# THE PROCESSES OF WELCOMING VERY YOUNG CHILDREN AND PARENTS: AN INTEGRATIVE LITERATURE REVIEW

**Felicia Siemsen[1] and Tania Stoltz[2]**

**ABSTRACT**

This integrative literature review aims to understand the process of welcoming very young children and parents in the collective environment. For the selection of articles, the following descriptors were used: adaptation, very young child, daycare, parents in Portuguese, English and Spanish, with the combination of the Boolean operator AND and OR. The articles were collected in the following databases: Capes, Web of Science, and EBSCO journals, considering the period from 2014 to 2022. The number of articles selected for full reading was 21 publications, which led to the discussion of five categories: adaptation and reception of babies from maternal separation; foster care as a right of the child and the family; collaboration between teachers and the family; acceptance of parental social and cultural identities; and parental individuation as a process of conscious acceptance. The results demonstrate that the adaptation of babies as a parental process lived in trust generates greater security in maternal separation from the child. Foster care, as a right of the child and the family, should be more respectful of social and cultural identities. The collaboration between school and family in the foster care process provides a parental individuation of less suffering. Shared care and education practices strengthen the child's development and the self-knowledge of mothers and fathers.

**Keywords:** Adaptation. Host. Very small child. Parents. Early Childhood.

[1] Doctor student in the Graduate Program in Education
Federal University of Paraná, Brazil
E-mail: feliciasiemsen028@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3230-9462
LATTES: https://lattes.cnpq.br/1787626501832149
[2] Full Professor of the Graduate Program in the Education Sector
Federal University of Paraná, Brazil
E-mail: tania.stoltz795@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9132-0514
LATTES: https://lattes.cnpq.br/8495637038816664

## INTRODUCTION

Certainly, humanized reception as a place of right has been the subject of debate since the significant increase in enrollment of very young children in Brazilian daycare centers and preschools. (BARBOSA, 2013; COUTINHO, 2016; KRAMER; NUNES; PENA, 2020). Increasingly, mothers and fathers move on to professional life and seek the alternative shared care of grandparents, aunts and professionals who come to constitute a new family configuration around the child and a "social support network" (BRASIL, 2006, p. 24).

Studies show that, for families, the welcoming process means a moment of experiences of anguish, fear, pain and anxiety (MARTINS et al., 2014; SILVA; LUZ, 2019; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). This is an important gap to be investigated, as there are life stories of children and families in the different contexts of the Brazilian territory who experience difficulties in having their voice heard (FRIEDMANN, 2022). There is a need to improve the adaptation period as a welcoming process, contributing to the field of research in early childhood (CARVALHO, 2005; CASANOVA, 2016; FERRÃO et al., 2017). In this sense, the present integrative review is justified, whose objective is to understand the process of welcoming very young children and parents in the collective environment.

## METHODOLOGY

The study is an integrative literature review (WHITTEMORE; KNAFL, 2005). It is a method that summarizes the past of empirical or theoretical literature to provide the most comprehensive understanding of a particular phenomenon (BROOME, 2000). An analysis of the knowledge already built in previous studies on the subject was based on six stages, according to BOTELHO, CUNHA and MACEDO (2011).

For Sampieri, Collado and Lucio (2013), the selection of documents usually begins broadly and narrows as the researcher returns to the initial question. The movement of literary search is not always linear (BROOME, 2000). The guiding question of the integrative literature review was: How is the process of welcoming very young children and parents in the collective environment?

### PROCEDURES

The review was carried out with the following descriptors in Portuguese, Spanish and English: adaptation, very young child, daycare, parents in Portuguese; adaptation, very small child, daycare, parents in Spanish; adaptation, very young child, nursery, parents in

English. The combination of descriptors was performed with the Boolean operator AND and OR.

The databases consulted were: Capes Journals, Web of Science and EBSCO for bringing together a considerable amount of articles from the fields of education. The inclusion criteria used were: theoretical and empirical articles that dealt with education, early childhood, early childhood education in the period between 2014 and 2022, in Portuguese, Spanish, and English. The exclusion criteria were: articles prior to 2014; in languages other than Portuguese, Spanish and English; repeated articles and articles with studies in the areas of Administration, Economics, Public Policy, Nutrition, Medicine, Foreign Affairs, Health and Primary, Elementary, Secondary and Academic Education.

First, the titles of the articles found were read to verify whether they met the criteria previously determined. Afterwards, the abstracts were read and, subsequently, the selection of the articles for the reading of the full text followed the criteria defined in the figure (attached at the link).

## RESULTS

The documents in Portuguese, Spanish and English were first searched with the descriptors in Portuguese for the Capes Journals, with the descriptors in English for the Web of Science and EBSCO databases. In this first stage, 4658 (four thousand six hundred and fifty-eight) references were obtained, of which 258 (two hundred and fifty-eight) were references from the Capes Journal Database, 1861 (one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one) from the Web of Science and 2539 (two thousand five hundred and thirty-nine) from EBSCO. Using the inclusion and exclusion criteria described above, all documents prior to 2014 were excluded, obtaining the result of 2468 (two thousand four hundred and sixty-eight) documents, excluding all documents that were not articles, resulting in 2217 (two thousand two hundred and seventeen) articles. In total, 1562 (one thousand five hundred and sixty-two) articles from the areas of Health, Medicine, Nutrition, Economics, Administration, Public Management, Law, Primary, Elementary, Secondary and Academic Education, Psychiatry, Special Education and Linguistics were excluded. After reading the titles, 612 (six hundred and twelve) repeated articles and articles from the areas of Educational Management, Educational Law, Nutrition, Environment, Nursing and Psychopedagogy were excluded, resulting in 43 (forty-three) articles, 14 (fourteen) of which were from Capes, 11 (eleven) from Web of Science and 18 (eighteen) from EBSCO for the reading of the abstract. After reading the abstract, 22 (twenty-two) articles were excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria, leaving the final result of 21 (twenty-one)

articles for full reading. The analysis of the articles was done using a tabular instrument, which contains the data found on the selected publications: year of publication, title of the article, author(s), source of location, research objectives, nature of the research, theoretical framework, methodology, results and conclusion of the study.

After the articles were organized, an expanded discussion regarding the content of the articles was initiated. Eight articles in Portuguese from Brazil, one study in Spanish from Spain, and 12 articles in English from the following countries: Germany, Australia, Canada, China, Croatia, United States, England, and Sweden were identified. The 12 studies in English come from Germany, Australia, Canada, China, Spain and the United States, with two studies from Croatia and Sweden and three studies from England.

In total, it was observed that 11 studies are in the area of Education with an emphasis on the adaptation and reception of babies and very young children in a collective environment of daycare and preschool, and on the reception shared by family members, grandparents and professionals, while their parents need to return to the professional environment. 7 studies were found that are in the area of Psychology and deal with the adaptation and reception of babies and very young children in a collective environment of daycare and preschool and about the feelings, anxiety and fear expressed by mothers and fathers during the process. Among these, 3 studies are in the area of Social Pedagogy and deal with the adaptation and reception of babies and very young children in situations shared by a social program with an emphasis on music, songs and rhythms in the circle of women and children; about the reception experienced by families in situations of social vulnerability and poverty, and about the reception of children in a collective environment of immigrant groups and due to Covid 19.

Regarding the methodologies of the studies presented in Table 1, 12 articles present qualitative methodology (MARTINS et al., 2014; RAHMQVIST; WELLS; SARKADI, 2014; SIME; SHERIDAN, 2014;  LAVELLE, 2015; GABRIEL; LOPES, 2016; GABRIEL et al., 2017; BARRS; DRURY, 2017; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019; SEHN; LOPES, 2019; SILVA; LUZ, 2019; LIU; TOBIN, 2021; SCHESTAG et al., 2021), three articles quantitative methodology (ÁLVAREZ et al., 2020; MIKOVIC; TOT, 2020; HU et al., 2021) and six articles describe mixed, qualitative and quantitative methodology (PÊSSOA et al., 2016; LING; TIBBETS; SCHARFE, 2017; VISKOVIC; JEVTIC, 2017; DEGOTARDI; SWELLER; PEARSON, 2018; BECKER; PICCININI, 2019; GRÖNLUND; ÖUN, 2020). The participants in these studies were mostly adults: educators, teachers, mothers, fathers, grandparents, and caregivers. The studies by Martins et al., (2014), Sime and Sheridan (2014), Lavelle (2015), Barrs and Drury (2017), Ling, Tibbets and Scharfe (2017), Becker and Piccinini

(2019), Sehn and Lopes (2019), Vercelli and Negrão (2019) and Liu and Tobin (2021) presented infants and young children as participants.

From the results shown in Table 1 (attached at the link), it is possible to see that all the studies found were empirical and used as data collection instruments: questionnaires, interviews, field observations, reflection circles, photographs, written and recorded records conducted with babies and very young children in daycare centers and preschools, teachers, mothers, parents, grandparents, family members and professionals belonging to the locus of each article researched. In quantitative studies, Álvarez et al. (2020) use the School-Family Relationship Scale (MARTÍNEZ-GONZÁLEZ, 1994) and descriptive analyses comparing groups of women and families. Mikovi and Tot (2020) use questionnaires (ANTULIC, OPIC and TOT, 2016) and analysis of results from the Shapiro-Wilk Test. The questionnaire used by Hu et al. (2021) was the MIXED instrument (HONG, 2004), with analysis in SPSS 19 and use of parental belief tests (AIKEN; WEST, 1991).

In the studies by Martins *et al*., (2014), Rahmqvist, Wells and Sarkadi (2014), Sime and Sheridan (2014), Lavelle (2015), Gabriel and Lopes (2016), Gabriel *et al*., (2016), Pêssoa et al (2016), Barrs and Drury (2017), Becker and Piccinini (2019), Sehn and Lopes (2019), Silva and Luz (2019), Vercelli and Negrão (2019), Grönlund and Öun (2020), Schestag *et al*.,  (2021), Liu and Tobin (2021), the semi-structured interview, was the most used instrument.

Based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria,  it was observed that the articles come from the fields of Education, Psychology and Social Pedagogy. The studies by Gabriel and Lopes (2016), Gabriel et al. (2017), Sehn and Lopes (2019), Becker and Piccinini (2019), Silva and Luz (2019) deal with the importance of a safe and trusting support network around the mother and father, encouraging the process of welcoming babies and very young children in daycare and preschool and parental knowledge; in the studies by Sime and Sheridam (2014), Lavelle (2015), Álvarez et al., (2020) the participation and collaboration between parents and teachers in the reception of very young children was observed. In the articles by Barrs and Drury (2017), Viskovic and Jevtic (2017), Mikovic and Tot (2020) and Hu et al., (2021), the integration of parental perceptions and family cultural values in the daycare and preschool environment was addressed. In the studies by Martins et al., (2014), Pessôa et al., (2016), Gabriel et al., (2017), Vercelli and Negrão (2019), Sehn and Lopes (2019), Silva and Luz (2019), the adaptation and reception of babies in daycare centers in the relationship with mothers, families, their beliefs and alternative care at the time of separation from children were presented. The importance of career, profession, gender, and family in the decision of mothers and fathers were deepened in two studies:

Degotardi, Sweller and Pearson (2018) and Grönlund and Öun (2020). The transformation of paternal involvement throughout the babies' adaptation period was found in two articles: Gabriel and Lopes (2016) and Becker and Piccinini (2019); the incorporation of parents and grandparents into the routine of infants and very young children was seen in the study by Liu and Tobin (2021). In addition, three articles, Rahmqvist, Wells and Sarkadi (2014), Ling, Tibbets and Scharfe (2017) and Schestag et al., (2021) state that parental prevention programs favor humanization in encounters between individuals, respect, values and dialogue. Also, the development of parental awareness from strategies applied in children's education was investigated in the article by Rahmqvist, Wells and Sarkadi (2014).

As for the theoretical references indicated in the articles, which refer to the separation and detachment of mother and father in the adaptation and reception of babies and very young children in the daycare environment, Bowlby is highlighted in the articles Gabriel et al., (2017), Vercelli and Negrão (2019), Liu and Tobin (2021). Ainsworth, on the other hand, is referenced in the studies of Sime and Sheridan (2014), Becker and Piccinini (2019), Liu and Tobin (2021) and Winnicott in the articles by Gabriel et al., (2017), Sehn and Lopes (2019), Vercelli and Negrão (2019) and Schestag et al., (2021). In turn, Bronfenbrenner is indicated in the studies by Barrs and Drury (2017), Álvarez et al., (2020), Mikovic and Tot (2020) to emphasize the importance of forming a support network for parents and children with daycare professionals. Lavelle's article (2015) emphasizes Foucault, as a philosophical foundation in the emergence of the phenomenon of distancing in public organizations and the importance of social responsibility in parental participation in contexts of vulnerability and poverty. The meaning of interactions in the socio-historical construction of relationships in the school community is discussed from Vygotsky in the article by Barrs and Drury (2017). The processes of social vulnerability in the diversity of parental cultural realities are analyzed taking Bourdieu's reference in Sime and Sheridan (2014). Thus, studies on the very young child have been based mainly on Bowlby, Ainsworth, Winnicott and Bronfenbrenner.

A greater number of studies (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019; LIU; TOBIN, 2021) with an emphasis on theoretical approaches to mother-child attachment (BOWLBY, 1984), and on the quality of mother-child interaction (SEHN; LOPES, 2019; BECKER; PICCININI, 2019) for child development, following the reference of Ainsworth (1978) was verified. Other studies deal with the function of maternal care for the positive adaptation of the baby in the daycare center and are based on Winnicott (1982, 2006), regarding the theme of mother-child distancing (SEHN; LOPES, 2019; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). However, the biggest concern is to create an environment of trust. The importance of the teacher's role as an

agent of change in empathetic communication with families is emphasized. The studies emphasize that the attitude of mutual collaboration provides an increase in the quality of transactional interaction between the child and his environment, teachers and families, following the perspective of Bronfenbrenner (1989). Understanding the meaning of collaboration and mutual partnership in the environment of daycare centers and preschools favors the quality of relationships in the preschool environment for the achievement of common goals, such as the needs of families and healthy child development (MIKOVIC; TOT, 2020).

Other studies emphasize that, through human relationships, shared feelings, fears and anxieties worked through reliable support networks, in the participation and collaboration of dialogue circles, the role of mothers and fathers, grandparents, family members, caregivers, teachers and managers can contribute to the process of adaptation and reception of babies and very young children in the collective environment to be more individualized and less mechanized.

As for the data analysis in the articles found, in the article by Vercelli and Negrão (2019), the qualitative analysis is carried out based on Lüdke and André (2013), with observation favoring the researcher's personal contact with the participants to deal with the researched phenomenon. The categories mentioned in the first phase of the research are: a) direct experience as the best tool for verifying an event; b) the observer can resort to his knowledge and personal experiences to understand the phenomenon studied; c) approximation of the subjects involved in the research in the apprehension of meanings that are expressed by the participants; d) observation techniques to favor the capture of new data on the phenomenon studied; e) observation in data collection is considered the best tool to communicate in various situations (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019).  In the second phase of the research, the semi-structured interview is highlighted (LÜDKE; ANDRÉ, 2013), to make clarifications and corrections in order to understand the phenomenon expressed by the participant (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019).

Qualitative content analysis based on Bardin (2016) was used to address categories on the factors associated with the baby's non-adaptation to daycare (MARTINS et al., 2014). The categories raised in this study were: a) the baby's temperament; b) parents' feelings linked to the separation of parents and babies and the inclusion of other people in the child's daily life; c) parenting beliefs and practices related to other alternative care; d) parents' attitudes towards daycare; e) parents' feelings related to the child's entry into daycare (MARTINS et al., 2014). For the quantitative analysis of the data, obtained from the

GIDEP questionnaire - Group of Social Interaction, Development and Psychopathology (1998a), the Nvivo8 Software was used (MARTINS et al., 2014).

Silva and Luz (2019) followed the content analysis based on Bardin (2016) and raised categories on the complex relationship between conceptions and practices (MINAYO, 2012): the function of guard and its relations with trust, security and well-being, conflicts and spatial-temporal dimensions of sharing (SILVA; LUZ, 2019). The central category discussed in the study is the sharing with the children's families in the care and education of daily life and its constitutive elements of conjugation in space-time, conceptions of childhood, child and education.

Sehn and Lopes (2019) analyzed clinical reports based on Epstein (2011) to treat the records of content manifested by the participants. Becker and Piccinini (2019) emphasize the discourse of psychoanalysis in the sense of building communication between the participant and the researcher. In the analysis of the quality of the interaction between the mother and the child from 12 to 18 months of age by Becker and Piccinini (2019), the Mother-Baby instrument NUDIF/CRESCI - Childhood and Family Center (PICCININI et al., 2011b) was used. Pederson, Moran and Bento (2013) also used the *Maternal Behavior Q-sort* (MBQS), arriving at the following categories: a) being aware of the child's signals, assessing the mother's awareness of the child's needs; b) efficacy and response, evaluating the mother's response to the child's signals; c) positive affect, evaluating the different forms of affection and emotions of the mother in the relationship with the child; d) rejection, to deal with whether the mother rejects the child; e) synchrony, to deal with the involvement between mother and child in adapting to the environment; f) control and interference, to deal with the way the mother responds to the child's behavior (BECKER; PICCININI, 2019).

The analysis of the video recordings in Liu and Tobin (2020) was based on Adair and Kurban (2019). This ethnographic research method seeks to combine the use of videos in the preschool environment to analyze the situations collected in the focus group recordings at minimal levels. They look for the movements of bodies in the daily practices of parents and grandparents when children enter daycare in the Chinese and North American contexts (LIU; TOBIN, 2020).

For Lavelle (2015), the beginnings that children make in the collective environment of daycare can be different when families are welcomed with affection and human warmth. The analysis of data from focus group interviews was done by the multilevel method and by the multiperspective method, according to Pole and Morrison (2003). In the article by Lavelle (2015), the concern with studying people in an objective way was highlighted, but

also with learning about them and with them in the construction of their discourses, following the reference of Spradley (1980), in everyday interactions. An analysis based on the structured theory of Glaser and Strauss (1967) arrived at five categories about the "*Parent-Child Mother Goose*"[3] (PCMG) parental program, which were called: a) mothers' reports about PCMG facilitating the bond with the child; b) PCMG is a resource for new parenting tools; c) PCMG is an instrument of social interaction; d) mothers' reports describe warm dialogues between the facilitators; and e) reports of mothers who would like to repeat the experience at the PCMG (LING; TIBBETS; SCHARFE, 2017).

## DISCUSSION

The analysis of the studies based on Bardin (2016) led to the survey of five categories on the reception of very young children and the parental experiences lived. 1) Adaptation and reception of babies from maternal separation (MARTINS et al., 2014; BECKER; PICCININI, 2019; SEHN; LOPES, 2019; SILVA; LUZ, 2019; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019); 2) Foster care as a right of the child and the family (DEGOTARDI et al., 2018; ÁLVAREZ; MARTÍNEZ-GONZÁLEZ; RODRÍGUEZ-RUIZ, 2020; GRÖNLUND; ÖUN, 2020); 3) Collaboration between teachers and the family (PÊSSOA et al., 2016; VISKOVIC; JEVTIC, 2016; BARRS; DRURY, 2017; SILVA; LUZ, 2019; HU et al., 2021); 4) Acceptance of parental social and cultural identities (PÊSSOA et al., 2016; BARRS; DRURY, 2017; LING; TIBBETS; SCHARFE, 2017; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019; LIU; TOBIN, 2021); and 5) Parental individuation as a process of conscious acceptance (RAHMQVIST; WELLS; SARKADI, 2014; SCHESTAG et al., 2021).

In this article we will be presenting the first two categories.

## ADAPTATION AND RECEPTION OF BABIES FROM MATERNAL SEPARATION

The first category first demonstrates the emphasis on the dimension of adaptation during the family's transition to the daycare environment (MARTINS et al., 2014; BECKER; PICCININI, 2019; SEHN; LOPES, 2019; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). Adaptation is presented in its characteristics, context and quality of interaction established between the mother and the caregiver. It seeks to study the separation and secure attachment of the mother and child based on Bowlby's attachment theory (MARTINS et al., 2014; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019); child development from the separation of the mother is based on Ainsworth (SEHN; PICCININI, 2019); and the influence of the subjective experiences of

---

[3] *Parent-Child Mother Goose* (PCMG) is a parenting program that promotes maternal guidance through the sharing of songs, songs and rhythms with children, respecting the customs and culture of local communities (SCHARFE, 2011).

families on the child's adaptation to daycare (MARTINS et al., 2014). Stable bonds between teachers and children are indicated as favoring the adaptation period (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). The impact of daycare on mother-child interaction and the reasons for dependence are analyzed from Winnicott (BECKER; PICCININI, 2019; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). The role of transitional objects in the child's adaptation is studied (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019), and the reasons for the baby's non-adaptation to daycare (MARTINS et al., 2014). Investigating the use of transitional objects in the child's entry into daycare, for Vercelli and Negrão (2019), demonstrates the importance of the process of adaptation and reception in the daycare respecting the duration of one to three weeks, such as the time that the child remains in the institution and the modification of the child's entire daily life (ROSSETTI-FERREIRA et al., 2011). The change of context between the family environment and the collective environment, for some families, can be challenging. The reasons given are: baby being the center of attention; the child's temperament; feelings linked to the separation between parents and the child in the inclusion of other people in the child's daily life; parenting beliefs and practices related to other alternative care for the child; attitudes towards daycare; and feelings related to the mother and father when the child enters the daycare center (MARTINS et al., 2014).

## FOSTER CARE AS A RIGHT OF THE CHILD AND THE FAMILY

Degotardi, Fenech and Beath (2018) deal with the complex reasons that lead Australian parents to decide to start adapting and welcoming babies and children in daycare and preschool. Grönlund and Öun (2020) study the right that Swedish parents of babies have for the stress caused by the double workday. The need for support in child care is evident when women need to follow the long journey in the profession. On the other hand, parents in rural areas need a preschool that serves a regular number of hours to work in the labor market for an irregular time. Especially for mothers in rural regions in Spain, there are difficulties in their participation in the education of children (ÁLVAREZ; MARTÍNEZ-GONZÁLEZ; RODRÍGUEZ-RUIZ, 2020).

Next, it is presented how each of the two categories responded to the objective of understanding the reception of the child and the parents in the collective environment.

(1) In the transition process between the family and the collective environment, the safe detachment of babies (BOWLBY, 1984) is influenced by the temporal factor in the planning of caregivers, teachers, mother and child (AHNERT et al., 2004; MARTINS et al., 2014; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). The separation between mother and child presents more predictable results when the three-week time is respected (ROSSETTI-FERREIRA et

al., 2011). As well as when transitional objects (WINNICOTT, 1971) facilitate the adaptation process, providing calm and less anxiety for the child (VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019). The child's satisfaction avoids regression in the process of separation between mother and child (RAPPOPORT; PICCININI, 2001). The child's non-adaptation can be caused both by maternal anxiety (BOWLBY, 1960) and by parental beliefs not considered by the institution (LIU; TOBIN, 2021). A child's difficult temperament can also affect the subjects involved in the process (MARTINS et al., 2014).

In addition, the parents' decision to include the child in the daycare center involves the presence of greater tension, feelings that may determine the future adaptation process (DUMONT-PENA; SILVA, 2018; SILVA; LUZ, 2019). For, for Aisworth et al. (1978), the quality of the interaction between the mother and child determines the entire progress of the process of adaptation and reception in the collective environment (BECKER; PICCININI, 2019). The organization and emotional maturity of both mother and child (WINNICOTT, 2006, 2011) indicate whether there is an integration of individuals in the generation of separation movements (SEHN; LOPES, 2019). Also the process of the child's adaptation (WINNICOTT, 1971, 1998), the relationships of adults, parents and teachers, established in an environment of trust, generate results with less suffering for the subjects (GABRIEL; LOPES, 2016; GABRIEL et al, 2017; VERCELLI; NEGRÃO, 2019).

(2) To enroll babies and very young children in daycare and preschool, several reasons are demonstrated prior to the parents' decision-making (DEGOTARDI et al., 2018). From dealing with the expectations of looking for an institution for the child to be full-time due to the parental work schedule, or needing institutionalized part-time care for the child (SOLLARS, 2016).  The differences of the families can be welcomed in partnership by the teachers, forming a school community (EPSTEIN, 2011). For Lister (2003), it is a challenge experienced by countless mothers and fathers today, to reconcile the professional journey, financial independence and family. The stress caused by the accumulation of family tasks is accepted as a right to transform tension into time of shared care (GRÖNLUND; Öun, 2020). Since, the individualization of the woman in the maternal role can be less painful when she assumes the need for help in the care of the child. Thus, the child's care journey shared in shifts between the couple, grandparents and professionals is considered a familiarization process (LOHMANN; ZAGEL, 2016).

For Álvarez, Martínez-González and Rodríguez-Ruiz (2020), daycare and preschool institutions are considered by teachers as social centers, where there are several groups that interact with each other as microsystems (BRONFENBRENNER, 1979). The participation of families in schools, in the perception of teachers, proves to be a different

partnership (EPSTEIN et al., 2002). On the one hand, the greatest difficulty for families is to establish relationships and coexistence in urban centers, due to the numerous parental activities. On the other hand, despite the greater involvement of families from more remote areas, public access to daycare centers in rural areas needs to be rethought (ÁLVAREZ; MARTÍNEZ-GONZÁLEZ; RODRÍGUEZ-RUIZ, 2020).

## CONCLUSION

The objective of the present study is to understand the process of welcoming very young children and parents in the collective environment. The reception of babies and very young children in public daycare centers needs to consider, from the beginning of the transition, the bond between the mother, the father and the child. Stable relationships between adults, teachers and parents prove to be the essential element in the effort for the collective preschool environment.

The child and the family have the right to live quality daily experiences in the collective environment (BRASIL, 1988). The social benefits for all child development that interactions provide are emphasized, even though the social and economic changes in today's contemporary society directly affect families who seek shared care for the child in order to return to the field of work. For this reason, we emphasize the importance of the role of caregivers, teachers and professionals in the daycare environment, for the recognition and satisfaction of families for the processes experienced.

This review indicates the need for greater teacher grounding on the complexity of families' emotions in the reception of children in the child environment (HAYASHI; KARASAWA; TOBIN, 2009). The valorization of cooperation between teachers and families at the time of reception is emphasized (MIKOVIC; TOT, 2020; HU et al, 2021). If, on the one hand, we highlight the diversity of experiences lived in the separation between mother and child, on the other hand, there is the challenge of providing a support network for families, which can respect a longer time of coexistence in preschool environments.

## THANKS

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The figure and table with the data of the article are available at the link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1oa_7xFKmJYJFoiKRj9Uljd2uuhpiajtYTBD4BmQgfrE/prefil l

# REFERENCES

1. Adair, J. K., & Kurban, F. (2019). Video-cued ethnography in educational settings. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 50(1), 245–254. https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12311

2. Ahnert, L., Gunnar, M., Lamb, M. E., & Barthel, M. (2004). Transition to child care: Associations with infant mother attachment, infant negative emotion and cortisol elevations. *Child Development*, 75, 639–650. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00698.x

3. Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.

4. Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709–716. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.4.709

5. Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Erlbaum.

6. Ainsworth, J. W. (2002). Why does it take a village? The mediation of neighborhood effects on educational achievement. *Social Forces*, 81(1), 117–152. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2002.0038

7. Aloa, V. (2008). *Infants settled into care: More than attachment*. Flinders University of South Australia.

8. Álvarez, L. F. F., Martínez-González, R.-A., & Rodríguez-Ruiz, B. (2020). Estudio exploratório sobre la percepción del profesorado acerca de la participación de las madres en los centros escolares de educación infantil y primaria. *Journal of Research in Social Pedagogy*, 36, 111–123. https://doi.org/10.7179/PSRI_2020.36.07

9. André, M. (2013). O que é um estudo de caso qualitativo em educação? *Revista da FAEEBA – Educação e Contemporaneidade*, 22(40), 95–103. https://doi.org/10.21879/faeeba2358-0194.v22.n40.753

10. Antulic, S., Opic, S., & Tot, D. (2016). Evaluation level in the process of self-evaluation of educational institutions. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 18(Special Ed. 1), 31–46. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v18i0.2183

11. Atckinson, A. (1987). Fathers' participation and evaluation of a family day care. *Family Relations*, 3(1), 146–151. https://doi.org/10.2307/583944

12. Bakeman, R., Deckner, D., & Quera, V. (2005). Analysis of behavioral streams. In D. M. Teti (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in developmental psychology* (pp. xx-xx). Blackwell Publishers.

13. Barbosa, M. C. S. (2013). Creche: Uma estranha no ninho educacional. *Dialogia*, 17, 75–92. https://doi.org/10.5585/Dialogia.n17.4410

14. Barbosa, F. A., Machado, L. F., Vilela e Souza, L., & Scorsolini-Comin, F. (2010). Significados do cuidado materno em mães de crianças pequenas. *Barbaroi*, 33, 28–

49. http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid-S0104-65782010000200003

15. Bardin, L. (2016). *Análise do conteúdo* (1ª ed.). Edições 70.

16. Barrs, M., & Drury, R. (2017). "Documentation" in Pistoia preschool. A window and a mirror. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, 8(1), 3–20. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173670.pdf

17. Becker, S., & Piccinini, C. (2019). Impacto da creche para a interação mãe-criança e para o desenvolvimento infantil. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 35, e3532, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1590/0102.3772e3532

18. Botelho, L. L. R., Cunha, C. C. de A., & Macedo, M. (2011). O método da revisão integrativa nos estudos organizacionais. *Gestão e Sociedade*, 5(11), 121–136. https://doi.org/10.21171/ges,v5i11.1220

19. Bourdieu, P. (2000). Bodily knowledge. In P. Bourdieu, *Pascalian meditation* (pp. 128–163). Stanford University Press.

20. Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14–25.

21. Bowlby, J. (2006). Psicanálise e cuidados com a criança. In J. Bowlby, *Formação e rompimento de laços afetivos* (4ª ed., pp. 13–41). Martins Fontes. (Original publicado em 1958).

22. Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.

23. Bowlby, J. (1984). *Apego e perda*. Martins Fontes.

24. Bowlby, J. (1960). Separation anxiety: A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 1(4), 251–269.

25. Brasil. Presidência da República. Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos. Conselho Nacional dos Direitos da Criança e do Adolescente. (2006). *Plano Nacional de Promoção, Proteção e Defesa do Direito de Crianças e Adolescentes à Convivência Familiar e Comunitária*. Conanda.

26. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

27. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). The ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22(6), 723–742. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.6.723

28. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

29. Broome, M. E. (2000). Integrative literature reviews for the development of concepts. In B. L. Rodgers & K. A. Knafl (Eds.), *Concept development in nursing: Foundations, Techniques and Applications* (2nd ed., pp. 231–250). W.B. Saunders Company.

30. Carvalho, A. M. O. T. (2005). Pais na creche: a arte do diálogo entre educadores e família. *Educação e Sociedade*, 26(91), 689–693.

31. Casanova, L. V. (2016). Creche e família ou creche e famílias: o contexto dessa relação na contemporaneidade. *Horizontes*, 34(2), 41–48.

32. Cohen, P. N., & Bianchi, S. M. (1999). Marriage, children and women's employment: what do we know? *Monthly Labor Review*, 122(12), 22–31.

33. Coutinho, A. S. (2016). Os novos estudos sociais da infância e a pesquisa com crianças bem pequenas. *Educativa*, 19(1), 762–773. https://doi.org/10.18224/educ.v19i3.5426

34. Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 209–240). Sage.

35. Degotardi, S., Sweller, N., & Pearson, E. (2013). Why relationships matter: Parents and early childhood teacher perspectives about the provisions afforded by young children's relationships. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 21(1), 4–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2013.771325

36. Dumont-Pena, E., & Silva, I. de O. (2018). *Aprender cuidar: diálogos entre saúde e educação infantil*. Cortez.

37. Epstein, R. (2011). El relato y la realidad. In M. Vorchheimer (Ed.), *XXXIII Simposio Annual: Relatos de la clínica* (pp. 31–46). Associación Psicoanalítica de Buenos Aires.

38. Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

39. Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin.

40. Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2006a). Child-care effect sizes for the NICHD study of early child care and youth development. *American Psychologist*, 61(2), 99–116.

41. Ferrão, E. S., Breder, L. L., Assis, J. C., Christ, L., & Caetano, C. (2017). Família e escola de crianças pré-escolares: experiência em atenção básica. *Temas em Educação e Saúde*, 13(2), 224–241. https://doi.org/10.26673/rtes.v13.n2.jul-dez.2017.9538

42. Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Sage.

43. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of a prison*. Penguin.

44. Fraiberg, S. (1980). *Clinical studies in infant mental health: The first year of life*. Basic Books; Tavistock.

45. Freud, S. (1990). Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety. In S. Freud, *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20, pp. 87–178). W.W. Norton & Company.

46. Friedmann, A. (2022). A importância do respeito às vidas das crianças na Primeira Infância na perspectiva antropológica. In A. Friedmann et al. (Eds.), *Olhares para as crianças e seus tempos: caminhos, frestas e travessias* (pp. 18–34). Passarinho/Diálogos Embalados.

47. Freire, P. (2003). *Educação como prática da liberdade* (27th ed.). Paz e Terra.

48. Fritzemeyer, K., Lebiger-Vogel, J., Rickmeyer, C., Schestag, L., Rossi, R., & Leuzinger-Bohleber, M. (2019). Das Frühpräventiventionsprojekt "ERSTE SCHRITTE" für Kleinkinder mit Migrationshintergrund: Erste Ergebnisse. *Kinderärztliche Praxis*, 90, 19–23.

49. Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.

50. Gabriel, M., & Lopes, R. de C. (2016). Transformações no envolvimento paterno ao longo dos seis primeiros meses do bebê na creche. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 32(3), 1–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-3772e32321

51. Gabriel, M., Polli, R., Dall'Agnol, L., Tudge, J., & Piccinini, C. A. (2016). Envolvimento paterno aos 24 meses de vida da criança. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 33, 1–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-3772e33410

52. Giovannini, D. (2018). The role of environments and spaces in the pedagogy of Pistoia. In G. Goodliff, N. Canning, J. Parry, & L. Miller (Eds.), *Young children's play and creativity: multiple voices* (pp. 181–188). Routledge.

53. Giovagnoli, R. (2018). From habits to rituals: Rituals as social habits. *Open Information Science*, 2, 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1515/opis-2018-0014

54. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine Transaction.

55. Grönlund, A., & Öun, I. (2020). Minding the care gap: Daycare usage and the negotiation of work, family and gender among Swedish parents. *Social Indicators Research*, 151, 259–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02366-z

56. Grupo de Interação Social, Desenvolvimento e Psicopatologia. (1998a). Entrevista de dados demográficos do casal. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

57. Grupo de Interação Social, Desenvolvimento e Psicopatologia. (1998c). Entrevista sobre a gestação e expectativas da gestante. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

58. Grupo de Interação Social, Desenvolvimento e Psicopatologia. (1998d). Entrevista sobre gestação e as expectativas do futuro pai. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

59. Grupo de Interação Social, Desenvolvimento e Psicopatologia. (1999). Entrevista de experiência da paternidade. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

60. Hayashi, A., Karasawa, M., & Tobin, J. (2009). The Japanese preschool's pedagogy of feeling: Cultural strategies for supporting young children's emotional development. *Ethos*, 37(1), 32–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1352.2009.01030.x

61. Hong, Q. (2004). Research of parents' need and satisfaction of childcare quality in preschool (In Chinese) (Master's thesis). Biblioteca Digital de Teses e Dissertações de Taiwan.

62. Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teachers College Record*, 97(2), 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700202

63. Hu, B., Alexander, C., Wu, H., Roberts, S., & Li, Y. (2021). Exploring home-school partnership and Chinese parental satisfaction of preschool services: The moderating effect of childrearing beliefs. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 30, 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-020-01862-7

64. Hu, B., Yang, Y., Song, Z., Wu, H., & Netzel, J. (2018). Structural and process predictors of Chinese parental satisfaction toward early childhood education services. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 89, 179–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.04.022

65. Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428–444). Sage.

66. Jackson, D., & Needham, M. (2014). *Engaging with parents in early years settings*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473909359

67. Keller, H. (2007). *Cultures of infancy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

68. Kim, E. M., & Sheridan, S. M. (2015). Foundational aspects of family-school connections: Definitions, conceptual frameworks, and research needs. In *Foundational aspects of family-school partnership research* (pp. 1–15). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13838-1_1

69. Körner, R., & Betz, T. (2012). Die empirische Bestimmung der sozialen Herkunft und des Migrationshintergrunds von Kindern. *Das Erhebungsinstrument der standardisierten Elternbefragung. Ergebnisbericht aus dem Projekt EMiL* (EMiL Working Paper n. 1). Goethe-Universität.

70. Kramer, S., Nunes, M. F. R., & Pena, A. (2020). Crianças, ética do cuidado e direitos: A propósito do Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente. *Educação Pesquisa*, 46, e237202. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202046237202

71. Kude, V. M. M. (2004). Qualidade do atendimento na educação infantil: Um estudo em duas culturas. *Educação*, 53(2), 319–348. https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/faced/article/view/385

72. Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1985). Paternal behavior in humans. *American Zoologist*, 53(3), 883–894. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/25.3.883

73. Lavelle, M. (2015). A storm in a tea-cup? 'Making difference' in two Sure Start children's centres. *Children & Society*, 29(6), 583–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12091

74. Laville, C., & Dionne, J. (1999). *A construção do saber: manual de metodologia em ciências humanas*. Artes Médicas.

75. Ling, D., Tibbets, G., & Scharfe, E. (2017). Once upon a time: Lessons learned from the benefits of parent-child Mother Goose. *Child Welfare*, 95(2), 9–31. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:164506544

76. Lister, R. (2006). Children (but not women) first: New Labour, child welfare and gender. *Critical Social Policy*, 26, 315–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018306062588

77. Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: feminist perspectives*. Palgrave.

78. Liu, C., & Tobin, J. (2021). Embodied routines and ethnotheories of morning drop-offs at US and Chinese preschools. *ETHOS: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, 49(2), 171–193. https://doi.org/10.1111/etho.12306

79. Lohmann, H., & Zagel, H. (2016). Family policy comparative perspective: The concepts and measurement of familiarization and defamiliarization. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 26(1), 48–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928715621712

80. Lordelo, E. R. (1997). Efeitos da experiência de creche no desenvolvimento da criança: Uma revisão. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 13(2), 221–229.

81. Lüdtke, M., & André, M. E. D. A. (2013). *Pesquisa em educação: abordagens qualitativas* (2. ed.). EPU.

82. Malterud, K. (2012). Systematic test condensation: A strategy for qualitative analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 40(8), 795–805. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494812465030

83. Martins, G., Becker, S., Leão, L., Lopes, R., & Piccinini, C. (2014). Fatores associados à não adaptação do bebê na creche: Da gestação ao ingresso na instituição. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 30(3), 241–250. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722014000300001

84. Martínez González, R.-A. (1994). Diagnóstico de necessidades en la cooperación entre familia y centro escolar. Informe de Investigación, Universidade de Oviedo.

85. McCutcheon, A. L. (1987). *Latent class analysis* (Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, n. 07-064). Sage.

86. Meurs, P., & Jullian, G. (2015). Das Projekt « Erste Schritte » - kultursensible und bindungsgerichte preventive Entwicklungsberatung für Migranteneltern und Kleinkinder. In K. Brisch (Ed.), *Bindung und Migration* (pp. 222–248). Klett-Cotta.

87. Mikovic, I., & Tot, D. (2020). The role of professional knowledge and skills of preschool teachers in building and developing partnerships with parents. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 22, Sp.Ed. 3, 71–81. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v22i0.3910

88. Minayo, M. C. S. (2012). Análise qualitativa: teoria, passos e fidedignidade. *Revista Ciência e Saúde Coletiva*, 17(3), 621–626. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-81232012000300007

89. Mollica, R., Caspi-Yavin, Y., Bollini, P., Truong, T., Tor, S., & Lavelle, J. (1992). The Harvard Trauma Questionnaire: Validating a cross-cultural instrument for measuring torture, trauma, and posttraumatic stress disorder in Indo-Chinese refugees. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 180(2), 111–116.

90. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Eunice Kennedy Shriver. (2006). Child-care effect sizes for the NICHD study of early child care and youth development. *American Psychologist*, 61(2), 99–116.

91. Núcleo de Infância e Família/NUDIF/CRESCI. (2011a). Entrevista sobre a maternidade – 6º mês. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS.

92. Núcleo de Infância e Família/NUDIF/CRESCI. (2011b). Observação da interação mãe-bebê – 6º mês. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS.

93. Núcleo de Infância e Família/CRESCI. (2011a). Entrevista sobre adaptação do bebê à creche – versão pai. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS.

94. Núcleo de Infância e Família/CRESCI. (2011b). Entrevista sobre gestação, parto e a experiência da paternidade. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS.

95. O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 32(3), 396–402. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03200807

96. Pederson, D., Moran, G., & Bento, S. (2013). *The maternal behavior Q-Sort (MBQS): Assessing maternal sensitivity and the quality of mother-infant interaction*. University of Western Ontario.

97. Pessôa, L., Seidl-de-Moura, M. L., Ramos, D., & Mendes, D. (2016). Sistemas de cuidados e o discurso de diferentes cuidadores do Rio de Janeiro: Evidências de trajetória de desenvolvimento. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 33(1), 71–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-02.752016000100008

98. Piccinini, C. A., Silva, M. R., Gonçalves, T. R., Lopes, R. S., & Tudge, J. (2004). O envolvimento paterno durante a gestação. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 17(3), 303–314. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722004000300003

99. Piccinini, C. A., Becker, S. M. S., Martins, G. D. F., Lopes, R. C. S., & Sperb, T. (2011). Impacto da creche no desenvolvimento socioemocional e cognitivo infantil: Estudo longitudinal do sexto mês de vida do bebê ao final dos anos pré-escolares – CRESCI. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS.

100. Piccinini, C. A., Tudge, J., Lopes, R. C. S., & Sperb, T. (1998). *Estudo longitudinal de Porto Alegre: Da gestação à escola*. Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

101. Picchio, M., Giovannini, D., Mayer, S., & Musatti, T. (2012). Documentation and analysis of children's experience: An ongoing collegial activity for early childhood professionals. *Early Years*, 32(2), 159–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2011.651444

102. Pole, C., & Morrison, M. (2003). *Ethnography for Education*. Open University Press.

103. Rahmqvist, J., Wells, M. B., & Sarkadi, A. (2014). Conscious parenting: A qualitative study on Swedish parents' motives to participate in a parenting program. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(5), 934–944. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-013-9750-1

104. Rapoport, A., & Piccinini, C. A. (2001). O ingresso e adaptação de bebês e crianças pequenas à creche: Alguns aspectos críticos. *Psicologia Reflexão Crítica*, 14(1), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722001000100007

105. Rege, K., & Almeida, N. (2013). Effective communication facilities partnering with parents: Perception of supervisors and teachers at preschool and primary school levels. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(7), 53–70. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2383428

106. Rossetti-Ferreira, M. C., Mello, A. M., Vitória, T., Gosuen, A., & Chaguri, A. C. (2011). *Os fazeres na Educação Infantil* (12. ed.). Cortez.

107. Rossetti-Ferreira, M. C., Amorim, K. S., & Vitória, T. (1996). Emergência de novos significados durante o processo de adaptação de bebês à creche. In *Investigação da criança em interação social* (Vol. 4, n. 1, pp. 111–144). Coletâneas da ANPEPP.

108. Sanders, M. R. (2008). Triple P – Positive Parenting Program as a public health approach to strengthening parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(4), 506. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.506

109. Sanders, M. R. (1999). Triple P – Positive Parenting Program: Towards an empirically validated multilevel parenting and family support strategy for the prevention of behavior and emotional problems in children. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 2(2), 71–90. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021843613840

110. Sampieri, R. H., Collado, C. H., & Lucio, M. P. B. (2006). *Metodologia de pesquisa* (3. ed.). McGraw-Hill.

111. Scharfe, E. (2011). Benefits of Mother Goose: Influence of community-based program on parent-child attachment relationships in typical families. *Child Welfare*, 90(5), 9–26.

112. Schestag, L., Mehrer-Gentner, J., & Stein, L. (2021). Ghosts in the nursery in exile: Supporting parenting in exile during the Covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytics*, 18, 197–207. https://doi.org/10.1002/aps.1702

113. Sehn, A., & Lopes, R. C. (2019). A vivência materna da função de cuidar no período de dependência da criança. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 35(esp.), e35nspe8, 1–11. https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102.3772e35nspe8

114. Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2007). *Parent survey of family and community involvement in the elementary and middle grades*. Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, Johns Hopkins University.

115. Silva, I. O., & Luz, I. R. (2019). Relações entre famílias e instituições de educação infantil: O compartilhamento do cuidado e educação das crianças. *EccoS – Revista Científica*, (50), e14110, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.5585/eccos.n50.14110

116. Sime, D., & Sheridan, M. (2014). 'You want the best for your kids': Improving educational outcomes for children living in poverty through parental engagement. *Educational Research*, 56(3), 327–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2014.934556

117. Sollars, V. (2016). Parents' expectations about early years services. *Early Years*, 37(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2016.1154507

118. Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

119. Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. The Guilford Press.

120. Statistics Sweden. *Labour Force Surveys (LFS)*. Disponível em: https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/labour-market/labour-force-surveys/labour-force-surveys-lfs/. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2024.

121. Sure Start. *New performance management framework for Sure Start Children's Centres*. Disponível em: http://surestart.gov.uk/publications/?Document-1852. Acesso em: 14 jul. 2022.

122. Sylvia, K., Stein, A., Leach, P., Barnes, J., Malmberg, L. E., & the FCCC team. (2011). Effects of early child-care on cognition, language, and task-related behaviors at 18 months: An English study. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 29(1), 18–45. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151010X533229

123. Tashakkori, A., & Teddie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Sage.

124. The Parent-Child Mother Goose Program. *Electronic references*. Disponível em: http://www.nald.ca/mothergooseprogram/about.htm. Acesso em: 20 dez. 2023.

125. Tobin, J., & Hayashi, A. (2017). Return interviews and long engagements with ethnographic informants. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 48(3), 318–327. https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12202