience generates “conversations, enactments, and narrations in the images and metaphors that are evoked” (pp. 10-11), and drawing cannot help but be a part of it. In this process, agencies of children, materials, literature, and so forth co-exist and entangle in a space allowing each other’s idea and theory that are constructed through drawing to go beyond the representation. Drawing such encounters affects and provokes the drawers and the viewers to think deeper and feel the world in order to generate a constant process of covering new knowledge and recovering new concerns (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2017).

The Role of Art in Early Childhood Education

McArdle (2008) questions the purpose of using art in an educational space. Is it solely about teaching skills and adequate techniques to create a perfect final product, or is it for children to express themselves freely without collaboratively exchanging different ideas with others? While asserting the importance of process learning in children’s artistic engagement rather than relying on a “pre-cut” approach, Aune (2005) points out that her main focus in a process of children’s artistic engagement is “the study of shapes and colours [as] standard practice” as children’s “spontaneous play” that links to the “modernist aesthetic” such as the shapes and colours during their art-making process (p. 25). Conversely, considering artistic process as research, Kind (2010) writes that the significant

points during children's artistic engagement are the generation of "new perceptions, knowledge, and understandings" (p. 119) rather than counting on a particular pre-constructed understanding, or observing the "form of individual and personal expression" (Kind & Lee, 2017, p. 101). Kind (2010) also claims that the challenge in considering children's art as language being used in such a form of research is children's art being valued within the discourse of modernist elements of "design, ... individual skill development, or exploratory play" (p. 119). Similarly, Sunday (2015) notes that relying solely on modernist paradigms such as viewing children's art as an instrument to reveal their inner feelings limits what children's art can be.

If lines and colours are not the first priority to consider in children's drawing, then what could be the focus during the learning process? We, as educators, often discuss the importance of following children's interests. What if the children's interest is in the action of colouring princesses in the colouring books? Some may say that educators ignore this particular interest because it diminishes children's creativity or the drawing practice can be based on too much of an instrumental approach. However, in terms of focusing on children's interests in the work of early childhood education, Thomson (2009) shares an interesting aspect of the role of art. She notes that if educators understand children's interests based on psychological truth, then some may believe that choosing a superhero as an object for drawing can be problematic. She further explains that some educators or even parents may tend to imagine that the roughness and aggressiveness of a superhero might have a negative effect as children might represent themselves in the same way. However, she points out that the influence of the superhero is not an actual issue here. A focal point in the event of drawing is to make connections between materials and children, children and their peers, and finally children and adults when children are engaging with the objects or themes in which they are genuinely interested. In other words, the focus is not about what children choose to draw, but what happens and emerges in the space between children and others - both humans and non-humans are essential. It is highly relational.

Drawing as an In-Between Space Where Encounters Happen

Thompson (2009) describes this in-between space by relying on Wilson's concept of "third pedagogical space" (Wilson, 2007, cited in Thompson, p. 29) where educators and children fluidly linger to share learning both as organically making meaning and as being in a socially situated time and space rather than transmitting predetermined knowledge. Sunday (2015) also calls it "hybrid spaces of art-making" which contains



“struggle and resistance” (p. 234). Kind (2018) writes, when educators carefully pay attention to small moments in such a space, they begin to notice that the children are having difficulties in drawing a given object, for instance, a laying person. By conversing about what creates resistance, both the children and the educators uncover “problems in representation” (p. 11): Not to solve problems and be able to complete the drawing of the laying person, but to pay attention to the difficulty and struggles. In this way, the drawers go beyond representing the object by working through difficulties *in* drawing, not *of* drawing; in other words, they are not simply focusing on the accuracy, but also working towards a solution to close the learning. Instead, to open new possibility, experimentation as learning from unknown (Olsson, 2009; Kind, 2018) is welcomed in the third space. Kind (2018) describes as referring to Olsson: lingering in a process of building up problems, at the same time, feeling obliged to arrange situations for children to work with the problems and curiosities by paying attention, noticing, and listening to children’s concerns.

Additionally, in this type of space children go through physical and mental processes. At first, children become comfortable with how drawing materials work (Kind 2010; Pacini-Ketchabaw., et al 2017); for instance, to feel the texture of soft pastel to experience how it moves and makes lines on a paper and so forth. Once children are familiarized with the characteristics of materials, drawing might become a way of communication in order to tell what is taking place. For instance, when I worked with a group of four young children with black soft pastel in our drawing inquiry project, I noticed that the children’s way of exploring the material simultaneously showed their interests in the colour and the transferability that the soft pastel offered when covering their hands black. Once the children understood the affordability of the material, their drawing action was removed from the paper, and transferred to their hands at once. The next moment, instead of drawing with the soft pastel, the blackened hands became the drawing instrument by banging them on the paper to make handprints. In the meantime, they encounter difficulties with printing the hand clearly. Encountering difficulties with soft pastel through drawing, the children constructed concerns and reconstructed knowledge while their thoughts move across the third space.

Similarly, Kind and Lee (2017) observed that the children shared generative thoughts and stories based on their drawings with peers and educators. During an episode of drawing, for example, children talked about the moon visiting them. Because the moon was high up, a child suggested that it ‘fly’ like a bat. Another child suggested it was a butterfly. While children comically played with the sound of words – ‘bat fly’ and ‘butterfly,’ another child began to develop tangents and brought in unlikely connections to

add a new storyline. Multiple ideas were constantly generated in the particular time and space among humans and non-humans. Such dialogues in these ‘third pedagogical spaces’ are fluid, which offer the movement of multiple meanings and possibilities. With the pedagogical support of adults, children encounter something “new” with materials (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2017, p. 36) in terms of ideas, thoughts, and experiences within a mutual relationship. Fresh and personal ideas unexpectedly emerge as rhizome in various directions without a general ordering, numbering, tracing or binominal system. This whole phenomenon positions itself in the middle (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

Drawing as social practice

Sunday (2015) reveals that in a production of “moments of sociability” (p. 229) through drawing children build their own theory through art, which is also used to interpret and understand the world wherein they live. Objects in “relational art practice”, which, according to Sunday, means to make an action towards today’s societal confines thinking objects as non-central to the work of art making, but “to engender social relations and create encounters that open dialogue” (p. 235) amongst the art creators and the teachers. This concept in the process of learning with drawing is vital in terms of thinking about how children use drawing as a language and also what the adults’ role can offer during the learning process. Dean and Brown (2008) discuss that departing from “traditional ‘hands-off’ approach” (p. 341) is significant; in other words, children construct knowledge *with* others in a process. By conversing, children share different perspectives to add to their knowledge from their past, which makes their knowledge richer (Olsson, 2009). Negotiation during a drawing event, for example, allows children to pause and think to seek subjectivity rather than just copying what others ask them to practice. Dean and Brown (2008) encourage educators to take an active role in the event of drawing to model their personal value and aestheticism of art. During such experiences, children are invited to think freely, take risks, and be humorous together with other children (Kind & Lee, 2017).

Although children naturally desire to be heard (Sunday, 2015; Kind & Lee, 2017), Kind and Lee’s (2017) concern is that children are too often left alone when they draw. What needs to happen during children’s drawing process in order to keep the dialogues open? What does it mean not to leave children alone to draw? Binder and Kind (2017) articulate while interviewing Steele, if drawing is identified as a language, then “somebody has to be there to listen and respond to the drawing” (p. 8). Considering drawing as a language, a way of knowing others as social practice related to children’s world, concerns,



and interests, the act of responding is as important as listening to children's drawing as language. In terms of listening to children's drawing as language or even as stories, educators attend not only to the content of each child's drawing, but also their particular ideas, their strategies for composition, how children experience their drawing, and finally what impels their drawing and maintains its movement are also pivotal points (Kind & Lee, 2017). During one of my drawing inquiry projects, for instance, I began to notice that the texture of the pencil crayons on the paper, sounds of the pencils tapping, gestures that children unexpectedly add, and movement of facial expressions became an integral part of listening in order to notice children's thoughts and theories. To attend, for Pacini-Ketchabaw et al. (2017), is "to notice the world around us" (p. 39). The focal point of listening and attending is that the attenders are required to be aware of the in-between space and attend to how all protagonists and occurrences around them in the space are related to one another. Focus is, thus, on a relation, not solely on children's actions. As children and adults are together, situations are created in a social context through drawing (Kind & Lee, 2017). In this way, adults understand a culture of children and their world so that an inquiry endures as a learning journey (Thompson, 2008). In order to maintain this journey, the listener responds to the movement of a way of knowing, in this case drawing as language, while observing events proactively and feeling ready to be affected by others such as life of materials or the unknown that we encounter as all the protagonists in the artistic events relate to each other (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2017).

Closing Thoughts

Languages are inevitable instruments for human communication and drawing indisputably counts as one of them. A Montreal-born contemporary artist, Jessica Potenza (n.d.), notes that drawing signifies her life. Her love of horses and coffee gifted her opportunities to encounter new ways of drawing to articulate her feelings towards the object as a language. The drawing materials mixed with coffee provide a unique sensation and brings back equine memories. Her strong desire to "have the ability to communicate meaning without use of words" (para. 2) encourages my soul as an educator to understand and encounter the unknown and further collective inquiry with children through drawing as a language. This statement also resonates with the drawing conversation I experienced with a hearing-impaired boy. It was a moment of two people willing to continue a silent conversation mediated by drawing. Not as simply representing an object yet encountering

our new understanding of each other. In an educational setting, art offers a deeper sense. Drawing acts as a language and allows educators to maintain a reciprocal relationship with others to be able to attune and listen to the spirit of a space, children, and oneself to enter and re-enter to a new possible world of pedagogy. It is an on-going journey to encounter infinite surprises.



References

- Adams, E. (2017). Power drawing. In M. Binder and S. Kind (Eds.). *Drawing as Language: Celebrating the Work of Bob Steele* (pp. 49-62). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Aune, A. (2005). Building with colors and shapes: The modernist aesthetic for young children. *Art Education*, 58(1), 25-32.
- Barad, K. (2007). Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Binder, M., & Kind, S. (2017). *Introduction*. In M. Binder and S. Kind (Eds.). *Drawing as Language: Celebrating the Work of Bob Steele* (pp. xix-xxiii). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Binder, M. (2017). *In conversation with Bob Steele*. In M. Binder and S. Kind (Eds.). *Drawing as Language: Celebrating the Work of Bob Steele* (pp. 1-12). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Cabrera, L., & Weckert, J. (2013). Human enhancement and communication: On meaning and shared understanding. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 19(3), 1039-56. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.1007/s11948-012-9395-2>
- Dean, J. & Brown, R. (2008). Reflection, renewal and relationship building: An ongoing journey in early childhood arts education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 9(4), 339-353.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B, Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). The arts and the creation of mind. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Kind, S. (2010). Art encounters: Movements in the visual arts and early childhood education. In V. Pacini-Ketchabaw (Ed.), *Flows, rhythms, and intensities of early childhood education curriculum*, pp. 113-132. Rethinking Childhood series, New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kind, S. (2018). Collective improvisations: The emergence of the early childhood studio as an event-full place. In C. Thompson and C. Schulte (Eds.), *Communities of practice: Art, play, and aesthetics in early childhood* (pp. 5-21). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
- Kind, S. & Lee, C. (2017). Moon bear and the night butterfly: Exploring the pathways of children's drawing-stories. In M. Binder and S. Kind (Eds.). *Drawing as Language: Celebrating the Work of Bob Steele* (pp. 101-116). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts towards a double(d) science*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/book/5183>
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early childhood education: Introducing intra-active pedagogy. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McArdle, F. (2008). The arts and staying cool. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 9(4), 365-374.
- Olsson, L. M. (2009). *Movement and experimentation in young children's learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood education*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Kind, S. & Kocher, L. L. (2017). *Encounters with materials in early childhood education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Potenza, J. (n.d.). Jessica Potenza: Artist Statement. Retrieved from <https://www.jessicapotenza.com/about/>
- Rinaldi, C. (2006). *In dialogue with Reggio Emilia: Listening, researching and learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.



- Rastall, P. (2017). Representation and argument: Is communication the central purpose of language?. *La linguistique* 53(1), 69-86. doi: 10.3917/ling.531.0069.
- Sunday, K. E. (2015). Relational making: Re/imagining theories of child art. *Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research* 56(3), 228-240.
- Thompson, C. M. (2009). Mira! Looking, listening and lingering in research with children. *Visual Art Research* 35(1), 24-34.
- Thompson, C. M. (2015). Prosthetic imaging and pedagogies of early childhood art. *Qualitative Inquiry* 21(6), 554-561.
- Vecchi, V. (2010). *Art and Creativity in Reggio Emilia*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Author: Yuko Shimomura

Yuko is a student in the School of Education and Childhood Studies at Capilano University. She is currently working on her graduation project on *Story invention as a social practice in a studio setting*. She is also working as an early childhood educator at the University of British Columbia Childcare Services.