

Bodies, Curricula, and Childhoods: Experimentations with Movements in Becoming-Child as an Inventive Possibility in Education

Corpos, currículos e infâncias: Experimentações em devir-criança como possibilidade inventiva em educação

Cuerpos, currículos e infancias: experimentaciones de movimientos en devenir-niño como posibilidad inventiva en la educación

Lorena Carmo ^[a] 

Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ)

Luana Bezerra ^[b] 

Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ)

How to cite: CARMO, L.; BEZERRA, L. C. *Corpos, currículos e infâncias: Experimentações em devir-criança como possibilidade inventiva em educação*. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, Curitiba, PUCPRESS, v. 25, n. 87, p. 2111-2122, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.25.087.DS17EN>

^[a] Pós-doutoranda em Educação pela Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ). Graduada em Pedagogia (UNIRIO). Mestre e doutora em Educação (UNIRIO), e-mail: lorena.azevedo33@hotmail.com

^[b] Doutoranda no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação pela Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (PROPED - UERJ). Mestre em Currículo (PPEB - UFPA). Graduada em Pedagogia (UFPA), e-mail: luanabezerra31@gmail.com

Abstract

This work stems from concerns raised during an activity conducted in the context of teaching internship, where fourth- and fifth-semester pedagogy students were invited to anonymously share significant experiences in basic education. The reading of the accounts was marked by the recurrence of violences experienced during childhood, which prompted questions about how children's bodies are treated and often silenced within the school environment. In light of these issues, the objective of this theoretical study is to problematize the silencing of bodies in childhood and to think of becoming-child as an ethical-political movement in curricula, aiming to create alternative possibilities for (re)existence in everyday school life. To this end, we engage with the philosophy of difference, studies in/of/with everyday life, and the field of curriculum, seeking to problematize expectations of control and normative discourses about childhood, with the desire to affirm their multiplicities and singular existences within the school space.

Keywords: Curriculum. Childhood. Difference. Becoming.

Resumo

Este trabalho parte de inquietações trazidas durante uma atividade desenvolvida no contexto do estágio docência, onde estudantes do quarto e quinto período do curso de pedagogia foram convidados a compartilhar, de maneira anônima, experiências marcantes na educação básica. A leitura dos relatos trazidos foi marcada pela recorrência de violências vividas nas infâncias, o que mobilizou questionamentos sobre os modos como os corpos infantis são tratados e, muitas vezes, silenciados no espaço escolar. Diante dessas questões, o objetivo deste trabalho teórico é problematizar os silenciamentos dos corpos nas infâncias e pensar o devir-criança como movimento ético-político nos currículos, para criar possibilidades outras de (re)existências nos cotidianos escolares. Para isso, dialogamos com a filosofia da diferença, os estudos nos/dos/com os cotidianos e o campo do currículo, buscando problematizar as expectativas de controle e os discursos normativos sobre as infâncias, desejando afirmar suas multiplicidades e existências singulares no espaço escolar.

Palavras-chave: Currículo. Infâncias. Diferença. Devir.

Resumen

Este trabajo parte de inquietudes surgidas durante una actividad desarrollada en el contexto de la práctica docente, donde estudiantes de cuarto y quinto semestre del curso de pedagogía fueron invitados a compartir, de manera anónima, experiencias significativas en la educación básica. La lectura de los relatos estuvo marcada por la recurrencia de violencias vividas en la infancia, lo que movilizó cuestionamientos sobre las formas en que los cuerpos infantiles son tratados y, muchas veces, silenciados en el espacio escolar. Ante estas cuestiones, el objetivo de este estudio teórico es problematizar los silenciamientos de los cuerpos en la infancia y pensar el devenir-niño como un movimiento ético-político en los currículos, para crear otras posibilidades de (re)existencias en las cotidianidades escolares. Para ello, dialogamos con la filosofía de la diferencia, los estudios en/de/con las cotidianidades y el campo del currículo, buscando problematizar las expectativas de control y los discursos normativos sobre las infancias, con el deseo de afirmar sus multiplicidades y existencias singulares en el espacio escolar.

Palabras clave: Currículo. Infancias. Diferencia. Devenir.

Contextualizing our mobilizations

We start from the premise that we, teachers, always in formation, learn in the relationship that recognizes a time that will not come to be, but that is being (Süssekind; Lontra, 2006, p. 90).

The mobilizations to produce this article arose from an activity with undergraduate students, in teacher formation, in a public institution located in Baixada Fluminense (lowlands region), Rio de Janeiro. The very diverse class, which occupied a stigmatized territory, overflowed their experiences with us during collective and individual exchanges, in the context of the discipline we taught.

Among these exchanges, those that emerged from a particular activity affected us deeply: the proposal of anonymous writings¹, based on the perceptions and experiences of the students, preferably lived in Basic Education, but without excluding Higher Education. The dynamics occurred as follows: each student would write freely about a good or bad experience that was part of their schooling and that has, in this way, marked their life. At the end of their report, each one would place it in a container so that the teaching team, in an assorted way, could read to the class, so that they could mobilize the dialogues, without addressing them.

The writings that emerged from the proposed activity opened problems that have accompanied Brazilian Basic Education for decades. These are testimonials of silence, attempts to erase differences, exclusion, restriction of children's bodies. In short, there are reports of violence, of the most diverse, mainly against the bodies of children (Butler, 2021). These shares composed a mosaic of experiences that, far from being individual, expressed collective and social marks, of bodies that were written there, spoke loudly. Bodies in movement, which tension norms, curricula, and experiences with their ways of existing in school.

Excerpts such as "in a play in the classroom, a colleague said that I could not play because I was a 'black monkey'" or "a student was murdered for simply being a three-year-old and everything remained normal" hit us like shards of a mirror that reflected images of violence. Images that manifest that in the fixity of a singular, white and homogeneous childhood, black childhoods are not possible, for example, and that not all bodies are capable of deserved mourning (Butler, 2015).

Such experiences mobilized us to stress how much bodies, especially children's bodies, racialized, feminized and impoverished, are marked by technologies of domination and exclusion. For, when a student writes about the impact of the death of a child on their teaching trajectory, they not only expose facets of daily barbarities, but affirm the need for implication with life, with other possible ways of caring, teaching and living together.

Driven by these writings, what we call bodies in movement, in this theoretical work, gains contour: they are the bodies that refuse to be normalized, swallowed, forgotten, that carry the marks of shards of a formation crossed by oppression, but that insist on producing other meanings, displacing places, tensioning certainties, (re)existing. These bodies announce other childhoods, not as idealizations or ready-made futures, but as ethical-political openings that are made in the present, in the now.

We would like to highlight that the experiences mobilized by the teaching internship do not act in this text as empirical material, but as events that operate as a thought force (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011). Therefore, it is not an analysis of the testimonials, but a sensitive approach that allows reverberating theoretical questions about the silences of children's bodies, betting on the becoming-child as an ethical-political movement in the curricula, based on encounters experienced in school daily life.

Therefore, we write this article not as someone who tries to translate (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004) the testimonials, given their impossibility, but as people who were also implicated, affected and restless, because this movement with the class also called us to look at our experiences in Early Childhood Education, both as students and

¹ The proposal of anonymous writings was due to the understanding that by not identifying themselves, students would have greater freedom to express themselves without judgment and/or guilt.

as teachers. In this sense, writing here is also a body. A body without organs, open to flows and intensities, that stands up against attempts at silence and that walks towards the invention of other possibilities of movements with childhoods (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011).

In this sense, this article proposes to think about children's bodies in their becoming-child movements, which manifest not a linear projection of an adult future, but the possibility of existence here and now. We argue, therefore, that the notion of becoming-child does not refer to a time to come, but to a power that is present in the movements, playful activities, refusals, dances, and silences of young individuals. Thus, the aim of this work is to problematize the silencing of bodies in childhoods and to consider becoming-child as an ethical-political movement within curricula, in order to create other possibilities for (re)existence in everyday school life. To this end, we produced this work from the contributions of the philosophy of difference, passing through the post-structural contributions in their appropriations with the field of curriculum and studies with daily lives. This article is an extension, a reflection of the conversations, of the exchanges we have been making with colleagues, teachers, with students in the internships, with whom we share our research, because we believe that "education is an encounter of singularities" (Gallo, 2010, p. 231), and that these singularities produce effects.

Preschool as a preparation space for the training of children's bodies and subjectivities

At the end of nursery, in the Early Childhood Education stage, children enter what we call "preschool," a name that, not by chance, carries within itself the idea of preparation for a future school experience, as if childhood needed to cease being what it is to be ready for something that is not yet possible. In this process, there are profound transitions, in which children's bodies are slowed, contained, tamed.

Play, which was once a legitimate language, is being replaced by directed activities. The body, which could previously express itself with a certain freedom, begins to be called to silence, to stay "head down", to sit upright, to respect the line². At this moment, there is an expectation of a dualistic rupture between thought and body (Lopes; Carvalho, 2025), as if learning were an act solely of the mind, separate from the sensitive, emotional, and motor experiences that constitute childhoods.

This ideal of behavior permeates the expectations of control of the bodies that begin, from childhood, to be domesticated in favor of the production of the individual understood as autonomous and endowed with reason. This ideal of the individual is produced within the structure of modern thought, where achieving "pure reason" means being free from emotions, playful activities, movements, since reason and emotion, in this discourse, are opposites. The notions of curriculum and childhood, for example, are strongly anchored in modern assumptions, therefore, in these spaces still impregnated by the dichotomies Individual/State, Man/Woman, Inclusion/Exclusion, Adult/Child. It is urgent to have a thought that guides us to walk in the hardened fabrics of these realities, to shake these dualisms.

This separation, far from being neutral, produces violence that acts on young bodies: by cutting the flows of play, disciplining gestures, normalizing speeches, the preschool curriculum is designed as an essay on the schooling that will come and not as an affirmation of childhoods in their power. As Frangella (2016) states, childhoods are disputed territories, in which different subjectivation projects face each other.

The studies in/of/with the daily lives also make ruptures with the modern paradigms and, from these ruptures, allow us to think outside the dualistic and homogenizing discourse that reduces the daily lives to an opposition to the scientific. Daily life as an epistemological field in Brazil arises from the theories of Certeau, the Brazilian researchers Nilda Alves and Regina Garcia and Carlos Ferraço, it impels us to perceive daily practices in the school space with other

² More than organizing space or time, this practice conveys senses of order, waiting and obedience that align with a normative school logic. Therefore, "respect the queue" works as a disciplinary device in Early Childhood Education, teaching obedience, and control of bodies under the appearance of coexistence, aligning with the normative school logic.

lenses, not these, stigmatized by the modern discourse of rationality and the polarization between common and critical sense. But it comes to be thought of as that which surrounds us every day (or that which is ours to share), it is also that which binds us intimately, with all its uniqueness and lack of repetition³.

Thinking about the productive force of everyday life, as a movement of meanings, of heterogeneities, powerful and unrepeatable experiments, is an attempt to subvert the rigidity of the curriculum; it “connects with other machines of thinking and living that have living forces of becoming, to conjure the weight and gravity of pachydermal curricula stained with lead-gray” (Corazza, 2012, p. 10).

From this perspective, studies with daily lives (Alves, 2001; Ferraço; Perez; Oliveira, 2008; Garcia; Lobo, 2002; Sússekind, 2007;) and post-structural approaches contribute to tension the idea of curriculum as a truth to be followed. Instead of curriculum as a prescription, we propose curricula as a crossing, lived and shared curricula, capable of welcoming the experiences of the different bodies that inhabit the school. It is in these meetings that we create possibilities to resist normalizing violence in childhoods.

If curricula are crossings, if they are complicated, cosmopolitan conversations, full of history, bringing glocalization in multiple dimensions, preventing fixity, like a rhizome, and suggesting liquidity and transience, classrooms are, therefore, spaces of occurrence, difference, and invention, of “manipulating commonplaces” while conquering their own places (Sússekind; Lontra, 2016, p. 94).

Everyday life, in this sense, takes a prominent place, allowing for other ways of questioning what is considered common, what is rendered invisible, and what is trivialized. Therefore, discussing other ways of thinking about the movement of childhoods is an important exercise to “create cracks in the locus of metaphysical rationality, in curricular research” (Borges; Lopes, 2021, p. 115).

Our theoretical bets act in response “to a conception of the world that operates with excessive ordering, normativity, discipline, control, hierarchy, decomposition, atomization, homogeneity and with a view to producing universals” (Borges; Lopes; 2021, p. 115). And, these dialogues create possibilities for expansion in the educational field, causing the broadening of the horizon of understanding and comprehension of what has been possible to be experienced in curricula, in daily life and in childhood.

It is to understand the importance of thinking about childhood as a condition of experience marked by encounters that, therefore, is linked to a new understanding of temporality. In this intensive relationship with time, which escapes as we try to capture it, childhood is thought of as becoming, as a power to experience the new, it is a constant movement always in progress (Deleuze, 2009). We believe that betting on the inventive force of becoming with children and creating errant and shifting curricular virtualities with them is a productive exercise in passing the flows that accompany existence. It is walking around zigzagging, stumbling, and doing mischief, disputing curricula that embrace pulsating lives, that encounter people, documents, ideas, movements, and events.

Experiments in becoming-child

It even seems that a singular life can pass without any individuality or without any other concomitant that individualizes it. For example, very young children all look alike and have no individuality; but they have singularities, a smile, a gesture, a grimace, events that are not subjective characteristics. Very young children, amid all suffering and weaknesses, are crossed by an immanent life that is pure power, and even beatitude (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011, p. 4).

Becoming-child is a movement that allows bodies to escape the model of society that subjects the body to live in a single reality of the world. A body in becoming-child invents other possible worlds, operating cracks in hegemonies

³ Here, we chose not to define the studies with the daily lives, as we understand that “there is no way to define what is research in/of/with the daily lives, since its power is in the diversity of possibilities that are presented in the midst of the networks woven during its realization [...]” (Ferraço et al, 2008, p. 17).

and building networks of affection that invent other ways of existing. It can be said that the becoming-child is a movement of resistance to the domesticated and homogenizing model in education (Kohan, 2010). The becoming-child moves in notions of creation and understands that there is no linear succession in events, but understands existence as “a suspended event, which violently propels the flow of creation, indicating entrances and exits to new lives, path to new forms of existence, incidences on unprecedented possibilities of living” (Oline, 2017, p. 133).

Soares (2020) states that becoming sets in motion experience, novelty, the unusual, the unthinkable and other ways of learning that arise from the encounter with the unknown in the curriculum. In his thesis, curriculum is also understood, based on Paraíso (2015, p. 51), as a territory consisting of forms and forces, “forms print routines, demand repetitions of the same, require organizations and orders [...]”, and forces, in turn, “allow to deform the rules; to risk; to follow the movement of life”. It is these mobilized forces evoked by Paraíso (2015), which we wish to achieve to make cracks in the curricular molds, to, then, give way to other ways of existing in the school space.

Childhoods, with their minority movements, are understood as a creative power in curricula, allowing openings to think what is not thought and be what is not allowed to be (Kohan, 2010), to produce other realities, create virtualities, make something possible, which interests these children. From this theory, it is possible to observe inventive strategies, powerful outputs not to succumb to universality.

Childhood is the positive way of a multiple becoming, of an unmediated productivity, the affirmation of the still unanticipated, unnamed, non-existent; the assertion that there is no predetermined path that a child (or an adult) must follow, that there is no thing that she (or he) must become: “childhood is ‘only’ an immanent exercise of forces” (Kohan, 2010, p. 252).

As Queiroz and Frangella (2023) warn us, bodies that resist this rigid model of childhood – those that run, refuse, cry, or do not perform as expected – are quickly labeled as “difficult” or “delayed,” reinforcing a logic that pathologizes and insists on measuring, classifying, and correcting. It is, therefore, a curricular perspective that operates through anticipation and containment, converting the power of the play-body into the body-individual of performance, goal, and result. And, to problematize the attempts to control bodies in childhood, denounces all preparation that requires the separation of the body and playful activity, which silences the multiplicity of childish ways of existing, which they do not prepare, they try to train. And every attempt at containment, training is, in itself, a form of violence.

Children’s bodies carry stories, affections, social marks, and desires that challenge the traditional curricular logic, still deeply marked by attempts at disciplinary normativities, hegemonic patterns, temporal linearity, and universalizing development, which establish in advance what is allowed, expected, and recognized as “childhood.” By ignoring the context, times and knowledge that emerge from childhood experiences, the univocal curriculum contributes to the maintenance of a homogeneous and regulated childhood, silencing other possible ways of living and learning.

In this sense, destabilizing the paths of repetition, we wish, based on the references chosen for this article, to break with childhood patterns as a fixed definition, betting on the inventive force of becoming a possibility of experimenting with the movement of existence, inventing other ways of learning-living that arise unexpectedly in school daily life. Thus, curricula can also be meant as open territories for “the movements of invention and creation that affirm life” (Soares, 2020, p.22), even though it is crossed by regulatory norms that seek fixity and stability.

Betting on the potential of doing differently with childhoods involves the desire to believe in the importance of breaking with sedentary curricular organizations, marked by mortified knowledge. Becoming, then, is a wager on the movement of life that forms alliances, for it is encounter, escape, deterritorialization of the model, fissure and leakage, a composition woven in lines-experimentation, in a curriculum-experimentation, which weaves heterogeneous connections, finding conditions for the new to be produced, expanding the meanings of curricula to see it as a field for inventiveness (Pantoja, 2018).

By assuming curricula as this shifting field, crossed by lives and therefore inventive, we also assume other ways of thinking about educational networks, childhoods and everything that goes through school daily life. Another way of

thinking, it becomes a tool of intervention, of action in the world, therefore, claiming other possibilities for childhoods in the curricula, presupposes engaging with the world, supposedly already built, named, known.

Our references destabilize the models that reduce thinking to the representation of a pre-established world, and operate with tools that place as a priority the “questioning of the world with its singular and unpredictable events to think about the concrete living being that acts in a certain space-temporal-historical place” (Barros et al, 2020, p. 6).

Seeking ways to enable the passages of these other forms of life that cross the production of curricula, as a way of overturning traditions, inciting processes of singularization and reducing their relevance. It is to experience unstable curricula, practices useful for the maintenance of life, alliances, small revolutions “to further expand our condition of negotiation in this shifting terrain without the intention of leaving it” (Borges; Lopes; 2021, p. 131).

Disputing other possibilities of meaning for curricula in childhood

Curricula and childhoods, when thought beyond Cartesian rationalism, move as a field of knowledge production, beyond the prescriptive interposition of elements and contents. Using the notion that all practices are political, we believe that betting on childhoods that we do not want to name, once and for all, create counter-hegemonic movements that, in many cases, are invisible to the established ways of legitimizing knowledge.

Assuming and incorporating the movements of childhoods, it involves betting on a conception of decentralization of large projects, to propose to experience the power of existing networks in everyday life. For the school space is a territory of unpredictability, of unique movements, of vibrations and variations, and which, because it deals with lives, is always subject to differences.

Like the individuals crossed in their trajectories by violence, demands and policies of narrowing horizons, we are faced with the constant attempt to capture our identities and experiences within a standardized mold. However, these individuals are constituted through individuations that are always very precarious (Butler, 2018), partial and provisional.

By tensioning the idea of childhood as fixed and universal, we seek to highlight the disputes of meanings about the bodies of racialized, poor children with disabilities, dissenting from gender and sexuality who all the time challenge school and tension the limits of a curriculum that often produces erasures under the veil of normalization and an attempt to guarantee a “quality education” that ignores all children’s differences (Frangella; Queiroz, 2023).

Contemporary curricular policies often mobilize promises of fullness and stability, seeking to fix meanings, identities, and educational trajectories in a field that, by its very nature, is marked by lack, contingency, and openness to antagonism. It is precisely in this open and unfinished space that lies the power to create new forms of existence, knowledge, and subjectivities, which escape normalizing and standardizing attempts. Thus, to think the curriculum is also to embrace conflict, negotiation and the multiplicity of voices and experiences, without the intention of reducing this complexity to a single and definitive narrative.

In addition, reflecting on childhood and homogenization movements in curricula also permeates thinking about attachment to the field of identity as a field subject to pitfalls and deprivations, in view of the imposition of what is common to all, as a synonym for improvement. Through the disputes of meanings of childhoods, the search for belonging to an identity aims to achieve something that is intrinsically impossible, which is constantly coming (Reis, 2025).

In recent years, curriculum policies in Brazil have been crossed by initiatives that, under the official justification of “improving student performance”, align with neoliberal rationality. This alignment has driven reforms marked by control, evaluation, and accountability devices, which focus on the ways of teaching, learning and existing in educational institutions. Literacy policies, inserted in this movement, operate through logic of measurement, regulation and normalization of knowledge and individuals, impacts that also reach Early Childhood Education. Often anchored in mechanical models, these policies tend to reduce educational processes to the logic of repetition, prediction, and control, emptying the complexity of childhoods and school contexts, such as the National Pact for Literacy at the Right

Age (PNAIC, acronym in Portuguese), whose name already reveals the logic of rigid chronology and the standardization of times and modes of learning.

This logic guides literacy as a fixed time frame to be reached, disregarding the multiple ways of experiencing and learning present in childhoods. Therefore, educational processes start to privilege compliance with established standards and goals, to the detriment of recognizing the uniqueness of the individuals and the contexts in which they are inserted. Thus, policies such as the National Pact for Literacy at the Right Age exemplify how official initiatives, when trying to guarantee results “in the right time”, end up reinforcing control and exclusion devices, limiting the possibility of pedagogical experiences that value play activities, the children’s own time and the multiple languages present in childhoods.

This way of operating focuses directly on the daily lives of Early Childhood Education, producing displacements and tensions that reveal the strength of curricular projects organized by competencies, such as the National Common Curricular Base for Early Childhood Education, for example. According to Lopes and Carvalho (2025, p. 15), “[...] by limiting the fields of experience to the condition of learning objectives, that is, of skills and abilities to be acquired [...] the National Common Curricular Base excludes more powerful possibilities of carrying out the experience of childhood as a singular process and open to the production of a new [...]”.

The anticipation of literacy, often linked to goals and performance indicators, crosses the teaching work and children’s experiences, converting the right to education into a competition for results. In this context, the child is seen as an individual to be prepared, trained, molded and no longer in his power to be-in-the-world, but as a promise of future productivity.

In this sense, the attempt to standardize formative paths through instruments such as external evaluations and normative curricular references, acts as a government technology that disauthorizes local knowledge and makes the unique ways of learning and teaching invisible. This movement disregards territories, cultures, times, and bodies, producing ruptures between what is lived and what is expected of children. It is in this tension that the fractures between prescribed policies and the ways they are experienced, interpreted, and exist in everyday school life become visible.

We understand with Lopes and Macedo (2011) that the ways and objectives with which these policies are implemented locally are varied, giving multiple meanings to the global and highlighting the complex articulation between the global and local. In this dispute of meanings, in addition to the vast academic production produced in the field, it is not possible to disregard that Early Childhood Education is marked by ambiguities. On the one hand, there is the pressure to adapt children to the schooling process from an early age; on the other, there is still a welfare conception that, although not constituted as a network policy, is present in the imagination of some educators and can manifest itself in local politics.

Welfare, in this context, is not only a social practice aimed at protecting childhood or caring for working families, but a discursive regime that produces certain truths about what the child is, who should take care of them and for what purposes. Therefore, we question meanings of practices that reduce the nursery to a place of custody, hygiene and surveillance, an extension of the home or the maternal/female function.

Negotiation and translation processes are not thought of as “resistance”, as conscious actions, according to Derrida, they are understood based on the understanding that the world, texts, only become intelligible through processes of negotiation and translation, processes marked by difference “[...] beyond any limit” (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p. 33). Just as “it is impossible to find two equal schools” (Ezpeleta; Rockwell, 1989, p. 50), it is impossible to find two childhoods, or two equal networks.

As Queiroz and Frangella (2023) discuss, normative curriculum policies tend to reduce education to the logic of teaching, aligning with discourses of school quality assessment even in the absence of formal promotion in Early Childhood Education, which shows a capture of childhood by external metrics and parameters.

In this context, the search for the homogenization of knowledge and individuals can be seen as an effort to erase the differences and experiences that exist in them. For childhoods, this standardization represents not only an

attempt to capture and fix their senses, but also a rupture of natural movements and cycles of development, especially in Early Childhood Education, where the pleasure of playing and interacting is fundamental for learning.

In their speeches, official normative documents defend themselves by talking about not prescribing actions or ways of doing in their guidelines. However, they delimit fields of experiences for each group, highlighting the child's leading role from a script often elaborated by specialists who suffocate other possible creations.

Thinking about the curriculum in Early Childhood Education requires shifting perspectives that have historically been anchored in notions centered on adults, developmental, and school-oriented views of childhood. The child, in this hegemonic model, is understood as an individual in formation, incomplete, lacking knowledge to be acquired in foreseen and measurable stages. This linear and normative view not only regulates children's times and bodies, but also captures their experiences, expressions, and ways of inhabiting the world, converting childhood into an object of intervention and training.

To highlight this regulation, we use the timesheet, a device that, through well-coordinated grids, lines, columns and temporalities, tries to standardize the school rhythm. As a note, we emphasize that there are disputes over the time allocations for scheduling, which go beyond and fall short of the school. More than a marker, time proves to be an important reference of curricular policies (Souza; Lopes, 2024, p. 4).

Therefore, it is necessary to ask: what ways of being a child fit in the official guidelines, in the fields of experience, in the plans and in the evaluations? Which voices are heard, and which are silent within institutions? When affirming child leading role in normative documents, it is necessary to pay attention to the limits of what is allowed to lead, whether it is inventive gestures, error, daydreaming and improvisation or just the reproduction of "adequate" tasks and "expected" behaviors.

Thus, affirming the curriculum as a field of disputes implies recognizing children as individuals of knowledge, culture, and language. It also implies refusing identity fixations and school scripts that anticipate what must be learned, felt, or expressed. Childhoods, in the plural, call us to think about other times and other ways of learning in which activities play, listening, pause and the body are central. A curriculum that recognizes childhoods as a power must move away from the logic of anticipation and productivity, and open itself to experience, to the unforeseen, to events.

Thus, instead of asking "what should children learn", perhaps we should ask ourselves: "what can a becoming-child?", how he/she feels, creates, moves, and communicates. This inversion shifts the curriculum from a place of application of knowledge to a space for the creation of possible worlds, worlds that are made in the relationships between children, adults, spaces, objects, and discourses.

Official normative documents, when seeking homogenization, tend to erase the differences and vitality that exist in them, perpetuating a cycle of exclusion and marginalization. Many of the curricular policies, such as the National Common Curricular Base, for example, are justified in the logic of the common for the benefit of the universal. These policies are guided by a unique perspective of curriculum, literacy and childhoods contributed to the centralizing logic that argue for the guarantee of a democratizing common (Pereira; Reis, 2022).

Bhabha (2013), when arguing that the nation is a fictitious construction, allows us to reflect on the homogenizing groupings that produce normative collective identities. In this sense, it is possible to think about how certain policies place, for example, children as individuals who can only be recognized as having rights if they meet criteria such as literacy, as if access to written language was a condition for the legitimacy of childhood.

Curricular policies aimed at children are discursive articulations that dispute meanings, cause effects, and produce constraints around regulations (Souza; Lopes, 2024), such as, for example, literacy at the "right time". In any case, within the school model in question, the child is guided, even though educational and pedagogical resources, deemed playful, to appropriate previously established concepts, to identify already formulated problems, and to apply these same concepts in the pursuit of exemplary and expected solutions.

Thinking about curricula with and for childhood implies questioning the ways in which children's bodies are summoned, standardized, educated and, often, silenced. It is about shifting the perspective to what escapes and assuming the curricula as a crossing (Süssekind; Lontra, 2016), as territories of enunciation of differences, flows, and intensities in childhoods. Assuming the criticism of the curriculum as a prescriptive document, which operates as a technology for regulating bodies, which defines rhythms, conducts, times, and spaces that children must occupy in the future, normalizing from the way they sit to how they express themselves. Children's bodies are forged by a school grammar that values control, restraint, obedience, and repetition.

Insurgent considerations

The theoretical records mobilized in this work allowed us to perceive how the formative processes in Basic Education are crossed by disputes of meanings about bodies, especially in childhood. Curricular policies, for example, by instituting expected contents and skills, as demarcated in the National Common Curricular Base, also establish models of a single desirable childhood, in an attempt to erase differences and impose bodily, cognitive, and emotional patterns. It becomes, therefore, urgent to constantly (re)think about curricula that recognize childhoods in their many other ways of being, not as incomplete or information individuals, but as individuals of rights, potent in their ways of living, feeling, and learning. Individuals who have always existed, in the gaps, in the erasures, in the cracks, weaving alternatives to dispute other possibilities of being in school.

It was in this shifting territory, where words met bodies and bodies performed meanings, that the proposed article gained unexpected contours. In this sense, assuming the movements of life in becoming-child in the curricula, involves betting on a conception of education populated by unpredictability, unique movements, vibrations, and variations, open to lives and always subject to the unrepeatable. For moving bodies announce futures that we do not yet know and do not intend to name. But as an ethical political investment, we direct ourselves in a way that allows us to look at other ways of being and being in the world. In our clipping, we adjusted our research lenses to children's bodies, in their differences and in their eternal becoming.

We believe that, by following the bodies of children in their movements, we learn to listen to the gestures, silences, displacements, and creations that tension the ways in which we have embroidered curricula in the daily lives of Early Childhood Education. These bodies, far from being passive, announce other worlds, escape capture, and call us to rethink the ways of naming, planning, and evaluating.

It is in this movement that curricula become terrains in dispute of invention and resistance. For to claim the heterogeneity of childhoods is also to refuse the normative projects that intend to establish what it is to be a child, to teach or to learn. More than applying prescriptions, the ethical-political commitment that is affirmed here is with sensitive listening, with unfinished work and with openness to the unpredictable. So that we can continue creating cracks through which winds of the future, of childhoods in the making, and of curricula in transition can pass.

References

ALVES, Nilda Guimarães. Decifrando o pergaminho: o cotidiano das escolas nas lógicas das redes cotidianas. *In*: OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa de; ALVES, Nilda Guimarães (Org.). **Pesquisa no/do cotidiano das escolas: sobre redes de saberes**. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2001. p. 13–38.

BARROS, Maria Elizabeth; FERRAÇO, Carlos Eduardo; DEBENETTI, Carmen Ines. Formação permanente de professores de um município da Grande Vitória/ES: um exercício estético. **Pro-Posições**, Campinas, SP, v. 31, p. e20170120, 2020. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/proposic/article/view/8660744>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2025.

BHABHA, Homi. **O Local da cultura**. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2013.

BORGES, Veronica; LOPES, Alice Casimiro. Por que o afeto é importante para a política? Implicações teórico-estratégicas. **Práx. Educ.**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 17, n. 48, p. 114-135, out. 2021. Disponível em http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2178-26792021000500114&lng=pt&nrm=iso. acessos em 19 jul. 2025.

BUTLER, Judith. **A força da não violência**: um vínculo ético-político. Tradução de André Cabral. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2021.

BUTLER, Judith. Corpos em aliança e a política das ruas: notas para uma teoria performativa da assembleia. *In*: **Corpos em aliança e a política das ruas**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2018. p. 29–68.

BUTLER, Judith. **Quadros de guerra: quando a vida é passível de luto?** Tradução de Sérgio Lamarão. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2015.

CORAZZA, Sandra. Contribuições de Deleuze e Guattari para as pesquisas em educação. **Revista Digital Do LAV**, Rio Grande do Sul, v. 8, p. 125–144, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.5902/198373485298>.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Lógica do sentido**. Tradução de Luiz Orlandi. 5. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil platôs**: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Tradução de Ana Lúcia de Oliveira; Lúcia Cláudia Leão. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2011. v. 5.

DERRIDA, Jacques; ROUDINESCO, Elisabeth. **De que amanhã...: diálogo**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed., 2004.

EZPELETA, Justa; ROCWELL, Elsie. **Pesquisa participante**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1989.

FERRAÇO, Carlos Eduardo; PEREZ, Carmen Lúcia Vidal; OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa. Diferentes abordagens, temas e modos de ser da pesquisa nos/dos/com os cotidianos. *In*: FERRAÇO, Carlos Eduardo; PEREZ, Carmen Lúcia Vidal; OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa (org.). **Aprendizagens cotidianas com a pesquisa**: novas reflexões em pesquisa nos/dos/com os cotidianos das escolas. Petrópolis: DP et Alii, 2008. p. 15–22.

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia dos Prazeres. Políticas de formação do alfabetizador e produção de políticas curriculares: pactuando sentidos para formação, alfabetização e currículo. **Práxis Educativa**, [S. l.], v. 11, n. 1, p. 107–128, 2016. DOI: 10.5212/PraxEduc.v.11i1.0005. Disponível em: <https://revistas.uepg.br/index.php/praxiseducativa/article/view/7110>. Acesso em: 19 jul. 2025.

GALLO, Silvio. Eu, o outro e tantos outros: educação, alteridade e filosofia da diferença. *In*: GARCIA, Regina Leite (Org.). **Diálogos cotidianos**. Petrópolis: DP et Alii, 2010. p. 231–246.

GARCIA, Angela; LOBO, Rosângela Alves. Currículos oficiais e currículos praticados: a diversidade vai à escola? *In*: OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa de; SGARBI, Paulo (Orgs.). **Redes culturais**: diversidade e educação. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2002. p. 57–70.

KOHAN, Walter Omar. Não há verdade sem alteridade. A propósito de “Devir-criança da filosofia: infância da educação”. *In*: KOHAN, Walter Omar. (Org.). **Devir-criança da filosofia**: Infância da educação. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2010. p. 7-13.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. **Teorias de currículo**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

LOPES, Sammy William; CARVALHO, Janete Magalhães. Os currículos da educação infantil e o problema da experiência. **Revista e-Curriculum**, v. 23, p. e68770-e68770, 2025. Disponível em: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/curriculum/article/view/68770>. Acesso em 16 jul. 2025.

OLINI, Polyana. **Noodramatização do currículo**: arquivo do Projeto Escreleituras. Tese (Doutorado). Faculdade de Educação - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2017.

PANTOJA, Roniqueli. **Instantâneos cartográficos de um currículo artifice**. 2018. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, 2018.

PARAÍSO, Marlucy. Fazer do caos uma estrela dançarina no currículo: invenção política com gênero e sexualidade em tempos do slogan “ideologia de gênero”. In: PARAÍSO, Marlucy Alves; CALDEIRA, Maria Carolina da Silva (Org.). **Pesquisas sobre currículos, gêneros e sexualidades**. Belo Horizonte: Mazza, 2018, p. 23-52.

PARAÍSO, Marlucy. Metodologias de pesquisas pós-críticas em educação e currículo: trajetórias, pressupostos, procedimentos e estratégias analíticas. In: MEYER, DAGMAR Estermann; PARAÍSO, Marlucy Alves. **Metodologias de pesquisas pós-críticas em educação**. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Mazza Edições, 2015.p.23-46.

PEREIRA, Talita Vidal; REIS, Matheus Saldanha do Amaral. Limites democráticos de um projeto de formação comum a todos. **Educ. Rev.**, Curitiba, v. 38, e85861, 2022. Available from http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-40602022000100201&lng=en&nrm=iso. access on 19 July 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.85861>.

QUEIROZ, Isabele Lacerda; FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. IDEIAS PARA ADIAR O FIM DAS INFÂNCIAS: currículo, alfabetização e avaliação na educação infantil. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, v. 23, p. e1136, 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol23articles/1136.pdf>. Acesso em 28 ago. 2024.

REIS, Matheus Saldanha do Amaral. **Das expectativas de controle à inevitabilidade da différence**: os limites de um projeto de democracia comum a todos. 2025. 149 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2025.

SOARES, Erika. **DEVIR-SELVAGEM DA CRIANÇA NA EDUCAÇÃO INFANTIL**: um currículo entre voos e pousos da Mariposa. Tese (Doutorado). Faculdade de Educação - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte, 2020.

SOUZA, Bárbara Rocha; LOPES, Alice Casemiro. DIFERENTES SENTIDOS PARA TEMPO EM DISCURSOS PELA ALFABETIZAÇÃO. **Práx. Educ.**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 20, n. 51, e14453, 2024. Disponível em http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2178-26792024000100111&lng=pt&nrm=iso. Acesso em 16 jul. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.22481/praxisedu.v20i51.14453>.

SÜSSEKIND, Maria Luiza. **Teatro de Ações**: arqueologia dos estudos nos/dos/com os cotidianos – relatos de práticas pedagógicas emancipatórias, 235f. Tese, UERJ, RJ, 2007. Disponível em: <http://livros01.livrosgratis.com.br/cp093504.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 ago. 2021.

SÜSSEKIND, Maria Luiza; LONTRA, Viviane. Narrativas como travessias curriculares: sobre alguns usos da pesquisa na formação de professores. **Roteiro**, v. 41, n. 1, p. 87-108, 2016. Disponível em: http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?pid=S2177-60592016000100087&script=sci_abstract. Acesso em: 14 jan. 2025.

Editor Responsável: Alboni Marisa Dudeque Pianovski Vieira

Recebido/Received: 20.07.2025 / 07.20.2025

Aprovado/Approved: 02.11.2025 / 11.02.2025