

Dečji vrtić kao prostor heterotopije

Milijana Lazarević¹

Visoka škola strukovnih studija za vaspitače i poslovne informatičare
„Sirmijum“, Sremska Mitrovica, Srbija

Apstrakt

Prostor dečjeg vrtića predstavlja integralni deo programa predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja, jer strukturiranje i korišćenje prostora odražavaju konceptijska polazišta programa. U ovom radu težili smo sagledavanju odnosa moći kojima je fizičko okruženje vrtića oblikovano, a koji su vidljivi kroz način na koji su strukturirani i način na koji se koriste zajednički prostori vrtića (holovi i hodnici). U istraživanju polazimo od Fukoovog koncepta heterotopije, kako bismo sagledali kontradiktornost i tenzije koje postoje u praksi vrtića, a koje imaju svoju fizičku manifestaciju u prostoru. Istraživanje je sprovedeno u jednom državnom vrtiću u Beogradu, uz učešće medicinske sestre – vaspitača i stručnog saradnika – pedagoga u analizi prostora putem intervju-ture kroz vrtić. Iskustvo učesnika istraživanja ukazuje na to da heterotopije unutar vrtića nastaju u pokušaju transformacije prakse od one zasnovane na hijerarhijskim odnosima moći ka praksi baziranoj na deljenju moći, kao i da stvaranje „drugih mesta“ u vrtiću doprinosi promeni načina učešća vaspitača, dece i porodice u korišćenju zajedničkih prostora vrtića.

Ključne reči: prostor dečjeg vrtića, Mišel Fuko, heterotopija, odnosi moći, intervju-tura

Uvod

U postavljanju teorijskog okvira istraživanja polazimo od Fukoovog koncepta odnosa znanja i moći (Fuko, 2012). Fuko nije eksplicitno polemisa o ovim pitanjima u kontekstu vaspitanja i obrazovanja u ranom detinjstvu, ali je svojim shvatanjem moći nastojao da rasvetli kako su moć i znanje oblikovani kroz društvo i oblikuju društvo, kako se prožimaju od institucije do pojedinaca kroz složenu mrežu odnosa, te kako se između ostalog manifestuju u fizičkom, tj. prostornom obliku. Fuko je odnose moći sagledavao u odnosu na realne, unutrašnje prostore, jer je smatrao da mi ne živimo u nekoj vrsti vakuuma, u prostoru u kome se mogu jasno razlučiti osobe i stvari, „već unutar jednog skupa odnosa koji određuje položaje nesvodive jedne na druge“ (Fuko, 2005: 31).

¹ vs.milijana.lazarevic@gmail.com

Pre nego što se upustimo u istraživanje fizičkih manifestacija odnosa moći u vrtiću, neophodno je napraviti distinkciju između pojmova *prostor* i *mesto*. U ovom radu prostor razumemo kao fizičko okruženje, „strukturu sveta, trodimenzionalno okruženje sačinjeno od objekata i događaja koji imaju relativan položaj i pravac“ (Harrison & Dourish, 1996: 2). Mesto predstavlja „prostor koji se vrednuje“ (Harrison & Dourish, 1996: 2), značenjski prostor „oblikovan ljudskim delovanjem, odnosima, emocijama, događajima i sećanjima vezanim za njega“ (Nairn et al, 2016: 5) koji je prožet „fluidnošću i oteľovljenim odnosima moći“ (Jobb, 2019: 214).

Istraživanjem organizacije prostora kao fizičkog okruženja dečjeg vrtića moguće je u njemu prepoznati mesta „koja imaju neobično svojstvo da ukidaju, obesnažuju ili preokreću skup odnosa koje sama oblikuju“ (Fuko, 2005: 31), a koji se u njima ogledaju. Ova mesta on deli na dva tipa: *utopije* i *heterotopije*.

Pojam „utopija“ potiče od grčkih reči *eu* što znači dobar i *topos* što znači „mesto“, kao i iz reči *ou* i *topos* koje označavaju „ne-mesto, tj. nepostojeće mesto“ (Mihajlović, 2016: 21). Utopije nisu stvarna mesta, „one predstavljaju odraz društva dovedenog do savršenstva, ili pak naličje društva, te su utopije prostori koji su u svojoj suštini nestvarni“ (Fuko, 2005: 31).

Heterotopije su stvarna, materijalna mesta, čiji se obrisi naziru u svakoj ustanovi društva i one predstavljaju svojevrsnu suprotnost utopijama. Reč „heterotopija“ je grčkog porekla i uključuje reč *heteros*, što znači „drugi“, „drugačiji“ i reč *topos* koja znači „mesto“, što zajedno čini „drugo mesto, ili mesto drugosti“ (Wood, 2020: 167). Heterotopija predstavlja dakle drugo mesto koje obuhvata ono što opisujemo kao fizički prostor, ali isto tako i društveni i kulturni prostor koji su u fizičkom sadržani i kojima je fizički prostor oblikovan. Heterotopija je istovremeno i realna, u smislu fizičkog prostora koji treba istraživati, i potpuno nestvarna, jer iako možda odražava društvo u kome postoji, ona funkcioniše po sopstvenim pravilima kojima je definisano (između ostalog) ko može ući u prostor i na koji način, šta je (ne)prihvatljivo u tom prostoru, kao i kakve prakse je moguće graditi u njemu. To znači da su heterotopije oblikovane mrežom odnosa moći kako unutar prostora tako i odnosa prostora sa društvom u kome se nalazi heterotopija (Ulla, 2017). Iz pozicije heterotopija, prostor dobija presudnu ulogu u istraživanju načina na koje funkcioniše društvo, jer ima sposobnost da „objedini sve moguće sadržaje određene kulture i da prikaže odnose moći u kondenzovanoj formi“ (Prodanović & Krstić, 2012: 426).

I sam Fuko je isticao da između utopija i heterotopija može da postoji „svojevrsan doživljaj mešanja“ (Fuko, 2005: 32), koji je opisao kroz „metaforu ogledala“ (Fuko, 2005: 32). Po njemu, ogledalo je jedna vrsta utopije, jer u njemu vidimo svoj odraz u jednom nestvarnom prostoru, prostoru koji ne postoji. Stvaranje odraza kao nečeg nematerijalnog je „analogno utopiji, dok materijalnost samog ogledala ukazuje na heterotopiju kao vid materijalizovane utopije“ (Mihajlović, 2016: 48). Tako, heterotopije predstavljaju mesta koja leže izvan svih mesta, „druga mesta“ (Fuko, 2005: 32) koja se ipak mogu lokalizovati.

Heterotopije predstavljaju „kontraprostore koje stvaraju odrasli – stvarna mesta smeštena izvan svih drugih prostora koja su predodređena da izbrišu, neutrališu, nadoknade ili pročiste prostore kojima se suprotstavljaju“ (Boyer, 2008: 53). Pored utopija i heterotopija, Fuko je u jednom svom gostovanju 1966. godine u radio-emisiji govorio

o „*lokalizovanim utopijama* koje su bliske i dobro poznate deci“ (Boyer, 2008: 53). Lokalizovane utopije „leže u dnu bašte, na tavanu ili u velikom roditeljskom krevetu u kome dete može da otkrije okean plivajući između pokrivača, ili pak krevet može postati šuma u koju se dete krije čekajući roditelje da se vrate“ (Boyer, 2008: 53). Možemo zaključiti da lokalizovane utopije nastaju u dečjoj igri u kojoj iako „stvarni fizički i društveni svet ne nestaje, njegovo prisustvo se izražava kroz drugu formu“ (Krnjaja, 2010: 266), kroz stvaranje „imaginarnih prostora kao paralelne realnosti koja vremenom može postati svakodnevna realnost“ (Krnjaja, 2010: 266).

Prostor vrtića predstavlja vidljivi iskaz o vrednostima koje vaspitači promovišu (Otto, 2005; Tarr, 2001, 2004) i sve što se u njemu nalazi, kao i način na koji je strukturiran, reflektuje teorijsko-vrednosne okvire na kojima se razvija vaspitno-obrazovna praksa. U istraživanju prostor vrtića sagledavamo u skladu s konceptijskim polazištima Osnova programa predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja „Godine uzleta“ (Osnove programa, 2018), kroz njegovo „fizičko, socijalno i simboličko značenje“ (Pavlović Beneselović i sar., 2022: 10). Vrtić sagledavamo kao prostor „demokratske prakse zajednice u kojoj se uzimaju u obzir interesi zajednice, porodice i dece“ (Osnove programa, 2018: 10). Takva praksa nije represivna, zasnovana na hijerarhijskoj raspodeli moći, već je „responzivna, bazirana na deljenju moći“ (Osnove programa, 2018: 10). Stoga fizičke manifestacije odnosa moći kojima je oblikovana praksa vrtića možemo prepoznati u fizičkom okruženju vrtića. Istraživanje prostora vrtića kao heterotopije predstavlja priliku da se dekonstruišu načini na koje deca i odrasli stupaju u interakciju u i sa prostorima vrtića (Jones et al., 2012, prema: Shaw, 2017), kao i priliku za sagledavanje odnosa moći koji vladaju u tim prostorima i kojima su oni oblikovani.

Deđji vrtić kao „drugo mesto“

Fuko je u svom radu *Druga mesta* (Fuko, 2005) dao prikaz načela kojima se heterotopije mogu identifikovati i opisati. Svako od načela u opisu koncepta heterotopija moguće je sagledati u odnosu na fizičko okruženje vrtića kao institucionalne forme predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja.

U prvom načelu govori se o tome da ne postoji kultura na svetu koja je lišena heterotopija, ali da heterotopije poprimaju različite forme, te da ne postoje njihovi univerzalni oblici. Fuko je istakao dva opšta tipa heterotopija: *heterotopije krize* i *heterotopije odstupanja* (Fuko, 2005). Heterotopije krize rezervisane su za osobe koje se nalaze u stanju krize, tj. stanju drugačijem od onoga koje je u društvu uobičajeno, pri čemu danas iščezavaju u oblicima u kojima su postojale u prošlosti (Fuko je naveo primer koledža iz 19. veka ili vojne obuke za dečake) i bivaju zamenjene heterotopijama odstupanja. Ove vrste heterotopija karakteristične su za one čije ponašanje odstupa od uobičajenog proseka ili propisane norme. Vrtići mogu biti sagledani kao mesta koja su na granici između heterotopije krize i heterotopije odstupanja, zbog toga što predstavljaju mesto gde se najčešće prvi put odvaja javno od porodice, kao i zbog osobenosti predškolskog uzrasta. Predškolski uzrast izdvaja se kao jedinstven i neponovljiv, jedini period života „sa toliko otvorenih mogućnosti, u kome čovek sa toliko energije, istrajnosti i entuzijazma razvija složene kapacitete od

kojih će zavisi njegove buduće mogućnosti, njegova ličnost i uspešnost funkcionisanja u daljem životu“ (Osnove programa, 2018: 3). Dečji vrtić, u odnosu na kontekst porodičnog vaspitanja, predstavlja određenu vrstu „društvene prakse“ (Fuko, 1998, prema: Miškeljin, 2022: 28), koju je nemoguće odvojiti od šireg društvenog konteksta (Miškeljin, 2012). Ipak, u odnosu na porodično vaspitanje dečji vrtić predstavlja i „mesto drugosti“, jer nezavisno od teorijsko-vrednosnih okvira na kojima gradi svoju praksu, neminovno je da vrtić deci pruža drugačija iskustva življenja u odnosu na porodično okruženje.

Drugo načelo podrazumeva heterogenost samih heterotopija, odnosno mogućnost da jedno društvo tokom istorije može preuzeti nove heterotopne strukture, te da „svaka heterotopija ima jasnu i određenu funkciju unutar društva, i jedna ista heterotopija, u zavisnosti od sinhronije kulture u kojoj se nalazi, može imati različitu funkciju“ (Fuko, 2005: 33). U skladu s ovim načelom – nega, vaspitanje i obrazovanje dece predškolskog uzrasta menjali su svoj oblik i načine ostvarivanja kroz istoriju. I sam termin *vrtić* nije konzistentan, te je u različitim kulturama i u različitim vremenskim periodima to mesto imalo različite nazive. U našoj zemlji je to prvo bilo *zabavište*, zatim *obdanište* i na kraju *dečji vrtić* po uzoru na termin „kindergarten“ koji je uveo tvorac prvih vrtića Fridrih Frebel (Miškeljin, 2012: 17). Tako je odrastanje predškolske dece kroz istoriju postalo društveno pitanje, a predškolsko vaspitanje i obrazovanje je sistemski uređeno i regulisano, te danas pored doprinosa porodice u razvoju i učenju deteta predškolskog uzrasta veliku ulogu ima i vrtić za onu decu koja ga pohađaju.

Treće načelo se odnosi na moć heterotopija da na jednom realnom mestu, unutar jednog prostora, postoji više različitih mesta, koja čak mogu biti nespojiva (Fuko, 2005). Neki autori su ovo načelo sagledali kroz primer *jukstapozicije* (Mihajlović, 2016; Shaw, 2017) – postojanje različitih mesta uz, pokraj, jedno pored drugog, pluralitet sadržaja koji ukazuju na mnoštvo oprečnih karakteristika ovih različitih mesta. Za razliku od utopije koja predstavlja jedinstvo ideja, vrednosti, uverenja i vizija budućnosti, heterotopije u sebi sadrže stvarna mesta u kojima se sučeljavaju različita razmišljanja, ideje i vrednosti. U vrtiću se jukstapozicijama mogu smatrati diskontinuiteti u dostupnosti različitih mesta unutar vrtića deci i odraslima, podvojenost igre i učenja, odnosi odraslih i dece zasnovani na hijerarhijskoj raspodeli moći, neusaglašenosti porodičnog i konteksta vrtića itd.

U okviru četvrtog načela razmatra se odnos heterotopije i vremena. S jedne strane postoje heterotopije vremena akumuliranih u beskonačnosti, kao što su muzeji i biblioteke, dok s druge strane postoje vremenski prolazne heterotopije kao što su, na primer, svetkovine (Fuko, 2005). Ovo načelo pokazuje da vreme u heterotopijama ne teče na isti način u odnosu na opšteprihvaćeni tok vremena. U vrtiću odrasli i deca dele isto vreme, ali načini na koji ga percipiraju znatno se razlikuju (Ulla, 2017). U savremenoj kulturi odrasli vreme najčešće doživljavaju linearno, vodeći se satom kao vremenskim orijentirima. Za decu vreme teče ciklično i nema svoje fizičke odrednice u formi sata. Umesto toga, deca vreme tumače onim što osećaju, vide, čuju i doživljavaju (Malakpa, 2007), kroz „trenutak u vremenu“ (Goble, 2020: 181) otevljen u događajima koji za njih imaju određeni smisao i značenje.

U petom načelu ističe se da heterotopije pretpostavljaju „uvek jedan sistem otvaranja i zatvaranja koji ih istovremeno izopštava i čini prohodnim“ (Fuko, 2005: 35). Hete-

rotopije, kako je istakao Fuko, imaju svojstvo čudnog oblika isključivanja, jer čak i kada svako može da uđe u neku heterotopiju, to predstavlja iluziju, jer „verujete da ste ušli, no u času kada ste unutra, isključeni ste“ (Fuko, 2005: 35). Vrtići takođe funkcionišu po sistemu otvaranja i zatvaranja, jer ne samo da imaju svoje radno vreme, već najčešće imaju i jasno definisana pravila kada i ko može ući u vrtić, kako se deca odvajaju i grupišu unutar uzrasnih grupa, kao i koji su prostori deci pri boravku unutra dostupni ili nedostupni. Kao što je Fuko naveo da ta uključenost predstavlja samo iluziju, tako se u vrtiću na primeru uključenosti porodica ovo načelo jasno odražava. Oni mogu ući u vrtić, ali samo u one prostore koje su im određeni kao dostupni (najčešće su to dečje garderobe, holovi i hodnici koji vode do grupe u kojoj njihovo dete boravi) i samo u određeno vreme tokom dana.

Šesto načelo koje određuje heterotopije odnosi se na njihovu funkciju stvaranja prostora privida, iluzije, ali takve da ona „razobličava svu iluzornost stvarnog sveta“ (Fuko, 2005: 35) ili pak stvaranje drugačijeg realnog prostora koji je savršeno uredan i dobro uređen, a koji je Fuko nazvao *heterotopijom kompenzacije*. Vrtići mogu predstavljati i heterotopije iluzije, ali i heterotopije kompenzacije. Heterotopije iluzije imaju tendenciju da filtriraju spoljašnje realnosti koje mogu biti neuredne ili nesavršene u poređenju s našim vizijama o tome kakvo detinjstvo, kakvo vaspitanje i obrazovanje i kakvu praksu vrtića želimo. Vrtići postaju heterotopije kompenzacije onda kada pokušavaju da usavrše prostor kroz organizaciju vremena i prostora, kroz profesionalizaciju prakse tako da profesionalci unutar vrtića omogućavaju deci drugačija iskustva u odnosu na ona koja imaju deca koja ne pohađaju vrtić (Shaw, 2017).

Metodološki okvir

Pitanje od kog smo pošli u ovom istraživanju odnosilo se na sagledavanje odnosa moći kojima je fizičko okruženje vrtića oblikovano na osnovu načela heterotopija koja su vidljiva u prostoru. Da bismo odgovorili na pitanje, istraživali smo kako prostor odražava odnose moći koji vladaju u vrtiću, tragali smo za značenjima koje prostor reflektuje kroz svoje fizičke manifestacije i kroz pisana i nepisana pravila u odnosu na mogućnosti korišćenja prostora.

Istraživanje je sprovedeno putem intervju-ture (engl. *walk-along interview*) (Franklin-Phipps & Gleason, 2019; Lynch & Mannion, 2016), kao istraživačke metode koja istraživaču pruža mogućnost da dok se kreće s učesnicima istraživanja kroz mesta koje zajedno istražuju „posmatra prostorne prakse *in situ* čime istovremeno pristupa i iskustvima i interpretacijama učesnika istraživanja“ (Kusenbach, 2003: 463). Intervju-tura čini vidljivim složenu mrežu odnosa moći u prostoru, te omogućava istraživaču da „korespondira s tokom događaja u prostoru prikupljajući podatke na participativan način“ (Lynch & Mannion, 2016: 335).

U okviru intervju-ture istraživač je s učesnicima, prolazeći kroz prostore vrtića, razgovarao o onome što u prostoru vide i doživljavaju. Intervju je bio polustrukturirani i težilo se tome da učesnici istraživanja budu što manje usmeravani, kako bi njihove priče očuvale autentični doživljaj i iskustvo koje su stekli tokom restrukturiranja prostora u vrtiću.

Istraživač je postavljao dodatna pitanja kako bi se sagledala iskustva učesnika vezana za stvaranje „drugih mesta“ u vrtiću, kao i za odnose moći koji se u njima prepoznaju.

Istraživanje je sprovedeno u jednom državnom vrtiću koji se nalazi na periferiji grada Beograda, u objektu koji je namenjen deci jaslenog uzrasta (od 1 do 3 godine), ali koji ima i dve grupe dece vrtićkog uzrasta (od 3 do 4 godine). U istraživanju je učestvovala medicinska sestra – vaspitač (koja je i rukovodilac objekta) i stručni saradnik – pedagog. U prikazu rezultata istraživanja termin „praktičari“ se odnosi na medicinske sestre – vaspitače, vaspitače, stručne saradnike i saradnike koji rade u vrtiću u kome je sprovedeno istraživanje. Termin „vaspitači“ koristimo kada govorimo o vaspitačima i medicinskim sestrama – vaspitačima.

Za potrebe ovog istraživanja fokusirali smo se na zajedničke prostore vrtića (holove i hodnike), sa ciljem promišljanja odnosa moći koje reflektuju, svesni da analiza celog prostora vrtića prevazilazi okvire ovog rada. Međutim, u interpretaciji rezultata istraživanja povremeno je postojala potreba da se određena situacija u praksi analizira u odnosu na širi kontekst ili da se referiše na ranije prakse u vrtiću, što je u interpretaciji i naznačeno.

Tokom intervju-a fotografisana su pojedina mesta u vrtiću koja su u razgovoru istaknuta kao važna za preispitivanje odnosa moći. Nakon početne analize, učesnici istraživanja su imali seriju dodatnih razmena (putem Viber grupe), tokom kojih su deljene fotografije izgleda prostora pre njegove transformacije i pokušaja stvaranja „drugih mesta“, ali i dodatni uvidi, komentari i tumačenja u odnosu na početnu analizu koju je istraživač podelio s učesnicima istraživanja.

U analizi smo pošli od „promišljanja kroz teoriju“ (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; 2013) iz potrebe da istraživačke podatke sagledamo u odnosu na Fukoovo shvatanje odnosa moći i heterotropija, ali i da izloženo shvatanje promišljamo u odnosu na prikupljene podatke (Mills, 2017). Analizi se pristupilo kroz nelinearno čitanje podataka (transkripta intervju-a, fotografija, video-zapisa, tekstualnih poruka) i izdvajanje pitanja, dilema i komentara koji su zatim podeljeni sa učesnicima istraživanja kroz razgovor. Nakon dobijanja novih uvida u razmeni istraživača i učesnika istraživanja pristupilo se ponovnom ukrštanju podataka i izdvajanju „sekvenci“ iz prakse. U interpretaciji podataka i diskusiji izdvojene su tri sekvence iz prakse koje su dovedene u vezu s određenim načelima heterotopija.

Rezultati i diskusija

Sekvenca 1: Verujete da ste ušli, no u času kada ste unutra, isključeni ste

Pri samom ulasku u vrtić vidljivo je obaveštenje o periodu kada su vrata vrtića otvorena, a kada se zaključavaju. To u praksi znači da u periodu kada su vrata zaključana roditelj može ući u vrtić tek nakon što mu neko od zaposlenih dozvoli pristup (otključavanjem vrata). Time se članovima porodice dece koja pohađaju vrtić šalje poruka u kom periodu mogu slobodno pristupiti vrtiću, a kada pristupaju uz odobrenje zaposlenih.

Stručni saradnik – pedagog tumači kako vidi funkciju obaveštenja za roditelje: *Roditelji mogu da ulaze u vrtić kada im odgovara, ne postoji doba dana kada se ne može ući u vrtić. Ali bih rekla da se oni nekako libe da uđu u tom periodu kada se vrtić zaključava. Iako im je rečeno da mogu, mislim da taj natpis ipak pravi neku barijeru, odnosno ruši dobrodošlicu.*

Postojanje ovakve procedure možemo dovesti u vezu s petim načelom heterotopija, po kome one predstavljaju sistem otvaranja i zatvaranja „koji ih istovremeno izopštava i čini prohodnim“ (Fuko, 2005: 35). Imajući na umu da postoji radno vreme vrtića kojim je određeno kada je vrtić prohodan, a kada izopšten u odnosu na sve učesnike vaspitno-obrazovne prakse, definisanje vremenskog okvira unutar radnog vremena u kojem je pristup vrtiću kontrolišu zaposleni dodatno vodi izopštavanju nekih njegovih članova (porodice dece koja pohađaju vrtić).

S načelom po kome heterotopije istovremeno predstavljaju sistem otvaranja i zatvaranja moguće je povezati i ustaljeni način organizovanja vaspitnih grupa u vrtićima. Dete upisom u vrtić postaje deo vrtićke zajednice dece različitih uzrasta i odraslih koji rade u tom vrtiću. Iako je vrtić dostupan svoj deci koja su u njega upisana, to ne mora podrazumevati i da su svi prostori vrtića jednako dostupni svoj deci. Istraživanja pokazuju da se u vrtićima dešava prostorna, uzrasna i socijalna segregacija dece (Pavlović Breneselović, 2015), jer ona najveći deo vremena u vrtiću provode u svojoj radnoj sobi, u kontaktu samo s decom i vaspitačima svoje grupe.

U vrtiću u kome smo sprovedli istraživanje praktičari su inicirali promenu ovakvog načina organizovanja vaspitnih grupa. Dok razgovaramo u hodniku, jedan tata dolazi po svoje dete i zbunjeno obaveštava medicinsku sestru – vaspitača da njegovo dete nije u svojoj sobi. Ona mu odgovara da su u sobi pored i da slobodno pokuca tamo, a zatim objašnjava istraživaču zbog čega su se organizovali tako da grupe budu „otvorene“, tj. da deca jedne grupe mogu koristiti prostore i igrati se sa decom drugih grupa.

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *Znate ranije je bilo – moja deca, moja grupa, moj vaspitač, ja ih imam danas četiri, vi sedamnaestoro [dece]... ovako je mnogo lakše i deci i nama. Ali potrebno je da se vaspitač prebaci u glavi, bilo je problema, i te kako. Ali ne prija svakom promena. E onda smo njih polako, prvo sa koleginicom koja je spremna, pa mic po mic, to je strategija bila kompletna. E sad smo svi u tome.*

Može se uočiti da promene u organizaciji i „otvaranje“ drugih mesta za decu nisu proistekli iz kritičkog preispitivanja da prostor podržava konceptijska polazišta Osnova programa predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja „Godine uzleta“ (Osnove programa, 2018), već iz realnih teškoća s kojima se vaspitači suočavaju u praksi, a pre svega zbog nedostatka vaspitnog osoblja.

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *Da vam kažem, i dalje postoje ti vaspitači koji ne daju tu moć, već je „moja deca – moja soba“. Imate koleginicu kojoj baš ne prija. Ali kada ona ima situaciju da jednog dana ona ima osamnaestoro a ja četvoro [dece], šta ćemo onda? Tada se shvati da je svima bolje. Deci prvenstveno. Jer zamislite sad godinu dana dolaze samo u ovu sobu. I kakve god materijale vi da imate i menjate, to su ista lica, ista soba. A desilo nam se i da su se neka deca tako povezala, evo na primer A. i L. Oni su se toliko zbližili i tako se lepo igraju, da smo u ovako otvorenim grupama mogli da ih spojimo da često budu zajedno. A nisu bili ista grupa.*

Ovakve vrste promena doprinose da se dešavaju i neke nove i drugačije interakcije između različitih učesnika prakse vrtića, „što vodi ka promeni njihovih uzajamnih odnosa i jačanju osećaja pripadanja i povezanosti“ (Krnjaja i Purešević, 2020: 228). Navedene promene nisu tekle bez otpora, ali su vodile ka novim uvidima vaspitača, što je otvorilo prostor za građenje odnosa između dece koja do tada nisu imala priliku za takvu vrstu interakcije s vršnjacima van svoje grupe. Ovaj primer možemo posmatrati i kroz Fukoovo viđenje moći kao fluidne, jer svaki učesnik vaspitno-obrazovne prakse istovremeno i doživljava i vrši moć (Jobb, 2019). U ovom slučaju, kada deca praktikuju moć i imaju priliku da biraju prostor u kojem će se igrati i decu s kojom će se igrati, novi odnosi koje su gradili s decom drugih grupa uticali su na vaspitače da preispitaju svoju ustaljenu praksu i da je u skladu s tim uvidima menjaju.

Sekvenca 2: Linearni i ciklični tok vremena

Zajednički prostor koji je najfrekventniji, kroz koji prolaze svi koji uđu u vrtić, jeste veliki hodnik gde su smešteni dečji ormarići s garderobom. Taj prostor ranije nije pozivao roditelje i decu da u njemu borave duže i da se u njemu igraju. Naprotiv, on je ranije služio za odlaganje viška nameštaja i opreme (Fotografija 1).

Fotografija 1

Deo glavnog hodnika vrtića pre uređenja prostora



Fotografisano 2022. godine. Izvor: arhiva učesnika istraživanja

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač ističe da je ovaj prostor najveće promene pretrpeo u poslednjih godinu dana. Kada su se upustili u promišljanje kako da zajednički prostor emituje dobrodošlicu porodici, prvo su sklonili sav nameštaj i opremu i na to mesto stavili sto, stolice i par knjiga (Fotografija 2).

Fotografija 2

Prostor hodnika nakon sklanjanja nameštaja

Fotografisano 2022. godine. Izvor: arhiva učesnika istraživanja

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *Kada smo nameštaj sklonili, ostao je prazan prostor u koji smo stavili za početak sto i stolicu. Onda smo promišljali šta bismo mogli da formiramo, a da bude inspirativno i deci i roditeljima. Zahvaljujući podršci i pomoći roditelja, dobili smo nameštaj od paleta koji su nam oni napravili. Jedna mama je sa suprugom napravila taj nameštaj, a onda sa nama učestvovala u uređenju ovog dela prostora.*

Ideja praktičara bila je da u ovom prostoru članovi porodice mogu da se informišu o novoj programskoj koncepciji kroz dostupan Programski dokument (Osnove programa, 2018) i dodatne brošure, čitaju priče o projektima koji su se u vrtiću u prethodnoj godini razvijali, čitaju literaturu iz oblasti roditeljstva ili da s decom čitaju knjige. Medicinska sestra – vaspitač i pedagog u razgovoru dele svoj utisak da se i dalje ujutru tu roditelji manje zadržavaju, dovedu dete i žure na posao, ali da se situacija u popodnevним časovima, kada dolaze po dete, znatno promenila otkad je prostor dobio novi oblik.

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *Kada smo promenili prostor, imali smo situaciju da onda roditelji dođu i ne provode samo deset minuta, već je jedan tata čekao u kolima majku koja je došla po dete skoro sat vremena. On se čovek uplašio, ušao u vrtić i pitao mamu: „Pa dobro gde ste vi?“ One su sele u biblioteku, čitale knjige, došle ovde oblačile kostime i to je trajalo. Pritom je to jedan od „nezgodnih tata“ gde ni saglasnost za fotografisanje, ništa nije bilo potpisano. Nakon toga je sve bilo potpisano. Sada nam se roditelji poprilično zadržavaju.*

Na ovom primeru možemo prepoznati kako je stvaranje drugih mesta u vrtiću uticalo na promenu percepcije vremena odraslog. Dok je otac vreme merio linearno (putem sata), majka je sa detetom bila u „dogadajnom vremenu“ (Goble, 2020), koje ima svoj drugačiji tok. U cikličnom doživljaju vremena ono se ne može izmeriti, te se iz vrtića odlazi ne u odnosu na vreme prikazano na satu, već kada je za to „najpovoljniji trenutak“ (Malakpa, 2007).

Kroz ovo iskustvo promene zajedničkog prostora možemo uočiti i kako se menjao odnos roditelja prema vrtiću. Kada su dobili priliku da vide i iskuse kako se njihovo dete igra u vrtiću, kada su i sami bili u ulozi saigrača s detetom, to je doprinelo građenju osećaja pripadanja zajednici vrtića, a samim tim i jačanju odnosa poverenja s vaspitačima.

Sekvenca 3: „Posmatračnica za ptice“ – heterotopijsko stvaranje mesta

Dolazimo do stepenica koje vode na sprat vrtića. Medicinska sestra – vaspitač zasta-je kod prostora ispod stepeništa i počinje priču o tome kako je ovaj prostor menjao svoj oblik i namenu.

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *Imamo, deca su ih krstila, Ćiru i Jovanku. Ćira i Jovanka su povelike sove. Sove nam često ispadaju ovde iz gnezda. I jednog dana ja ovde prolazim i ona tu stoji i gleda me, sova [pokazuje rukom na prozor pored stepeništa]. Kada se sova pojavila u dvorištu, nju su deca iz trpezarije videla i počela da komentarišu. I onda smo mi [vaspitači] sele i razmišljale kako to da iskoristimo, jer ej imamo sove, a sove nisu baš svakodnevice. A ovaj deo [ispod stepeništa] nam ni za šta nikad nije služio, jer je nizak, nebezbedan, zbog ćoškova i ivica. Ali čekajte, to se plašimo mi. Dete je u ovoj visini [pokazuje rukom], kako će da udari u ivicu?*

Fotografija 3

Prostor ispod stepeništa pre uređenja i ilustracija pozicije vaspitača u odnosu na prostor dok je govorio o njegovoj bezbednosti



Fotografisano 2022. godine. Izvor: arhiva učesnika istraživanja

Momenat u kome medicinska sestra – vaspitač pokazuje rukom na visinu stepeništa da bi opisala kako je to prostor adekvatan za decu (Fotografija 3) obojio je razgovor više nego što je to vidljivo u tekstu. Naša neverbalna komunikacija, ton kojim je razgovor tekao dalje i osećaj ponosa koji je lebdeo u prostoru dok govori ukazivali su na to da je za medicinsku sestru – vaspitača ovaj primer veoma važan i da ga smatra prekretnicom u preispitivanju i osveščivanju uloge odraslih u oblikovanju fizičkog okruženja vrtića, kao i inspiracijom za pokretanje promene u ovom prostoru (Fotografija 4).

Medicinska sestra – vaspitač: *A onda pošto su ptice uglavnom s te strane, i te sove su bile isključivo u tom delu dvorišta, onda smo upravo ovu celinu osmislili za to da se oni [deca] kriju, šunjaju, jer kiša je tih dana često padala i kroz prozor smo mogli da posmatramo ptice, kada ne izađemo u dvorište. Napravili smo jednu posmatračnicu, oni to zovu „ptičarnik“, deca. Tu oni vole i da se skrivaju, ulaze ovde, malo za nas odrasle je nezgodno da se zavučemo, ali oni uživaju.*

Fotografija 4

Prostor ispod stepeništa kao „Posmatračnica za ptice“



Napomena: strelicom je obeležen prozor kroz koji deca posmatraju ptice u dvorištu vrtića

Stvaranjem ovakvih „drugih mesta“ nastaju novi odnosi, koji pozicioniraju decu i odrasle kao ravnopravne „stanovnike“ vrtića kao mesta zajedničkog učenja i učešća. Oslanjajući se na Fukoov koncept heterotopija, Adlerštajn-Grimberg i Bralić-Eševeria (Adlerstein-Grimberg & Bralic-Echeverría, 2021) kreirale su pojam *heterotopijskog stvaranja mesta* kao opis za ovakve alternativne načine stvaranja novih mesta u vrtiću, uz učešće i agensnost dece i odraslih, što vodi i promeni odnosa moći. U ovom slučaju vaspitači su prepoznali zainteresovanost dece za posmatranje sova u dvorištu vrtića, ali su i preispitali svoje predrasude i strahove u vezi s korišćenjem određenih prostora kao što je prostor ispod stepeništa. Deca su pak imala svoje teorije kako ovo mesto može da se koristi i pored predviđenog (za posmatranje sova), koriste ga za skrivanje i osamljivanje. Ovaj primer

heterotopijskog stvaranja mesta može otvoriti mogućnost za susretanje heterotopije i lokalizovane utopije, što dalje može voditi do građenja novog, „koautorskog prostora“ (Krnjaja, 2012) koji nastaje u igri u kojoj odrasli i deca dele moć i time „stvaraju prostore u kojima njihove ideje postaju koautorizovane“ (Krnjaja, 2012: 274).

Zaključak

Istraživanja dečjeg vrtića kao prostora heterotopije imaju značajan potencijal za preispitivanje odnosa moći koji vladaju na svim nivoima sistema predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja – od nivoa odnosa obrazovnih politika i predškolskih ustanova do nivoa odnosa dece i vaspitača. Ovim istraživanjem zahvatili smo tek obrise heterotopijskih mesta u vrtiću i ukazali na neke od mogućih načina njihovog stvaranja u ustanovama predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja. U istraživanju smo tragali za „tananim kanalima“ (Fuko, 2012) kroz koje moć teče i preliva se unutar vrtića, imajući na umu da je „svako u osnovi nosilac neke moći, i u toj meri prenosi moć“ (Fuko, 2012: 77).

Iskustva koje su učesnici delili u fokus stavljaju njihovo preispitivanje funkcije i karakteristika fizičke sredine i iniciranje transformacije zajedničkih prostora vrtića, s idejom da će te promene doprineti transformaciji postojećih obrazaca moći u odnosima između različitih učesnika vaspitno-obrazovne prakse u dečjem vrtiću (pre svega vaspitača, dece i porodice). Istraživanje pokazuje da promenama u prostoru ovog vrtića nije uvek prethodilo promišljanje i preispitivanje odnosa moći, ali kada su se desile, promene su gotovo uvek vodile novim uvidima praktičara. Ti uvidi najpre govore o novim načinima učešća vaspitača, dece i porodice u korišćenju prostora vrtića, a time i o promeni njihovih odnosa. Teškoće u ostvarivanju nekih promena, kao što je mogućnost igre dece različitih grupa i „otvaranje“ radnih soba za decu drugih grupa, dovele su do eksplicitnijeg uočavanja neravnoteže u odnosima moći. U tom procesu postala je vidljiva potreba nekih vaspitača da imaju „moć“ i kontrolu nad kretanjem dece s kojom rade. Iskustva praktičara u ovom vrtiću pokazuju da su oni prilikom pokretanja promena u prostoru glavni oslonac tražili među svojim kolegama („Onda smo promišljali [vaspitači i stručni saradnik – pedagog] šta bismo mogli da formiramo, a da bude inspirativno i deci i roditeljima“; „I onda smo mi [vaspitačice] sele i razmišljale kako to da iskoristimo“). Fokus na promene u zajedničkim prostorima vrtića doprineo je da vaspitači „izađu iz izolovanosti svoje radne sobe“ (Pavlović Beneselović i sar., 2022: 84) i da kroz deljenje ideja, dilema, pitanja, zajedničko rešavanje problema i zajednički rad na promenama u prostoru s drugim vaspitačima i stručnim saradnikom – pedagogom grade odnose zasnovane na deljenju moći. Pokretanje promena u zajedničkim prostorima vrtića predstavlja dobru polaznu osnovu u procesu transformacije prakse, jer ove prostore vaspitači lakše dele s drugima, tj. ne doživljavaju ih svojim ličnim prostorom, kao što neretko imaju taj odnos prema sobi vaspitne grupe u kojoj rade (što je i vidljivo u predstavljenom primeru „otvaranja“ radnih soba).

Sprovedeno istraživanje ukazuje na kompleksnost procesa promene paradigme na kojoj je zasnovana postojeća praksa, jer čak i kada se fokusiramo samo na promene u fizičkom okruženju vrtića, možemo primetiti da one ne teku linearno, već kroz građenje

„mesta između – nabora koji predstavljaju prostornu transformaciju kroz koju se uočavaju novi prostorni identiteti“ (Kornberger & Clegg, 2003: 84). Novi obrasci moći nastaju upravo u tim „naborima“, mestima na marginama ustaljene prakse, koji osporavaju ustaljene odnose i koji po svojim karakteristikama predstavljaju heterotopije.

Ovo istraživanje pruža nove uvide u razumevanju uloge i značaja fizičkog okruženja za građenje prakse vrtića zasnovane na deljenju moći, kao i uvide o načinima na koje promene u fizičkom okruženju dovode do promena u odnosima učesnika vaspitno-obrazovne prakse. U ovom radu fokus je na sagledavanju odnosa moći kroz analizu zajedničkih prostora dečjeg vrtića, te je značajno pokrenuti nova istraživanja koja bi obuhvatila druge nivoe vaspitno-obrazovne prakse, ali i ukupnog sistema predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja. Time bi odnosi moći koji oblikuju praksu predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja mogli biti sagledani u odnosu na širi društveni kontekst.

Literatura

- Adlerstein-Grimberg, C. Y. & Bralic-Echeverria, A. (2021). Heterotopic place-making in learning environments: Children living as creative citizens. *Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 14(1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.m14.hpml>
- Boyer, C. (2008). The many mirrors of Foucault and their architectural reflections. In M. Dehaene, & L. De Caeter (Eds.), *Heterotopia and the city: public space in a postcivil society* (pp. 53-75). Routledge.
- Franklin-Phipps, A. & Gleason, T. (2019). Walking Methodologies with/in Teacher Education. *Journal of Public Pedagogies*, 4(1), 228-234. <https://doi.org/10.15209/jpp.1193>
- Fuko, M. (2005). Druga mesta. U P. Milenković i D. Marinković (ur.), *Mišel Fuko: Hrestomatija* (str. 29-36). Vojvođanska sociološka asocijacija.
- Fuko, M. (2012). *Moć i Znanje: Odabrani spisi i razgovori 1972-1977*. Mediteran Publishing.
- Goble, E. (2020). From kairos to chronos: The lived experience of time in education. In P. Howard, T. Saevi, A. Foran & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Phenomenology and Educational Theory in Conversation: Back to Education Itself* (pp. 179-197). Routledge.
- Harrison, S., & Dourish, P. (1996). Re-place-ing space: The roles of place and space in Collaborative systems. *Proceedings of the 1996 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (pp. 67-76). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/240080.240193>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412471510>
- Jobb, C. (2019). Power, Space, and Place in Early Childhood Education. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/ Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 44(3), 211-232. <https://doi.org/10.29173/cjs29596>
- Kornberger, M., & Clegg, S. (2003). The Architecture of Complexity. *Culture and Organization*, 9(2), 75-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759550302804>

- Krnjaja, Ž. (2010). Igra, stvaralaštvo, otvoreni vaspitni sistem: šta ih povezuje. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 59(2), 264–277.
- Krnjaja, Ž. (2012). Igra kao susret: koautorski prostor u zajedničkoj igri dece i odraslih. *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 7(1), 251–267.
- Krnjaja, Ž. i Purešević, D. (2020). Participacija pedagoga u promeni kulture dečjeg vrtića. U L. Radulović, V. Milin i B. Ljujić (ur.) *Participacija u obrazovanju - pedagoški (p)ogledi: zbornik radova* (str. 226-233). Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Pedagoško društvo Srbije.
- Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street Phenomenology. *Ethnography*, 4(3), 455–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146613810343007>
- Lynch, J., & Mannion, G. (2016): Enacting a place-responsive research methodology: walking interviews with educators. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 16(4), 330-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14729679.2016.1163271>
- Malakpa, S. (2007). Chronos and Kairos: temporal concepts with implications for classroom instruction and national development. *Liberian studies journal*, 32(1), 94-103.
- Mihajlović, J. (2016). *Savremeni prostori heterotopija u arhitekturi* (doktorska disertacija). NaRDUS (123456789/7791).
- Mills, T. (2017). Mangling Expertise Using Post-Coding Analysis to Complexify Teacher Learning. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(3), 128-144.
- Miškeljin, L. (2012). Dečji vrtić kao kulturni artefakt vrtić iz sociokulturne perspektive. U T. Grujić (ur.). *Zbornik radova Visoke škole strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača* (str. 11-28). Visoka škole strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača u Kikindi.
- Miškeljin, L. (2022). *Detinjstv(a) – konceptualizacije i kontekstualizacije: implikacije za praksu predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja*. Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Nairn, K., & Kraftl, P., & Skelton, T. (2016). *Space, Place, and Environment: Geographies of Children and Young People*. Springer.
- Osnove programa predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja – Godine uzleta* (2018). Prosvetni glasnik, Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, br. 16/2018.
- Otto, L. (2005). Materialitet, identitet og erindring. In M. Kraglund, & L. Otto (Eds.), *Materialitet og dannelse* (pp. 33-47). Denmark's Pedagogiske Universitetes Forlag.
- Pavlović Breneselović, D. (2015). *Gde stanuje kvalitet (Knjiga 2): Istraživanje sa decom prakse dečjeg vrtića*. Filozofski fakultet Univerzitet u Beogradu: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju.
- Pavlović Beneselović, D., Krnjaja, Ž. i Backović, S. (2022). *Vodič za uređenje prostora u dečjem vrtiću – Prostor u skladu sa osnovama programa PVO „Godine uzleta“*. Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja.
- Prodanović, S. i Krstić, P. (2012). Javni prostor i slobodno delanje: Fuko vs. Lefevr. *Sociologija*, 54(3), 423-436. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC1203423P>

- Shaw, L. J. (2017). *Heterotopia and Hauntings: Troubling the Spaces and Artefacts of Early Years' Education and Care in England* (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Early Childhood Studies the Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Tarr, P. (2001). Aesthetic codes in early childhood classrooms: What art educators can learn from Reggio Emilia. *Art Education*, 54(3), 33-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2001.11653447>
- Tarr, P. (2004). Consider the walls. *Young Children*, 59(3), 88-92.
- Ulla, B. (2017). Reconceptualising sleep: Relational principles inside and outside the pram. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 18(4), 400-408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491177427>
- Wood, J. (2020). Children as heterotopians: town planning with and for children. In M. Khan, S. Bell, & J. Wood (Eds.), *Place, Pedagogy and Play: Participation, Design and Research with Children* (pp. 165-179). Routledge.

Primljeno: 10. 04. 2023.

Korigovana verzija primljena: 19. 10. 2023.

Prihvaćeno za štampu: 09. 12. 2023.

The Kindergarten as a Space of Heterotopia

Milijana Lazarević¹

Preschool Teacher Training and Business Informatics College of Applied Studies –
Sirmium, Sremska Mitrovica, Serbia

Abstract

The space of the kindergarten is an integral part of the pre-school education programme, in view of the fact that the manner in which the space is structured and used, also reflects the conceptional fundamentals of the programme. In this paper, we have strived to explore the relations of power that shape the physical environment of the kindergarten, being also visible in the structure of the kindergarten and the way its communal spaces (halls and corridors) are used. In our research, we have proceeded from Foucault's concept of heterotopia, in order to gain a profound understanding of the contradictions and the tension existing in the practice of the kindergarten, which are manifested in the space physically. The research was conducted in a public kindergarten in Belgrade, with the participation of a nurse-educator and an expert associate-pedagogue in the process of analysing the space, which was performed by a walk-along interview tour of the kindergarten. The experience of the participants in the research indicates that heterotopias within the kindergarten emerge from the attempt to transform the practice from the one based on hierarchical relations of power, to a practice based on the sharing of power, as well as highlighting that creating 'other places' in the kindergarten contributes to changing the way the educators, the children, and their families are involved in the utilisation of the communal spaces within the kindergarten.

Keywords: *kindergarten space, Michel Foucault, heterotopia, relations of power, walk-along interview.*

Introduction

In defining the theoretical scope of the research, our point of departure was Foucault's concept of the relationship between knowledge and power (Foucault, 2012). Foucault did not explicitly polemicise about these issues in the context of early childhood education, however, applying his understanding of power, he endeavored to clarify how power and knowledge are constituted in society and how the society is shaped by them, the way they pervade each other from the institution to the individual through a complex network of relations, and how they are manifested, among the rest, in their physical, i.e.

¹ vs.milijana.lazarevic@gmail.com

spatial form. Foucault explored the relations of power with regard to real, internal spaces, arguing that we do not live in a kind of vacuum, in a space where persons can be clearly distinguished from objects, but 'rather, within a set of relations that define positions which cannot be mutually subsumed' (Foucault, 2005, p. 31).

Before we delve into the research of the physical manifestations of the relations of power in the kindergarten, it is necessary to make a distinction between the concepts of *space* and *place*. In this paper, space is perceived as a physical environment, a 'structure of the world, three-dimensional environment comprised of objects and events taking a relative position and direction' (Harrison & Dourish, 1996, p. 2). A place represents a 'space which is valued' (Harrison & Dourish, 1996, p. 2), a semantic space 'shaped by human activity, relations, emotions, events, and memories relating to it' (Nairn & Kraftl, 2016, p. 5) pervaded by 'fluidity and embodied power relations' (Jobb, 2019, p. 214).

In exploring the organisation of space as a physical environment within the kindergarten, it is possible to identify places within it 'that have the unusual feature of abolishing, disempowering, or reversing the set of relationships shaped by themselves' (Foucault, 2005, p. 31), which are mirrored in them. He divides these places into two types: *utopias* and *heterotopias*.

The concept of 'utopia' originates from the Greek words *eu* meaning good, and *topos* meaning 'place', as well as from the words *ou* and *topos* meaning 'non-place, i.e. non-existent place' (Mihajlović, 2016, p. 21). Utopias are not real places, 'they are the reflection of a society which has attained perfection, or, nonetheless, the reverse of the society, and therefore, utopias are spaces which are essentially unreal' (Foucault, 2005, p. 31).

Heterotopias are real, material places, the outlines of which can be discerned in any institution of the society, and they are a specific opposite of utopias. The word 'heterotopia' is of Greek origin, and it includes the word *heteros*, meaning 'other', 'different', and the word *topos* meaning 'place', the two coined together denoting 'other place, or a place of otherness' (Wood, 2020, p. 167). Heterotopia, therefore, represents other places which comprise what we describe as physical space, as well as representing the social and cultural space contained in the physical space, and at the same time shaping the physical space. Heterotopia is, concurrently, both real, in the sense of a physical space that is to be explored, and absolutely unreal, because, even though it reflects the society within which it exists, it functions according to its own rules defining (among the rest) who can enter the space and in which manner, what is (un)acceptable in that space, as well as what practices can be developed within it. This means that heterotopias are constituted by a network of relations of power, both within the space, and within the relationships between the space and the society where the heterotopia is situated (Ulla, 2017). From the perspective of heterotopias, space acquires a decisive role in exploring how the society functions, because it has the capacity of 'integrating all the possible contents of a certain culture and presenting the relations of power in their condensed form' (Prodanović i Krstić, 2012, p. 426).

Foucault, himself, stressed that there may be a 'specific mixed experience' in relation to utopias and heterotopias, which he described using the 'mirror metaphor' (Foucault, 2005, p. 32). According to him, a mirror is a type of utopia, because what we can see in it, is our own reflection in an unreal space, one that does not exist. Creating a reflection as

something immaterial is, 'analogous to utopia, while the materiality of the mirror itself, points to the heterotopia as being a form of materialised utopia' (Mihajlović, 2016, p. 48). Thus, heterotopias are places outside any other place, 'other places' (Foucault, 2005, p. 32) which can, nevertheless, be localised.

Heterotopias are 'counter-spaces created by adults' – real places situated outside any other space, predestined to erase, neutralise, compensate for, or purify the spaces they are opposed to' (Boyer, 2008, p. 53). In a radio programme in 1966, apart from discussing utopias and heterotopias, Foucault also referred to '*localised utopias* which are close and well-known to children' (Boyer, 2008, p. 53). Localised utopias 'are at the far end of the garden, on the attic, or in the large parents' bed, where the child can discover an ocean swimming inbetween the sheets, or moreover, the bed can become a forest where the child hides waiting for its parents to return' (Boyer, 2008, p. 53). We can conclude that localised utopias emerge in children's play where, even though the 'real physical and social world does not vanish, its presence is expressed in a different form' (Krnjaja, 2010, p. 266), by creating 'imaginary spaces as a parallel reality that can become everyday reality over time' (Krnjaja, 2010, p. 266).

The space of the kindergarten represents a visible statement about the values promoted by the educators (Otto, 2005; Tarr, 2001; 2004), and everything within it, as well as the way in which it is structured, reflects the theoretical-value framework underlying the development of the training-educational practice. In our research, we have addressed the space of the kindergarten in accordance with the conceptual fundamentals of the Pre-school Curriculum Framework *The Years of Ascent* (The Curriculum Framework, 2018), in the context of its 'physical, social, and symbolical meaning' (Pavlović Beneselović i sar., 2022, p. 10). The kindergarten has been viewed as a space of a 'democratic practice of the community, which takes into account the community, the family and the children' (The Curriculum Framework, 2018, p. 10). Such a practice is neither repressive, nor based on a hierarchical distribution of power, but rather, 'responsive, based on the sharing of power' (The Curriculum Framework, 2018, p. 10). Hence, the physical manifestations of the relations of power shaping the practice in the kindergarten can be identified in the physical environment of the kindergarten. Exploring the kindergarten space as a heterotopia provides an opportunity for deconstructing the interaction that the children and the adults have *in* the spaces within the kindergarten and *with* such spaces (Jones et al., 2012, as cited in Shaw, 2017), as well as for understanding the relations of power prevailing in these spaces, and shaping them.

The Kindergarten as the 'Other Space'

In his paper *Of Other Spaces*, Foucault (2005) presents the principles based on which heterotopias can be identified and described. Each of the principles in the description of the concept of heterotopias, can be observed in the context of the physical environment of the kindergarten as an institutional form of pre-school education.

In the first principle it is said that no culture in the world is deprived of heterotopias, however, heterotopias take on different forms, and therefore, they do not have a universal

form. Foucault emphasises two general types of heterotopia: *crisis heterotopias* and *deviation heterotopias* (Foucault, 2005). Crisis heterotopias are reserved for persons in a state of crisis, i.e. a state different from the one considered normal in society, however, at present, the forms in which they existed in the past have been disappearing (Foucault gives the example of a college from the 19th century, or military training for boys), being substituted by heterotopias of deviation. These kinds of heterotopias are 'inhabited' by individuals whose behaviour deviates from the general average, or the prescribed norm. Kindergartens can be perceived as places on the dividing line between crisis and deviation heterotopias, considering that they are places where a distinction is made between public and family upbringing, most often for the first time, as well as because of the characteristics of the pre-school age group. Pre-school age stands out as unparalleled and unique, the only period in life 'offering so many open possibilities, when an individual devotes so much energy, tenaciousness, and enthusiasm in mastering and developing complex capacities that will determine his/her future abilities, personality, and the success with which the individual will function in his/her further life' (The Curriculum Framework, 2018, p. 3). In relation to the context of family upbringing, the kindergarten is a specific kind of 'social practice' (Foucault, 1998, as cited in Miškeljin, 2022, p. 28), which cannot be separated from the broader social context (Miškeljin, 2012). Nevertheless, in reference to family upbringing, the kindergarten is a 'place of otherness', because, irrespective of theoretical-value frameworks forming the basis for the development of its practice, it is indisputable that the kindergarten provides children with a different experience of life compared to the family surroundings.

The second principle implies the heterogeneity of heterotopias, themselves, i.e. the possibility for a society to be able to adopt new heterotopic structures in the course of history, and that 'any heterotopia has a clear and defined function within the society, while one same heterotopia, depending on the synchronicity of the culture where it is situated, can have different functions' (Foucault, 2005, p. 33). In accordance with this principle – nurturing, training and education of pre-school children have changed their forms and modes of manifestation throughout history. The very term *kindergarten* is inconsistent, as a result of which, 'this place has had different names in different cultures and different time periods. In our country, it was first called *zabavište* (play space), then *obdanište* - day-care institution, and finally *dečiji vrtić* (children's garden) based on the term 'kindergarten' which was introduced by the creator of the first kindergartens, Friedrich Froebel (Miškeljin, 2012, p. 17). Thus, the growing up of children throughout history has become a social issue, while pre-school education has been organised and regulated in a systemic manner, and hence, today, apart from the contribution that the family provides to the development and learning of the pre-school child, the kindergarten also has a major role for the children attending it.

The third principle refers to the capacity of heterotopias for incorporating several different places at one single, real place, which can even be incompatible (Foucault, 2005). Some authors have discussed this principle through the example of *juxtaposition* (Mihajlović, 2016; Shaw, 2017) – the existence of different places side by side, one alongside the other, or next to the other – a plurality of contents pointing to a multitude of contradictory characteristics of these different places. In contrast to the utopia, which represents

the unity of ideas, values, beliefs, and visions about the future, heterotopias incorporate real places where different thinking, ideas, and values are confronted. Juxtapositions in the kindergarten are to be found in the discontinuities in the availability of different places in the kindergarten for children and adults, in the split between play and learning, as well as in the relations between adults and children based on a hierarchical distribution of power, the inconsistency between the family context and that of the kindergarten, etc.

The fourth principle discusses the relationship between heterotopia and time. On the one hand, there are heterotopias of time accumulated in the infinity, such as museums, while on the other, there are temporal heterotopias in the context of time, such as, for instance, festivities (Foucault, 2005). This principle points out that time in heterotopias does not run in the same manner like the generally accepted flux of time. In the kindergarten, adults and children share the same time, but the way they perceive it greatly differs (Ulla, 2017). In contemporary culture, adults more often have a linear experience of time, being guided by the clock as a time reference. For children, time runs cyclically, without any physical determinants in the form of clocks. Conversely, children interpret time by what they feel, see, hear, and experience (Malakpa, 2007) at a 'moment of time' (Goble, 2020, p. 181) embodied in the events that have a certain sense and meaning to them.

In the fifth principle, it is emphasised that heterotopias presuppose 'always a system of opening and closing that excludes them at the same time as making them penetrable' (Foucault, 2005, p. 35). Heterotopias, as highlighted by Foucault, feature a strange form of exclusion, because, even where everyone can enter a heterotopia, this is an illusion, because 'you believe that you have entered, however, the instant you enter, you are excluded' (Foucault, 2005, p. 35). Kindertartens also function according to the system of opening and closing, because not only do they have their working hours, but they also, most often, have clearly defined rules regarding who can enter the kindergarten and when, the method of separating and grouping children within the framework of their age groups, as well as which spaces are available or non-available for children during their stay in it. Just like Foucault observed, that inclusion is only an illusion, this principle is being manifested in the kindergarten by the examples of inclusion of the families. They may enter the kindergarten, but only in the spaces designated as available for them (most often, children's dressing rooms, halls and corridors leading to the group where their children are staying) and only at a certain time during the day.

The sixth principle defining heterotopias refers to their function of creating an illusory space, an illusion, but of such a kind that it 'exposes the entire illusion of the real world' (Foucault, 2005, p. 35) or, moreover, creates a different real space which is perfectly orderly and well arranged, that Foucault named *heterotopia of compensation*. Kindertartens can also represent heterotopias of illusion, as well as heterotopias of compensation. Heterotopias of illusion have a tendency to filter external realities that may be messy and imperfect in comparison to our visions of the kind of childhood, education and training, and kindergarten practice we desire to have. Kindertartens become heterotopias of compensation when they strive to perfect the space through the organisation of time and space, as well as through the professionalisation of the practice in such a manner that professionals in the kindergarten provide the children with the opportunity of having different experiences in relation to those of the children who do not go to the kindergarten (Shaw, 2017).

Methodological Framework

The question which was our point of departure in this research referred to gaining an insight into the relations of power that shape the physical environment of the kindergarten, on the basis of the principle of heterotopias that manifest themselves in the space. In order to answer the question, we have explored how the space mirrors the relations of power 'prevailing' in the kindergarten, searching for the meaning reflected by the space in its physical manifestations and in the written and unwritten rules regarding the possibilities of using the space.

The research has been conducted by a *walk-along interview* (Franklin Phipps & Gleason, 2019; Lynch & Mannion, 2016), as a research method that enables the researcher to 'observe spatial practices *in situ*' while walking with the participants in the research through the places they are jointly researching 'thus also having an access to the experiences and interpretations of the participants in the research' (Kusenbach, 2003, p. 463). The walk-along interview makes visible the complex network of relations of power in the space, enabling the researcher to 'correspond with the course of events in the space, collecting data in a participatory manner' (Lynch & Mannion, 2016, p. 335).

Within the framework of the walk-along interview, the researcher, passing through the spaces of the kindergarten with the participants, discussed with them their observations and experiences in the space. The interview was semi-structured designed to provide as little guidance to the participants as possible, so their accounts could preserve the authentic experiences and perceptions they gained in the course of restructuring the space in the kindergarten. The researcher asked additional questions to understand more profoundly the experiences the participants had in creating the 'other places' in the kindergarten, as well as those referring to the relations of power that could be identified in them.

The research was conducted in a public kindergarten situated on the outskirts of the City of Belgrade, in a building designed for nursery-age children (1 to 3 years of age), however, a facility also including two groups of kindergarten-age children (3 to 4 years of age). The research involved a nurse-educator (who was also the manager of the facility), and an expert associate-pedagogue. In the overview of the research results, the term 'practitioners' refers to the nurses-educators, educators, expert associates, and associates working in the kindergarten where the research was performed. We have used the term 'educators' in discussing educators and nurses-educators.

For the purposes of this research we focused on the communal spaces in the kindergarten (halls and corridors), with the aim of rethinking the relations of power they reflect, being aware of the fact that the analysis of the entire space of the kindergarten exceeds the scope of this paper. However, in interpreting the results of the research, there was a need, occasionally, for analysing certain practical situations in the broader context, or for making reference to the earlier practices in the kindergarten, which has been designated in the interpretation.

During the walk-along interview, we took photos of the individual places in the kindergarten which had been emphasised in the interview as important for re-examining the relations of power. Following the initial analysis, the participants in the research had

a series of additional exchanges of information (via a Viber group), sharing the photos depicting the appearance of the space before its transformation and the attempts to create 'other places', including other insights, comments, and interpretations regarding the initial analysis, that the researcher shared with the participants in the research.

In the analysis, we proceeded from *thinking with theory* (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; 2013) feeling the need to consider the research data in relation to Foucault's construction of the relations of power and heterotopias, however, also to consider the presented understanding in relation to the data collected (Mills, 2017). The analysis was performed by a non-linear reading of the data (interview transcripts, photographs, video recordings, text messages) and by extracting questions, dilemmas and comments which were then presented to the participants in the research, in a conversation. After gaining new insights through an exchange between the researcher and the participants in the research, a new cross-referencing of data was performed, including extracting of 'sequences' from practice. In interpreting the data and during the discussion, three sequences from practice were singled out as being associated with certain principles of heterotopias.

Results and Discussions

Sequence 1: You believe that you have entered, however, the moment that you enter, you are excluded

At the very entrance to the kindergarten, there is a visible notification about the period of time when the kindergarten door is open, and when it is locked. In practice, this means that when the door is locked, a parent may enter the kindergarten only after being allowed to enter by someone from the staff (by unlocking the door). Thereby, children's family members are notified about the period of time when they are free to enter the kindergarten, and when they can do so with the approval of the staff.

The expert associate-pedagogue interprets the way she sees the function of the notification for the parents, as follows: *Parents can enter the kindergarten when it suits them, there is no time of day when one is not allowed to enter the kindergarten. However, they seem to refrain from entering the kindergarten during the period of time when it is locked. Even though they have been told that they may enter, I think that the notification, nevertheless, creates a certain barrier, and annuls the welcome.*

The existence of a barrier of this kind can be associated with the fifth principle of heterotopias, based on which they represent a system of opening and closing 'which excludes them at the same time as making them penetrable' (Foucault, 2005, p. 35). In view of the fact that there are working hours during which the kindergarten is penetrable, and those when it is isolated in relation to any of the participants in the training-educational practice, the defining of the time frame when access to the kindergarten is controlled by the employees, leads additionally to the exclusion of some of its members (families of the children attending the kindergarten).

The principle of heterotopias as being a system of opening, at the same time as closing, can also be associated with the long-established manner of organising educational

groups in kindergartens. After being enrolled in the kindergarten, the child becomes a part of the group of the kindergarten children of different age groups and adults working in that kindergarten. Although the kindergarten is available for all the children enrolled in it, this does not necessarily imply that all the spaces in the kindergarten are equally available for these children. Research shows that a spatial, an age-based and social segregation of children takes place in kindergartens (Pavlović Breneselović, 2015), because they spent the greatest part of the time in the kindergarten in their study rooms, being in only touch with the children and educators in their group.

In the kindergarten which was the subject of our research, practitioners initiated a change in the current manner of organising educational groups. While we were talking in the corridor, one dad, who had come to pick up his child, informed the nurse-educator in a perplexed tone that his child was not in its room. She replied that the children were in the adjacent room and that he was free to knock on the door there. She then explained to the researcher why they had organised themselves in such a way as to create 'open' groups, i.e. enabling the children from one group to use the spaces of the other groups and play with the children in the latter.

Nurse-educator: You know, previously, we used to have, my children, my group, my educator, today I may have four of them [children], while you have seventeen... it is much easier like this, for both the children and us. However, the educator has to make this switch in his/her mindset, there have been problems, and not just a few. But, changes are not something everyone likes. However, we addressed them slowly, first the colleague who was ready, and then little by little, this required an entire strategy. And now, we are all in it.

It can be observed that the changes in the organisation and 'opening' of other places for children did not result from a critical rethinking with the purpose of ensuring that the space should support the conceptual principles of 'The Preschool Curriculum Framework *The Years of Ascent*' (Curriculum Framework, 2018) but from real difficulties the educators were faced with in practice, primarily due to shortages of educational staff.

Nurse-educator: I have to say, there are still educators who do not give up on that power, and insist on 'my children-my room'. There is a colleague who is still not at ease with this. However, if someday, she finds herself in a situation where she has eighteen children, and I have four, what shall we do then? That is when everyone realises that this is better for everyone. Primarily for the children. Because, imagine if children stayed only in this room the whole year round. No matter what kind of materials you have or whether you change them, they meet the same faces and the same room. Moreover, it happened that some children grew very close with each other like this. For instance A. and L. They have bonded so much, and they play together so nicely. We have managed to bring them together in these open groups enabling them to be together very often. And they were not in the same group.

Changes of this kind have contributed to new and different interactions taking place among the different participants in the kindergarten practice, 'leading to a change in their mutual relations and strengthening of the sense of belonging and connection' (Krnjaja & Purešević, 2020, p. 228). The aforementioned changes have not taken place without any resistance though, but they have led to the educators gaining new insights, and this has opened the possibility for building relations among children who did not have

an opportunity for such interaction with peers outside their group before. This example can also be discussed in the context of Foucault's understanding of power as being fluid, because every participant in the educational-training practice experiences and simultaneously exercises power (Jobb, 2019). In this case, the children exercising power and also having the opportunity to select the spaces where they want to play as well as the children they want to play with, have developed new relations with children from other groups, and this has prompted the educators to reconsider their long-established practice and change it in accordance with such insights.

Sequence 2: Linear and cyclic flow of time

The communal space which is the most frequented one, where everyone passes after entering the kindergarten, is the large corridor, housing the children's lockers with their clothes. Previously, this space was not inviting for the parents and the children to stay or play in it for long. Just the contrary, it previously served for storing redundant furniture and equipment (Photograph 1).

Photograph 1

A part of the main corridor in the kindergarten before the space was arranged



Photograph taken in 2022. Source: Research participants' files

The nurse-educator points out that this space underwent the greatest change in the last year. After considering the possible solution for this communal space to emit a welcome to the family, they first removed all the furniture and equipment, and placed a table and chairs there, including several books (Photograph 2).

Photograph 2

The space of the corridor after the removal of the furniture



Photograph taken in 2022. Source: Research participants' files

Nurse-educator: *When we removed the furniture, there was an empty space where we placed a table and a chair to start with. Then we wondered what we could create there, that would be inspiring for both the children and the parents. Owing to the support and the assistance of the parents, we obtained furniture that they manufactured for us, from wooden pallets. The furniture was manufactured by one mom and her husband, who then took part in arranging this segment of the space with us.*

The idea of the practitioners was to make it possible for family members to get informed in this space, about the new Programme Document (The Curriculum Framework, 2018) as well as additional leaflets, and to be able to read stories about the different programmes developed in the kindergarten over the previous year, including literature in the field of parenthood, or to read books with their children. In the interview, the nurse-educator and the expert associate-pedagogue shared their impression that parents still tended not to stay long in that space in the morning, that they just brought their children and hurried off to work, however, that the situation in the afternoon, when they came to pick up their children, had changed significantly since the space acquired a new form.

Nurse-educator: *When we redesigned the space, we had the situation where parents would come, and stay not only for ten minutes, but one father had to wait in the car for the mother to come back for almost an hour. He was so alarmed, that he entered the kindergarten and asked the mom: 'Well, where have you been all this time?' They had been sitting in the library reading books, and then, they moved over here, where they tried different costumes, and this took time. Notably, this was one of those 'tough' dads, as a result of which no approval had been given yet even for taking photographs, nothing had been signed at all. However, after this, everything was signed. Now, parents tend to stay here much longer.*

This example shows that the creation of other places in the kindergarten has prompted a change in the adults' perception of time. While the father measured time in

a linear fashion (by a clock), the mother, who was with her child, was in the 'event time' (Goble, 2020), which has a different flux. In the cyclic experience of time, time cannot be measured, and hence, one departs from the kindergarten not in accordance with the time the clock shows, but at the 'most appropriate moment' for that (Malakpa, 2007).

Through this experience of change in the communal space, we can observe a change in the relationship of the parents towards the kindergarten. The opportunity to see and experience their child play in the kindergarten, and to be themselves in the role of co-players with their child, contributed to their greater sense of belonging to the kindergarten community, and thereby to the strengthening of their relations with the educators.

Sequence 3: 'Bird observatory' – the heterotopic creation of a place

We have come to the stairway that leads to the upper floor of the kindergarten. The nurse-educator stops at the space beneath the staircase and starts describing how this space has changed its shape and purpose.

Nurse-educator: *We have Ćira and Jovanka, here, that is how the children have named them. Ćira and Jovanka are two rather large owls. Owls tend to fall down from their nests here. One day, as I was passing here, I saw an owl gazing at me [she points her hand at the window next to the staircase]. When the owl appeared in the yard, the children saw it from the dining room and started making comments. And then, we [educators] sat down and tried to figure out how to take advantage of this, because, hey, we had owls, and owls are not really a common thing. And this part [beneath the staircase] never served any purpose whatsoever, because it is low, and unsafe, because of the corners and the edges. But, wait a minute, this is something that we were scared of. The child is this tall [she points her hand], how could it be at risk of getting hurt by the edge?*

Photograph 3

The space beneath the staircase before it was arranged, and an illustration of the position of the educator in relation to the space while she spoke about its safety



Photograph taken in 2022. Source: Research participants file

The moment when the nurse-educator pointed her hand at the height of the staircase describing that the space was adequate for children (Photography 3) 'animated' the conversation more than can be realised from the text. Our non-verbal communications, the tone in which the conversation unfolded and the feeling of pride that overwhelmed the space while she spoke, showed that this example was very important to the nurse-educator, and that she considered it a turning point in the reassessment and raising of awareness of the role adults have in shaping the physical environment of the kindergarten, as well as an inspiration for introducing changes in this space (Photograph 4).

Nurse-educator: *And then, since the birds are mainly on that side, and the owls were exclusively in that part of the yard, we designed this spatial entity to serve the children for their hiding and sneaking, because it was often raining those days, and when we did not go out into the yard we watched the birds from the window. We made an observatory, they called it a 'bird observatory'. This is where they also like to hide, they go in here, for us, adults, it is a bit uncomfortable to slip in there, but they love it.*

Photograph 4

The space beneath the staircase as a 'Bird Observatory'



Note: The arrow points to the window from which the children watch birds in the yard of the kindergarten

By creating such 'other places' new relations emerge, positioning the children and the adults as equal 'inhabitants' of the kindergarten as a place of joint learning and participation. Relying on Foucault's concept of heterotopias, Adlerstein Grimberg and Bralic Echeverría (2021) created a new concept of *heterotopic creation of place*, as a description for such alternative ways of creating new places in the kindergarten, with the involvement and agency of the children and adults, which also leads to a change in the relations of power. In this specific case, the educators realised that children were interested in watching owls in the yard of the kindergarten, however, they also reassessed their prejudices and fears regarding the utilisation of certain spaces, such as the space beneath the staircase.

he children, however, had their own theories about how that place could be used, and apart from using it for the intended purpose, they also use it for hiding and seclusion. This example of a heterotopic creation of a place can open the possibility for encountering both a heterotopia and a localised utopia, which can lead further to the development of a new, 'co-authored space' (Krnjaja, 2012), emerging in the process of playing, where adults and children share power and thereby 'create spaces where their ideas become 'co-authored' (Krnjaja, 2012, p. 274).

Conclusion

Research into the kindergarten as a space of heterotopia has a significant potential for re-examining the relations of power prevailing at all the levels of the pre-school education and training system – from the level of relations between educational policies and pre-school institutions, to the level of relations between children and educators. In this research we have managed to explore only the outlines of heterotopic places in the kindergarten, pointing to some of the possible ways for their creation in pre-school education and training institutions. In the research we looked for the 'subtle channels' (Foucault, 2012) that power 'runs' through, spilling over within the kindergarten, bearing in mind that 'everyone is essentially the holder of a certain power, and conveying it in the given scope' (Foucault, 2012, p. 77).

The experiences shared by the participants centered around their re-examination of the function and characteristics of the physical environment, as well as around initiating a transformation of the communal spaces in the kindergarten, with the idea that such changes will contribute to the transformation of the existing patterns of power in the relations among the different participants in the educational-training practice in the kindergarten (primarily among the educators, the children, and the families). The research has shown that changes in the space of the kindergarten were not always preceded by a reconsideration and reassessment of the relations of power, however, once they were introduced, they almost always led to new insights by the practitioners. Such insights refer primarily to the new ways in which educators, children, and families can be involved in the utilisation of the space in the kindergarten, and therefore, also to a change in their relations. The difficulties in implementing certain changes, such as making it possible for children from different groups to play together, and 'opening' study rooms to children from other groups, have contributed to identifying more explicitly an imbalance in the relations of power. That process exposed the need of certain educators to have 'power' and to control the movement of the children they work with. Experiences of the practitioners in this kindergarten show that, when changes in the space were initiated, they looked for the main support in their colleagues ('Then we [educators and expert associate-pedagogue] tried to figure out what we could form there, which would be inspiring for both the children and the parents'; 'And then, we [educators] got together and discussed how to take advantage of this'). The focus on changing the communal spaces of the kindergarten contributed to the educators 'getting out of the isolation in their study rooms' (Pavlović Beneselović i sar., 2022, p. 84), and developing relations based on the sharing of power,

by sharing their ideas, dilemmas and questions, as well as jointly resolving problems and working jointly with other educators and the expert associate-pedagogue on changing the space. Initiating changes in the communal spaces of the kindergarten is a good starting point in the process of transforming the practice, because the educators find it easier to 'share' these spaces with others, i.e. they do not experience them as their own spaces, as they often tend to do in respect of the room of the educational group they work with (which is visible in the presented example of 'opening' of the study rooms).

The presented research points to the complexity of the process of changing the paradigm underlying the existing practice, because even where we focus only on the physical changes in the environment of the kindergarten, we can notice that they do not take place in a linear fashion, but rather, through the development of 'places in between – folds representing a spatial transformation through which one can perceive new spatial identities' (Kornberger & Clegg, 2003, p. 84). New relations of power emerge exactly in these 'folds', places on the margins of the usual practice, which challenge the usual relations, representing heterotopias by their characteristics.

This research provides new insights in the understanding of the role and significance of the physical environment in developing the practice in the kindergarten based on the sharing of power, as well as providing insights into the manner in which changes in the physical environment lead to changes in the relations manifested by the participants of the educational-training practice. This paper focuses on gaining a profound understanding of the relations of power through an analysis of communal spaces of a kindergarten, and hence, it is important to initiate new research involving other levels of educational-training practice, as well as the entire system of pre-school education. Thereby, a more profound understanding could be gained of the relations of power that shape the practice of pre-school education and practice in the broader social context.

Literature

- Adlerstein Grimberg, C. Y., & Bralic Echeverría, A. (2021). Heterotopic place-making in learning environments: Children living as creative citizens. *Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 14, 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.m14.hpml>
- Boyer, C. (2008). The many mirrors of Foucault and their architectural reflections. In M. Dehaene, & L. De Caeter (Eds.), *Heterotopia and the city: public space in a postcivil society* (pp. 53-75). Routledge.
- Franklin Phipps, A., & Gleason, T. (2019). Walking Methodologies with/in Teacher Education. *Journal of Public Pedagogies*, 4(1), 228-234. <https://doi.org/10.15209/jpp.1193>
- Foucault, M. (2005). Druga mesta. U P. Milenković i D. Marinković (ur.), *Mišel Fuko 1926-1984-2004 hrestomatija* (str. 29-36). Vojvođanska sociološka asocijacija.
- Foucault, M. (2012). *Moć/Znanje: Odabrani spisi i razgovori 1972-1977*. Mediteran Publishing.
- Goble, E. (2020). From kairos to chronos: The lived experience of time in education. In P. Howard, T. Saevi, A. Foran, & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Phenomenology and Educational Theory in Conversation: Back to Education Itself* (pp. 179-197). Routledge.

- Harrison, S., & Dourish, P. (1996). Re-place-ing space: The roles of place and space in Collaborative systems. Proceedings of the 1996 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (pp. 67-76). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/240080.240193>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412471510>
- Jobb, C. (2019). Power, Space, and Place in Early Childhood Education. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/ Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 44(3), 211-232. <https://doi.org/10.29173/cjs29596>
- Kornberger, M., & Clegg, S. (2003). The Architecture of Complexity. *Culture and Organization*, 9(2), 75-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759550302804>
- Krnjaja, Ž. (2010). Igra, stvaralaštvo, otvoreni vaspitni sistem: šta ih povezuje. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 59(2), 264–277.
- Krnjaja, Ž. (2012). Igra kao susret: koautorski prostor u zajedničkoj igri dece i odraslih. *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 7(1), 251-267. <https://doi.org/10.21301/eap.v7i1.12>
- Krnjaja, Ž. i Purešević, D. (2020). Participacija pedagoga u promeni kulture dečjeg vrtića. U L. Radulović, V. Milin i B. Ljujić (ur.) *Participacija u obrazovanju - pedagoški (p)ogledi: zbornik radova* (str. 226-233). Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Pedagoško društvo Srbije.
- Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street Phenomenology. *Ethnography*, 4(3), 455–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14661381034300>
- Lynch, J., & Mannion, G. (2016). Enacting a place-responsive research methodology: walking interviews with educators. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 16(4), 330-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14729679.2016.1163271>
- Malakpa, S. (2007). Chronos and Kairos: temporal concepts with implications for classroom instruction and national development. *Liberian studies journal*, 32(1), 94-103.
- Mihajlović, J. (2016). *Savremeni prostori heterotopija u arhitekturi* (doktorska disertacija). NaRDUS (123456789/7791).
- Mills, T. (2017). Mangling Expertise Using Post-Coding Analysis to Complexify Teacher Learning. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(3), 128-144.
- Miškeljin, L. (2012). Dečji vrtić kao kulturni artefakt vrtić iz socio kulturne perspektive. U T. Grujić (ur.), *Zbornik radova Visoke škole strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača* (str. 11-28). Visoka škole strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača u Kikindi.
- Miškeljin, L. (2022). *Detinjstv(a)o – konceptualizacije i kontekstualizacije: implikacije za praksu predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja*. Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
- Nairn, K., & Kraftl, P. (2016). *Space, Place, and Environment: Geographies of Children and Young People*. Springer.
- Osnove programa predškolskog vaspitanja i obrazovanja – Godine uzleta* (2018). Prosvetni glasnik, Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, br. 16/2018.
- Otto, L. (2005). Materialitet, identitet og erindring. In M. Kraglund, & L. Otto (Eds.), *Materialitet og dannelse* (pp. 33-47). Denmark's Pedagogiske Universitetes Forlag.

- Pavlović Breneselović, D. (2015). *Gde stanuje kvalitet (Knjiga 2): Istraživanje sa decom prakse dečjeg vrtića*. Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Pavlović Beneselović, D., Krnjaja, Ž. i Backović, S. (2022). *Vodič za uređenje prostora u dečjem vrtiću – Prostor u skladu sa osnovama programa PVO „Godine uzleta“*. Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja.
- Prodanović, S. i Krstić, P. (2012). Javni prostor i slobodno delanje: Foucault vs. Lefevr. *Sociologija*, 54(3), 423-436. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC1203423P>
- Shaw, L. J. (2017). *Heterotopia and Hauntings: Troubling the Spaces and Artefacts of Early Years' Education and Care in England* (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Early Childhood Studies the Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Tarr, P. (2001). Aesthetic codes in early childhood classrooms: What art educators can learn from Reggio Emilia. *Art Education*, 54(3), 33-39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3193922>
- Tarr, P. (2004). Consider the walls. *Young Children*, 59(3), 88-92.
- Ulla, B. (2017). Reconceptualising sleep: Relational principles inside and outside the pram. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 18(4), 400-408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491177427>
- Wood, J. (2020). Children as heterotopians: town planning with and for children. In M. Khan, S. Bell, & J. Wood (Eds.), *Place, Pedagogy and Play: Participation, Design and Research with Children* (pp. 165-179). Routledge, Abingdon.

Article received: 10. 04. 2023.

Updated version received: 19. 10. 2023.

Accepted for publishing: 09. 12. 2023.