

Movement belongs to all of us? Thinking interdisciplinarity with early childhood studies and kinesiology

Nicole Land

Abstract: This article takes up a question of how early childhood studies and kinesiology might undertake interdisciplinarity together. Working with the provocation of the phrase ‘movement belongs to all of us’, this article probes the character of three particular interdisciplinary alliances between early childhood studies and kinesiology, asking what becomes possible and impossible for interdisciplinary work amid each collision. These intersections include moving with humans and new materialist movements, dancing childhoods and bodily boundaries, and doing collaboratories and social justice. Working closely with each of these intersections, I propose discord, perceptibility, and collectivity as three possible practices toward inventing unfamiliar interdisciplinarity between early childhood studies and kinesiology.

Keywords: early childhood studies, kinesiology, interdisciplinary, pedagogy

Writing this article amid the political turmoil and loaded ethical complexities of the Beijing 2022 Olympics, I am struck by a commercial on television that perfectly articulates the intentions of this paper. With all the majesty of a contemporary advertisement facilitated by a massive budget, it travels through montages of curated, diverse humans moving on ice, in a town square, and in a ballet studio. “Movement,” it professes, “belongs to all of us”. The commercial is part of Toyota’s Start Your Impossible campaign,

titled *Beautiful Movement*. While I am sure that a larger analysis of the campaign's discourses of diversity, motion, and harmony amid the ecological devastation caused by multinational, global conglomerates certainly exists, it is the phrase 'movement belongs to all of us' that, as Stengers (2015) writes is about, "giving to the situation the power to make us think" (p. 185). *Movement belongs to all of us*. I wish to put all three gestures of this sentence into question as I think about interdisciplinarity, kinesiology, and early childhood studies in this article. My project is to notice how kinesiology and early childhood studies intersect, to take their interdisciplinarity not as a hollow signifier of pulling knowledge from both fields, but to instead ask how these knowledges become interdisciplinary and manifest particular modes of interdisciplinarity together in the name of understanding, responding with, and creating more livable worlds with moving bodies – all while knowing that to study the moving body is an intense and particular undertaking (Markula, 2020). I am interested in the character of interdisciplinary alliances between early childhood studies and kinesiology: what is the mode, the life, the politic of this interdisciplinarity? The consequences? What is made possible and what is foreclosed in how kinesiology and early childhood studies meet? What is created and what is reproduced, invented and clamped down upon? Drawing these questions together, there is something so sticky, so persistent, about 'movement belongs to all of us' that it has become an anchor for thinking about how interdisciplinary collisions between kinesiology and childhood studies come to matter. My first question is simply – does it? Does movement belong to everyone? Is such a sentiment even a possibility amid the modes of interdisciplinarity made possible when early childhood studies and kinesiology encounter one another?

I use this borrowed earworm of a three-layered phrase, 'movement belongs to all of us', to shape the article. To begin by thinking how *movement* belongs to all of us, I want to position movement not as a pre-given, technocratic description of a body, molecule, or energy through space or time. I want to ask if movement, as a rich, dense, murky entanglement, comes to happen: what is the movement that belongs to everyone and what of movements that cannot belong to everyone? I name this as an interdisciplinarity made through discord. Then, I take up the contention that movement *belongs* to all of us the unquestioned assertion that movement is a commodity subject to the logics of humanist ownership. I focus on questions of process: how does movement belong differently in different spaces? What are movement's belongings? I name this as an interdisciplinarity concerned with perceptibility. Finally, I confront the argument toward collectivity embedded in movement belongs to *all of us*. Who are the bodies of movement? Who

cannot move? How does movement belong to all of us, where ‘all of us’ is not a romanticized collection of individuals but a fragmented array of interdisciplinary alliances? This I get to know as an interdisciplinarity of collectivity. Finally, I conclude by emphasizing that my project in this paper is not to name a comprehensive, cohesive array of practices for doing interdisciplinarity between early childhood studies and kinesiology. I need to reiterate that I am never attempting a wholesale literature review. Rather, I am creating torsion with particular moments in the literature; moments that help to deepen how we might think of interdisciplinarity with early childhood studies and kinesiology. I close by reiterating my analysis as a provocation, as an invitation for doing interdisciplinarity otherwise.

Movement Belongs to All of Us

Thinking movement as a site of collision between early childhood studies and kinesiology, interdisciplinarity comes to matter as a practice of discord; of disharmony and dissonance where it is motion between discord and affinity that matters. This is a process of interdisciplinarity that speaks in dissensus, divergence, and overlap as we wonder, what is the movement that belongs to everyone and what of movements that cannot belong to everyone? In this section I trace one intersections of early childhood studies and kinesiology: moving with humans and new materialist movements. Within this intersection, I attend to how discord happens as an interdisciplinary ethic built when these differing threads from each field meet.

Discord: Moving with Humans and New Materialist Movements

Hackett (2015), an early childhood studies scholar, proposes ‘wayfaring’ as a method for moving within messy worlds, where children’s movements within a place are understood to be responsive and situated rather than predetermined by the terrain, regulations, or histories of a site. This is a profoundly relational ethos of moving as meaning making unfolds collectively and situatedly, as movement takes on a life in a particular space. Movement belongs to a place; to a time, a collective, an embodied situation and not to a bounded, individualist human child separate from the places they wayfind. Building on this work, Hackett and Somerville (2017) propose children’s moving within more-than-human worlds as “world-forming practices” (p. 386) as “thinking in movement stands as a critique of the frequent conflation of thinking, language and rationality, and the association

of these three things with what it means to be human” (p. 388). For Hackett and Somerville, moving with place reconfigures the child subject and child body, attending to how children move with their messy worlds. Here movement emerges in a relation between a child and their sonic, embodied, mobile entanglements with a place – entanglements that resist the image of a sovereign human child. Hackett builds this further with Rautio (Hackett, Rautio, 2019), taking children’s running and rolling as process-oriented practices for navigating lively worlds. They ask “where and when can children answer the world through their moving bodies? When and which material forces are allowed or denied their potential to materialise into running children?” (p. 1029). These questions foreground the politics of moving when movement unsettles the image of the anthropocentric child and instead demand we pay attention to what Taylor (2020) names a ‘minor stories’ – the everyday relations that shape with whom, and with what bodies, children might do moving. Movement, here, happens amid the flux of constantly re-materializing posthuman child bodies and the responsive movements that both make and disassemble how children move in complex common worlds (Land, Todorovic, 2021).

Turning to kinesiology, Markula (2019) proposes that thinking with feminist new materialisms requires a rejection of humanist inheritances as we turn instead toward questions of process and attending to more-than-human processes while foregrounding moving bodies. Arguing for the power of feminist new materialisms to empty masculinist, heteropatriarchal constructions of the rational human, Markula points toward posthumanist thinking as a site of intervention that “transcend[s] socially constructed binaries by including the body in motion as a vital mater for socio-cultural examinations of physical activity” (p. 6). Grounded in making visible the erasures of dominant research processes, Markula proposes postqualitative methodologies as a move toward futures that cultivate multiple embodied, situated ways of knowing. With Markula, movement unfolds amid relations with material worlds that defy the logics of liberal humanism and objective knowledge production; movement belongs to “the moving body as a machinic assemblage of metabolism and mechanics, motion and meaning, force and politics” (p. 9). Fullagar, Pavlidis, Hickey-Moody, and Coffey (2021) foreground feminist new materialisms through “embodied movement as method” (p. 174) where following moving bodies demands of us a profound unlearning of what we thought the moving body of humanism to be. It is in this making-strange of the body, they argue, that feminist new materialisms become “attuned to the ways that contexts and intra-personal, intra-species dynamics shape bodies and embodied knowledge as ongoing processes” (p. 188), therefore

unsettling what and how we thought we knew, with liberal humanism and objective science, bodies. Here, movement is not loyal to the Human but to the work of dismantling anthropocentrism. Fullagar (2017), writing on post-qualitative inquiry informed by feminist new materialisms, contends that a shift from asking what a body *is* toward what a body can *do* mobilizes a repudiation of status-quo body knowledges that seek to understand a body for its function. This rejection, as Fullagar shows, draws attention toward assemblages rather than individuals and binaries, invigorates the politicality of thinking movement and bodies beyond neutral terms of capture, and thinks the permeability of bodies and moving in complex worlds. Importantly, Fullagar contends that “doing theoretically oriented research that pushes the boundaries and creates uncertainty requires more than an individualised intellectual responsibility” (p. 255). Here, movement is both subversive and collective, treasonous in its orientation toward a commons that resists our existing individualist, neoliberal logics for understanding moving (and) bodies. Here, movement speaks the language of biopolitics (Fullagar, 2019; Markula, 2014) and to the work of moving differently toward otherwise biopolitics.

Read together with a question of what movements become possible and impossible in interdisciplinary collisions, moving with humans and new materialist movements enact an interdisciplinary discord that wrestles with the common work of disrupting the Eurocentric human of humanism (Taylor, Giugni, 2012) and the consequences such an image of the moving body perpetuates for movement. In early childhood studies, we named a movement that owes to a place or an embodied situation and not to a bounded, individualist human child; with kinesiology, we noticed how movement leans into to a processural, fleshy, assembled body. These two positions, when brought into an interdisciplinary dialogue of discord, overlap but are not tantamount to one another. One orients toward place, toward more-than-human multispecies entanglements while the other drags its scalpel into our skin, tracing our flesh as a lively more-than-human relation with the world. Taking discord as an ethic of interdisciplinarity means resisting the urge to conflate these projects under too easy a label of ‘posthuman’. Instead, we need to tend to each project’s specificity – the discord between wayfaring and flesh matters. An interdisciplinary question asked here with discord might be how we can attune to the places of flesh and the flesh of place. A second example: with early childhood studies, movement embodies entanglements that resist the image of a sovereign human child while with kinesiology we got to know movement that does not belong to the human but to the labour of refusing anthropocentrism. There is discord here, as one

project takes children's more-than-human worlding as process of creating relations that make the lies of sovereignty, of isolation, impossible while the other project refuses a world centered on the human. It would be too easy to conflate these projects, to say we have named a perfect alliance between early childhood studies and kinesiology. To think interdisciplinarity with discord, we need to keep alive the differences in theorizing movement beyond the subject and movement beyond anthropocentrism – the specificity of our interdisciplinary attunements matters. Perhaps here is a discordant interdisciplinary question of who moves, and how, after the human? What is posthuman moving and what does it do? Finally, with early childhood studies we found a movement that deals in the unrest of constantly re-materializing posthuman child bodies. With kinesiology, we met movement that matters to biopolitics and to the work of creating otherwise biopolitics. Here too is important discord: the re-creation of moving bodies as they engage a messy world differs from the sharp edges of inheriting, contending with, and dismantling normative biopolitics. Both are gestures toward world-making, but they ask of us different relations, different tools, different orientations. There is discord here in the differences that matter between fluctuating bodies and the biopolitical worlds that surround them. A question built of interdisciplinary discord might be, what moves with(in) a body? How?

I have proposed discord as an interdisciplinary ethic for thinking movement, and how and to whom movement belongs, with early childhood studies and kinesiology. It would be easy to align the projects I have thought with above, outlining the affinities that early childhood studies and kinesiology share. But I want to practice an interdisciplinarity against harmony, one that takes seriously the situated projects each field can articulate from within its own inheritances, places, and spaces. I have selected discord to highlight the messy space between consensus and dissensus that keeps discord alive; discord takes work to keep its tensions alive and it cannot rest in simple difference but seeks relational mess, epistemological turmoil. Therefore, imagining discord as a way to navigate but also nurture the traffic between early childhood studies and kinesiology might generate one practice for thinking interdisciplinarity.

Movement *Belongs* to All of Us

In thinking with questions of movement's belonging provoked by 'movement belongs to all of us', I want to propose an interdisciplinary ethic and practice of perceptibility between early childhood studies and kinesiology.

How, we can ask, does movement belong differently in different spaces? What are movement's belongings? Proposing perceptibility and making-perceptible as an interdisciplinary practice, I am offering the idea that becoming visible across fields requires more than a presence or a shared project but requires a collective project of doing discernability where a strand of one field becomes meaningful to another not by compromising to the conditions of that field, but through the shared work of making concepts or concerns perceptible to one another. I think through the image of the dancing child in early childhood studies and the question of bodily boundaries in kinesiology.

Perceptibility: Dancing Childhoods and Bodily Boundaries

Describing an experiment in dancing with the weather with young children, early childhood studies scholars Pollitt, Blaise, and Rooney (2021) “propose that cultivating dancerly attention to the (human) body through improvisation offers a practice for attuning to other bodies” (p. 1141) in the name of unsettling the individual, sovereign, rational human child-subject of neoliberal education. For Pollitt et al., dancing with children with the weather creates “weather bodied that are in perpetual co-composition” (p. 1142) as they disobey the human/nature or body/world boundaries we inherit. The improvisational creation of ways to move with the world is, they argue, urgent amid 21st century climate change and ecological precarity. Improvisation, in this context, refers to unplanned and responsive collaborations between children and the world, where acts of breathing and moving draw us into our ecological relations rather than separate children from more-than-human worlds. “Our dance intervention”, Pollitt et al. contend, “generated and made visible the embodied and unfixed relationality between children and weather” (p. 1149) thus unsettling pre-existing humanist assumptions (mastery, extraction, ownership, commodification) about how children should move within ecological worlds and setting forward, instead, the proposition that improvisational, responsive moving is an act of world-making, of reciprocity in motion, and of vulnerability through movement. With Pollitt, Blaise, and Rooney, movement belongs to reciprocity; to the practice of moving between the human body and the world where movement belongs neither to a bounded body but is also not so unbound as to be unanchored in the world. There is a deep ethic of response here, where moving enacts a belonging that is an act of living within a world. Also in early childhood studies, Lenz Taguchi, Palmer, and Gustafsson (2016) think with

experimental dance practices with preschool-aged children, following how children's movements and subjectivities assessable and reassemble to disrupt status-quo conceptions of children's movements. They name the child of these dance practices as the "becoming-monstrous child"; a child who refuses to move in ways that reproduce the individual, sovereign, rational skill-developing, developmentally appropriate, performative child subject. In experimental dance practices, movements "open up a possibility for the children to be part of a body – an assemblage – that does not consist of organized and functional parts or forces... Rather, this is an assemblage of acts and performances, moments, and functions that *performs* a body" (p. 710). Bodies that move and dance, with Lenz Taguchi et al., are collective and fragmented and fleeting. They resist assessment and reification because they are made in the crashes of arms and legs and music and sound and relations and gestures that become possible within experimental dance practices. Following Lenz Taguchi, Palmer, and Gustafsson, if movement belongs it is a belonging that is provisional, always in flux. Movement's belongings, here, resist easy categorization and lack the stability needed to assign a moniker. Rather, they are affective and relational: movement belongs to motion.

Thorpe (2021), writing in kinesiology and sporting cultures, shares *Sporting Scars*, a poem of which two stanzas read: "Wrestling bed-sheets / Gut, gutted, gutting feminism / Our intellectual labour is not enough / Where is the blood, the skin in the game? / Re-turning with bodies, affects // Times-pacematterings / Me-them-us / Finding new words / Alternative tools / To dismantle the gendered-assemblage / Of the dominant / Sporting system" (p. 412). Thorpe lays out a provocation that weaves together fleshed bodies with the ongoing project of disrupting status-quo knowledges, power relations, and ontological structures in kinesiology. How Thorpe ties the body – *the blood, the skin in the game* – to the work – *dismantling* – advances an image of the body that is not just political but is lively, made of the messy ethics and politics that makes worlds. There's a bodying as world making here, an assertion of an unstable but not unmoored body. Newman and Thorpe (2021) elaborate this body in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, contending that "the pandemic has forced us to rethink the relatedness of the body–to other bodies, to vulnerable bodies, to the population as a whole, to particulate matter, to the state and its medical-industrial-complexes" (p. 129). Here the body's borders stretch across scales, infiltrated by and infiltrating carbon, care, and quarantine. Jeffrey, Barbour, and Thorpe (2021), craft Yoga bodies as modes of entanglement that "move the discussion away from what a 'Yoga body' can do in a movement practice, and instead con-

sider women's Yoga bodies as intricately interconnected experiences and agentic phenomena always influencing the continual becoming of our world: (p. 355). Bodies resist boundaries that allow for easy assessment or evaluation and instead become processes of motion that unfold in dialogue with the world. Taking Thorpe's scholarship and collaborations with Newman, Jeffrey, and Barbour, movement belongs to a porous body, a body whose humanist borders can be breached by the vitality of the world. Continuing to think with body boundaries, I turn again to Thorpe, with Clark and Brice (2021a), as they think with Frost (2016) to position women athletes' bodies as 'biocultural creatures' whereby bodies are implicated in a worldly biological system of interchange and co-composition. This is, critically, not an anti-biosciences argument, but one that recognizes that "biology [and the knowledges we know biology with] is always in dialogue with, transformed by, and also transformative of, the sporting (knowledge) cultures and habits in which these athletes move, perform, compose, and decompose" (p. 16). Bodies have borders made *with*, not *by*, biologies; molecules create membranes and skin but these borders come to matter as bodies are made and remade through moving, where moving always unfolds amid the situated flurry of materials, discourses, ethics, and politics that surround human and more-than-human bodies. Here movement belongs to biocultural molecules and the patterned and unpatterned ways they come to matter as or mark bodies. This is a tenuous belonging, one that suggests that perhaps movement never belongs, that it always, as philosopher Erin Manning (2014) contends, outruns the subject. And, as Thorpe, Brice, and Clark (2021b) story, body boundaries become especially permeable amid the realities of a global pandemic.

How then, might we take perceptibility as an ethic for thinking interdisciplinarity with early childhood studies and kinesiology. With early childhood studies, we met movement that belongs to responsivity where to be responsive requires an ethic of carefully, modestly, and speculatively responding to the situated worlds of which we are a part. In kinesiology, we got to know movement that belongs to a porous body, where to be porous is to counter the borders of humanism's body. Taken together, what is made perceptible is that movement's belonging is a labour, work: movement is not automatically responsive nor is it automatically porous. This is a politics of perceptibility rooted in process that knows that making-perceptible such movements with such bodies is difficult against the shadow of status-quo conceptions of bodies and movement in and beyond childhood. It also makes questions of the human as a thread of moving perceptible: what becomes of the porous, responsive, moving human? Is this a human we want to stand for in pedago-

gies and practices? How? As a second example, we met an early childhood studies movement that is provisional, always unstable, while with kinesiology we encountered the contention that perhaps movement never belongs. This makes perceptible the moving body as a site of struggle not over identity or form, but over presence and possibility. What if movement truly fails to belong, if belonging does not hold up as a concept that can answer to the complexities of moving? This makes perceptible questions of how we might then get to know moving if the logics of belonging fail – how do we chase down moving in interdisciplinary work when it defies categorization? Why?

I have advanced perceptibility as one ethic for thinking through interdisciplinary collisions across early childhood studies and kinesiology while thinking through how the improvising, dancing, monstrous child intersects the porous, biocultural body. There are a multitude of questions made perceptible in this collision that I have not named. There are, also, a multitude of questions made imperceptible that I have not named. I want to be sure to emphasize that I am thinking perceptibility as more than the simple cumulative overlap of one knowledge onto another (ex: adding kinesiology to childhood studies). Instead, I want to propose we might truly dwell with questions made possible as one knowledge intersects with another and neither are resolved toward a ‘new’ interpretation. Making-perceptible is too slippery for such an approach, as both bodies of knowledge are in motion as the structures, theories, relations, worlds, and bodies that make them possible shift amid rapidly changing contemporary worlds.

Movement Belongs to *All of Us*

In the section to follow, I wonder this provocation of ‘all of us’ as a sticky point of contact between early childhood studies and kinesiology, proposing that collectivity matters as a practice of interdisciplinarity. I think in the company of questions of who the bodies of movement are: how do we move together? I ask how movement belongs to all of us, where ‘all of us’ is not a harmonious collection of individuals but a scrappy collection of interdisciplinary affinities and disjunctures. In doing this, I think through early childhood studies’ proposition of the collaboratory and kinesiology’s growing focus on social justice pedagogies both in and beyond the formal classroom.

Collectivities: Collaboratories and Social Justice

Confronting the provocation of how to work collectively in 21st century worlds that defy the inherited image of collectivity as the consensus of in-

dividual humans coming together to share knowledge and ‘solve’ a problem, early childhood studies scholars increasingly turn toward to processual and situated practice of sustaining collaboratories. Hodgins, Kummen, and Merewether (2022) theorize that a collaboratory is “a portmanteau of collaboration and laboratory, [that] is a hybrid and experimental space for collective research” (p. 1). In a collaboratory, the assumption of collaboration is never stable; rather, it is in the coming together of different moments, knowledges, and ethics that a collaboration becomes a collaboration. As Hodgins et al. suggest, it is in the learning *with*, not learning *about*, a common concern that a shared project of thinking takes on the energy of a collaboratory. What coheres a collaboratory is an emphasis on a politic, or on a shared question – how do we live well together? – that makes the work of a collaboratory both profoundly noninnocent and also intensely situated. Illustrative of this, Hodgins et al. propose a that caring holds together their collaboratories, where “caring collaboratories are distinguished not by conditions of ease, comfort and simplicity, but by their commitment to cultivate ‘practices of responsibility for the toxic present we are implicated’ (Shotwell 2016, [p.] 79)” (p. 4). Collaboratories, with Hodgins et al., are sites of “(re)questioning, (re)grappling, (re)exploring and (re)creating” (p. 13) where collaborating is the work of attuning to difference, motion, and complexity. Here, the ‘all of us’ that movement knows is a collective anchored in a highly politicized mode of caring as responding to our worlds; the ‘all of us’ is held together by our shared vulnerabilities in viral, toxic worlds. Pollitt, Kind, Vintimilla, and Blue (2021) propose collaboratories as a choreographic practice, where collaboratory work disrupts the image of the sovereign, independent human in education because the labour of nurturing a collaboratory is “an ensemble practice, focuses on moments of mutuality and relational connection that intentionally exceed child centred relations, that typically, are the focus in early childhood experiences” (p. 2). Pollitt et al. continue, situating the work of a collaboratory as co-labouring (Vintimilla & Berger, 2019) where “co-labouring practices are not centred on the individual subject (be that the child as learner, or the adult as teacher). Rather, the attention is in the multiple acts of responding and corresponding that emerge in the everydayness of studio work” (p. 2). This means that collaboratories thrive in the spaces where Enlightenment conceptions of humanism’s human dissolve into the flux of rapidly changing contemporary worlds, and where we make a concerted effort to think together about how we inherit these worlds with pedagogy. Here, the ‘all of us’ of collaboratory work is high stakes; it matters which bodies, subjectivities, lives, and consequences we labour with (and refuse) in situated collaboratories, and the speculative inventiveness of collaboratories must always be in dialogue with the lived realities of, and

possibilities for reconfiguring, everyday life. Taken together, thinking with collaboratories as a practice of collectivity means recognizing that the generativity and inventiveness of collaboratory work is a mode of coming together that profoundly disrupts existing forms of research, pedagogy, and subjectivity and, instead, is tentatively subversive in how it assembles speculative, political collectives that co-labour together toward otherwise possibilities for engaging with the worlds we share with young children.

One method of taking the questions embedded in ‘all of us’ to kinesiology is to encounter the question of social justice in kinesiology. Kinesiology holds a history, as Azzarito (2009) contends, of demanding and producing bodies that are “pretty, active, and ideally white” (p. 19). More recently, there have been increasing calls for thinking social justice as a concern entangled with interstices of ability, race, gender, sexuality, fatness, and access as they matter alongside human movement and dominant knowledges in kinesiology (Gill, 2021). As Harrison Jr., Azzarito, and Hodge (2021) make clear, kinesiology has historically proven itself a space that grapples with social justice in primarily deficit, interventionist terms. They argue that, toward other futures, kinesiology might more intentionally grapple with vectors of oppression and privilege, cultural knowledges, and countering narratives of deficit or ‘at-risk’ individuals, orienting instead toward projects that “share the principle aim of identifying, analyzing, theorizing, and combating inequalities and disparities particularly in PE [physical education] for marginalized groups” (p. 232). Following how kinesiology research holds a history of marking some groups as in need of (white, liberal, humanist) intervention, Harrison Jr. et al. propose that one practice invested in social justice involves learning to “[view] the issues from the perspective of the researched and valuing their stories will provide a more informative research and result in productive ways to develop a socially just society” (p. 238). This is an ‘all of us’ that takes on a project, that needs to figure out what social justice looks like in kinesiology – such a project is not already known, though is unfolding in minor pockets across the discipline. ‘All of us’ articulates a call for dismantling the minoritizing assumptions that make the existing powerful ‘all of us’ in kinesiology currently, fragmenting ‘all of us’ toward attending to local knowledges and building more modest, more situated, more affirmative knowledges with communities. Joseph and Kriger, proposing a decolonizing kinesiology ethics model, highlight how “health takes up a paradoxical position wherein it becomes widely desired on one hand, but an unevenly attainable, accepted method of control over systematically excluded bodies on the other hand. This paradox remains hidden when Kinesiology ethics is presented as neutral” (p. 192). It is this emphasis on non-neutrality that

grounds their model, such that kinesiology's knowledges – be those biomechanics, exercise prescription, or sport sociology – are actively wrestled from their status as validated, universal Euro-Western concepts and are instead dunked in the interdisciplinary, lived realm of human movement with/in the everyday world. For Joseph and Kriger, this practice involves intently making visible and dismantling how kinesiology's projects contribute to settler colonial structures of power, epistemologies, and idealized subjectivities. Foregrounding social justice to imagine what comes after the certainty previously ascribed to kinesiology's knowledges by ongoing colonialism and its allies capitalism and neoliberalism, Joseph and Kriger contend that “addressing the gaps in Kinesiology ethics requires deeper and broader understanding of decolonizing frameworks” (p. 204) by focusing on lived experiences and the costs of perpetuating the status quo. Here, the ‘all of us’ to which movement belongs is a collective grounded in a commitment to social justice that means tracing and interrupting settler colonial flows – an ‘all of us’ that humbly do the work of inheriting colonial legacies in our everyday practices. Finally, Culp (2016) draws public pedagogy into the question of social justice in kinesiology, arguing that kinesiology education and research must figure out how to unfold in the context of the wider worlds of which it is a part, thus rejecting the epistemological certainty afforded by reproducing the academic sphere it has become accustomed to. For Culp, “if kinesiology research is to be transformative, I believe it must work to further examine movement (and barriers to movement) as an issue of justice. This attention to physical justice... encompasses an understanding that the fundamental right for an individual to move is threatened by a host of intentional environmental, political, and social actions” (p. 279). Culp invokes an ‘all of us’ that intentionally attunes to social justice within moving – not to social justice as a generality, but social justice as the messy work of learning how to address difference, inequity, diversity, and inclusion *in moving*. This ‘all of us’ cares about moving not as only a practical mobility or a philosophical curiosity, but as a relation grounded in injustice and toward transformation.

What happens to interdisciplinary practice when we take collectivity as a mode for engaging early childhood studies with kinesiology? Thinking with the collaboratory as a site of coming together with pedagogy in early childhood studies, we encountered an ‘all of us’ that advanced caring as an ethic for living within messy, complex worlds with children. The work of caring matters as a labour that holds a collaboratory – a collective – together. Turning to social justice as it comes to push as a concern in kinesiology, we met with an ‘all of us’ that comes together, and not, to take on a project of dismantling oppressive, deficit-based narratives that is not already completely

known. Together, this involves a collectivity rooted in labour, in work, in figuring out how to live well together in situated contexts. This is a collectivity against universalism; its collective-ness is not found in exhaustive breadth nor perfectly representative attendance but is instead cohered by a commitment to figuring out how to build more livable worlds together. Interdisciplinarity, then, becomes the work of naming and dwelling with a problem, picking at its complexities not in the name of resolution but in recognizing its uneven consequences and how it implicates us in contemporary worlds. A second collision: with early childhood studies, we also found an ‘all of us’ that centered public pedagogies and subjectivities, recognizing that the mode of collaborative work is in itself variable and creative. In kinesiology, collective work named the project of inheriting and intervening in settler colonial logics as they thread through key concepts and practices in the field. In this collision, there is collectivity that tows together history and invention, where foundational Euro-Western binaries like health/unhealth are dismantled through this doubled work of recognizing a problematic inheritance and inventing a practice toward methods of gathering and thinking together that refuse such binaries their presumed strength. This collectivity is an interdisciplinary practice of subversion and creation together; a collective move beyond critical thinking and toward pedagogical imagination while never losing touch with being accountable for the existing structures that have shaped childhood and kinesiology for so long. Finally, from early childhood studies we traced a collaborative practice of situatedness, of collectively reconfiguring everyday life through careful acts of choreography and curation. In kinesiology, we encountered an ‘all of us’ that named the rich work of figuring out how to answer to difference, inequity, diversity, and inclusion in moving. This emphasis on choreography and on moving orients toward a collective in motion: a collective itself as a slippery concept ripe with ethics, politics, and world-making potentiality. A collective, as Vintimilla (2020) offers, that finds itself as it decomposes and recomposes throughout the work that it grounds itself in. This begets an interdisciplinarity that does not assume the grounds of collaboration between early childhood studies and kinesiology. Familiar rules of collectivity, like collegiality and cumulation, need to fail amid collectives that want to engage differently. Here live questions like: what happens to collectives when interdisciplinarity fails? How do we get to know movement together in the dust of early childhood studies’ and kinesiology’s collisions? Tension, re-creation, dissention, and irresolvable, imperceptible knowledges and concerns name the work of interdisciplinarity, intentionally flying in the face of interdisciplinarity as a practice toward ‘better’ knowledge. Instead, interdisciplinarity makes a mess as it creates collectives that disrupt the status quo across

fields while also inheriting and answering to lived, contemporary concerns through careful, humble, everyday practices.

I have proposed that collectivity marks one more possible ethic of interdisciplinarity for thinking early child studies with kinesiology. Importantly, I have highlighted that collectivity is not synonymous with progress-oriented constructions of community or with consensus. Instead, I have advanced collectivity as a strange kind of interdisciplinary kinship rooted in the uncertainty of collaboratory work as the invention of practices for coming together amid care, technologies, choreographies, and lived realities and of social justice work concerned with disrupting inheritances and quotidian narratives of risk, deficit, and health. This is an interdisciplinarity that both resists and invents and does not rest in only naming affinities between the two disciplines. Instead, it asks how a collectivity built of early childhood studies and kinesiology might figure out, through practices rooted in care, tension, and creation, how to move and live in constantly reconfiguring contemporary worlds.

Movement Belongs to All of Us?

Thinking with particular intersections of early childhood studies and kinesiology, including moving with humans and new materialist movements, dancing childhoods and bodily boundaries, and collaboratories and social justice, I have proposed three possible practices or possibilities for interdisciplinarity between early childhood studies and kinesiology: discord, perceptibility, and collectivities. Importantly, as I have traced these possible affinities, I have resisted the habit to frame them as best or easily applicable practices and have tried to maintain their messiness; their invitation to draw us in to thinking interdisciplinary otherwise beyond the knowledge politics enacted by neoliberalism and ongoing settler colonialism. It is my hope that the provocations I have offered will draw scholars in both fields to consider interdisciplinarity as a question and not a promise, as a practice in-the-making and not as a realm we already know, and as a relation of ethics and politics and not an 'outcome' or keyword that adds epistemological clout to our theorizing. I have grappled, throughout the paper, with the phrase I borrowed from a Toyota commercial, 'movement belongs to all of us'. I close the paper by reiterating this phrase, but as a question instead of a proclamation – a question that we might carry with us into our interdisciplinary alliances and experiments, and that students in both kinesiology and early childhood studies might wonder with as they think with the interdisciplinary intersections of these fields: movement belongs to all of us? What movement? What

belongings? What all of us? And, most importantly – how does this interdisciplinary work unfold and invent with moving?

References

- Azzarito, L. (2009). The panopticon of physical education: Pretty, active and ideally white. *Physical education and sport pedagogy*, 14(1), 19-39.
- Culp, B. (2016). Social justice and the future of higher education kinesiology. *Quest*, 68(3), 271-283.
- Frost, S. (2016). *Biocultural creatures*. Duke University Press.
- Fullagar, S. (2019). A physical cultural studies perspective on physical (in) activity and health inequalities: the biopolitics of body practices and embodied movement. *Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação*, 12(28), 63-76.
- Fullagar, S., Pavlidis, A., Hickey-Moody, A., & Coffey, J. (2021). Embodied movement as method: Attuning to affect as feminist experimentation. *Somatechnics*, 11(2), 174-190.
- Fullagar, S. (2017). Post-qualitative inquiry and the new materialist turn: Implications for sport, health and physical culture research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 9(2), 247-257.
- Gill, D. L. (2021). Kinesiology: Moving toward social justice? *Kinesiology Review*, 11(1), 88-94.
- Hackett, A. (2016). Young children as wayfarers: Learning about place by moving through it. *Children & Society*, 30(3), 169-179.
- Hackett, A., & Somerville, M. (2017). Posthuman literacies: Young children moving in time, place and more-than-human worlds. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 17(3), 374-391.
- Hackett, A., & Rautio, P. (2019). Answering the world: Young children's running and rolling as more-than-human multimodal meaning making. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(8), 1019-1031.
- Harrison Jr, L., Azzarito, L., & Hodge, S. (2021). Social justice in kinesiology, health, and disability. *Quest*, 73(3), 225-244.
- Hodgins, B. D., Kummen, K., & Merewether, J. (2022). Speculative caring laboratories: Mattering research alternatives. *Children's Geographies*, 1-15.
- Jeffrey, A., Barbour, K., & Thorpe, H. (2021). Entangled yoga bodies. *Somatechnics*, 11(3), 340-358.
- Joseph, J., & Kriger, D. (2021). Towards a decolonizing kinesiology ethics model. *Quest*, 73(2), 192-208.
- Land, N., & Todorovic, S. (2021). Getting to know movement differently: Nurturing communicative, relational, and collective movement pedagogies with toddlers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 19(2), 239-252.
- Manning, E. (2014). Wondering the world directly—or, how movement outruns the subject. *Body & Society*, 20(3-4), 162-188.
- Markula, P. (2014). The moving body and social change. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 483-495.
- Markula, P. (2019). What is new about new materialism for sport sociology? Reflections on body, movement, and culture. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 36(1), 1-11.

- Markula, P. (2020). Contextualizing the material, moving body. In J. I. Newman, H. Thorpe., & D. Andrews (Eds.), *Sport, physical culture, and the moving body: Materialisms, technologies, ecologies* (pp. 47-68). Rutgers University Press.
- Newman, J. I., & Thorpe, H. (2021). Sport, physical culture, and new materialisms. *Somatechnics*, 11(2), 129-138.
- Pollitt, J., Blaise, M., & Rooney, T. (2021). Weather bodies: experimenting with dance improvisation in environmental education in the early years. *Environmental Education Research*, 27(8), 1141-1151.
- Pollitt, J., Kind, S., Delgado Vintimilla, C., & Blue, L. (2021). Choreographing laboratories: Studios of situated improvisations. *Children's Geographies*, 1-12.
- Shotwell, A. (2016). *Against purity: Living ethically in compromised times*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Stengers, I. (2005). Introductory notes on an ecology of practices. *Cultural Studies Review*, 11(1), 183-196.
- Taguchi, H. L., Palmer, A., & Gustafsson, L. (2016). Individuating 'sparks' and 'flickers' of 'a life' in dance practices with preschoolers: the 'monstrous child' of Colebrook's Queer Vitalism. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(5), 705-716.
- Taylor, A. (2020). Countering the conceits of the Anthropos: Scaling down and researching with minor players. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 41(3), 340-358.
- Taylor, A., & Giugni, M. (2012). Common worlds: Reconceptualising inclusion in early childhood communities. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 13(2), 108-119.
- Thorpe, H. (2021). Sporting scars. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 21(5), 410-412.
- Thorpe, H., Clark, M., & Brice, J. (2021a). Sportswomen as 'biocultural creatures': Understanding embodied health experiences across sporting cultures. *BioSocieties*, 16(1), 1-21.
- Thorpe, H., Brice, J., & Clark, M. (2021b). Physical activity and bodily boundaries in times of pandemic. In D. Lupton & K. Willis (Eds.), *The COVID-19 crisis: Social perspectives* (pp. 39-52). Routledge.
- Vintimilla, C. D. (2020). Relational openings for the otherwise. In W. O. Kohan, & B. Weber (Eds.), *Thinking, childhood, and time: Contemporary perspectives on the politics of education*, (chapter 11). Lexington Books.
- Vintimilla, C.D., & I. Berger (2019). Co-labouring. B. D. Hodgins (Ed.), *Feminist research for 21st century childhoods: Common worlds methods* (pp. 187-196). Bloomsbury.

Author

Nicole Land, Assistant Professor
Ryerson University
School of Early Childhood Studies
350 Victoria Street
Toronto ON,
Canada M5B 2K3
Email: nland@ryerson.ca