

Now, where were we? Celebrating ten years of *Language Discourse and Society* doing what we do best: researching *Language in Society* by Federico Farini⁶ [Former Journal's Editor 2010-2016]

1. Preamble, and a celebration

Sometimes in 2008, I was a fresh Doctor in Philosophy, eager to share the results of my research on the intersection between educational communication and the promotion of children's agency, at the time still an innovative concept. I was firmly convinced that my research, if heard outside of the narrow circle of my home institution, the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, was going to make a difference. I was determined to the point to knock at the door of what appeared to me a global beacon of academic excellence for the study of language in society to propose my research for publication. By December 2008, my first academic article was accepted by the ISA Research Committee 25, *Language and Society*, for the RC25 Newsletter.

I was not aware of course that, as my article was being published, the RC25 was reflecting on the best way to promote sociological research on language in society. The 2010 ISA World Congress in Gothenburg became an opportunity to accelerate the development of the Newsletter in something new, and bigger. From my perspective, the World Congress was my the context of my first engagement with the life of RC25, to which I got closer throughout the review and editing process of the article between 2008 and 2009. As experiences taught me, the year leading to a World Congress is often a year of change for academic bodies. Possibly, such a landmark event invites reflection, possibly a four-years tenure lends itself to be seen as the ideal period for engaging with academic leadership within a research group. Un-sociological wild speculations aside, as I was leaving the RC25 Business Meeting at the 2010 ISA World Congress I was part of that change, as the new-newsletter editor.

My vision was quite clear: the newsletter had been a welcoming for several excellent and original piece of academic work. The Newsletter was working well as a platform for sharing research. Because it was working well, change was needed. The steady flow of journal-quality proposals to the Newsletter was telling me that for journal-quality articles, a journal was indeed needed. With the support of the RC25 Committee for the term 2010-2014, I happily spent many hours, then days, then weeks in designing and developing a brand-new journal as the home for sociological research in language and society. For a while I held a quite demanding double role as Newsletter editor, collecting member's news, linking members and sharing opportunities arising from the ISA and beyond, and Journal's editor until I could focus on the launch of the first issue of the Journal. December 2011 saw the first issue of *Language, Discourse and Society*. I would like to pay tribute to my colleague in the first Editorial Board of the Journal: Marta Soler-Gallart, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain; Celine-Marie Pascale, American University, USA; Amado Alarcon, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain; Melanie Heath, McMaster University, Canada; Taiwo Abioye, Covenant University, Nigeria; Daniela Landert, Universität Zürich, Switzerland (affiliations were valid as for 2011). I had the privilege to oversee a tumultuous development of *Language, Discourse and Society* over the following years, until I left the editorship in more than capable hands in 2016. I was delighted to see that the Journal has been continuously improving, claiming a prominent place in the global

⁶ Prof. Federico Farini, Ph.D. Centre for Education and Research; Centre for Psychology and Social Sciences University of Northampton, United Kingdom. Former *Language and Society* Editor, 2010-2016.

academic debate. My warmest appreciation to the current editor, Prof. Anna Odrowaz-Coates (Maria Grzegorzewska University, Poland) as well as to the editor who steered *Language Discourse and Society*: Stéphanie Cassilde, now President of the RC25, between 2016 and 2019 (Ronin Institute, Belgium) and Natalie Byfield, in the period 2019-2020 (St. John's University, USA).

I am glad to have the chance to write about the motivation and the dedication that supported the success of the journal. A success that could not to be taken for granted back in 2010. It could not be taken for granted that *Language Discourse and Society* was going to be published at all. The unique combination of individual talents and shared ambition in the RC25 Committee made the journal possible. Personally, it was a combination of determination to succeed and a few sleepless nights that pushed the journal through the most delicate times, when proposals come in slowly and reviewers are not an extremely rare commodity.

Unlike life, narrating life allows to turn back time. Winter of 2009. My first contribution to the academic debate on language in society is now published in one of the last issues of the original format of the ISA RC25 Newsletter. The article discussed some of the results of my doctoral research. The research was dedicated to the study of adult-children communication in educational context and the article focused, with a strong Conversation Analytical accent, on the adults' use of questions to pursue their educational agenda. Fast forward in time, more than 10 years later and 10 years from the first issue of *Language Discourse and Society*, I would like to celebrate an anniversary that transforms the history of journal in a tradition with another article that cuts through the years to dialogue with the contribution from which, after all, *Language Discourse and Society* was born. I am presenting now to share fresh research where a prominent theme, albeit not the only one, is the use of questions in educational interaction. Mirroring the role of *Language Discourse and Society* in liberating intellectual energies and supporting the voices of academic in a global dialogue, the article considers the use of questions, among others actions-in-interaction, to support children's agency towards dialogic teaching and learning. Incidentally, the article is also a possibility to celebrate a successful action-research project that embodies the very essence of the RC25 as it is animated by the idea that through language, individuals not only (and I dare say not so often) produce a photographic reproduction of reality. Through language, individuals construct their social worlds, the meaning of their experiences and position themselves and others in terms of status, rights and agency, in the local contexts of the interaction and beyond.

2. Introduction to the article

This article discusses the aims, methodology and findings of SHARMED (Shared Memories and Dialogue), a project of pedagogical innovation funded by the Erasmus+ programme, delivered by University of Suffolk (UK), University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (Italy) and Universität Jena (Germany) between 2016 and 2018. SHARMED involved 48 classes in Germany, Italy and UK, working with 7-12 years old children, from both migrant and non-migrant backgrounds.

SHARMED aimed (1) to promote new experiences of teaching and learning, with specific consideration for respect of cultural differences and promotion of intercultural dialogue, (2) to foster equity in participants' contributions to classroom interaction, and (3) to enhance empowerment and recognition of children's contributions, responding to the need to innovate traditional ways of dealing with different perspectives (Farini, 2019).

Research on adult-children interactions has highlighted some mitigation of hierarchical forms of authority, based on interactive facilitation of children's agency. Facilitation can be a form of communication that enhances empowerment and recognition of children's contributions. The design of SHARMED was based on Project Based Workshops (PBW; Mitchell et al., 2008), where children's were invited to share narratives related to photographs of their choice

important for their memories. Children's guardians were invited to help children's selection of photographs as well providing written consent for their children's inclusion in SHARMED. Teachers were invited to collaborate in the project and were key to the success of the project, particularly by supporting and motivating children and their parents. Facilitation was utilised to promote the production and dialogical exchange of narrative. This contribution focuses on how facilitation was implemented in PBW by discussing examples from SHARMED activities.

3. What I mean when I write stuff: theoretical background

3.1 Intercultural communication and cultural identity

Several studies on intercultural education use 'multicultural classroom' to describe the presence of participants from a variety of cultural backgrounds (Mahon & Cushner 2012). These studies discuss a variety of ways for handling cultural meanings and identity (Gundara & Portera 2008; Gundara 2000; Mahon & Cushner 2012) associating identity with membership of cultural groups (Hofstede 1980; Schell 2009; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009). This is an essentialist perspective which "presents people's individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are" (Holliday 2011: 4). Essentialism takes for granted that cultural identities are determined before intercultural communication (Baraldi 2015). The essentialist ideology is based on 'othering', which is a process whereby the western culture attempts to legitimise its hegemony at the expenses of 'others' (Holliday 2011). Within an essentialist paradigm dialogue is a way of enriching acknowledgment of difference among predefined cultural identities (Alred, Byram, & Fleming 2003; Grant & Portera 2011; Guilerhme 2012; Portera 2008).

Differently from essentialism, the view embraced by SHARMED values the prefix 'inter' of inter-cultural acknowledging the importance of relationships and communication, therefore warning against an essentialist representation of cultural identity (Byrd Clark & Dervin 2014). SHARMED sees identify as fluid, malleable and contingently constructed in communication (Dervin & Liddicoat 2013; Piller 2007, 2011; Tupas 2014).

In line with previous research, SHARMED argues that the primacy of cultural identity can be replaced with the idea of a construction of hybrid identity (Jackson 2014; Kramsch & Uryu 2012), where identity is negotiated in communication processes, also based on the exchange of the narratives related to personal and cultural trajectories (Holliday & Amadasi, 2020).

Hybridity is conceived as the outcome of a complex intertwining of narratives and interactions designed to "open up many possibilities for how narratives can intertwine and express themselves" (Holliday & Amadasi 2020: 11). In this anti-essentialist perspective, classrooms are the setting for sharing narratives about personal cultural trajectories - the production of 'small cultures' (Holliday 1999). According to Holliday (2013: 3) "cultural environments which are located in proximity to the people concerned". Thus, in SHARMED, the classroom is 'multicultural' since it constructs a variety of small cultures rather than being the sum of individuals with different, predefined cultural identities. In this context, communication is intercultural when it produces narratives of cultural varieties.

3.2 Narratives

SHARMED recognises narratives as social constructions where the experiences are interpreted and 'storied' in different ways (Fisher 1987). In the telling of their narratives, participants "create and recreate" their past in the light of their "present needs and concerns" (Norrick 2007: 139). For SHARMED, the construction of narratives based on autobiographical memory provided the opportunity to share and negotiate meanings and identity of participants (Bamberg 2011). Norrick (2007) argues that narratives are produced in the interaction. Firstly, each participant contributes to constructing and negotiating a narrative in interactions as teller, co-

teller, listener, or elicitor of new narratives. Secondly, narratives can receive different comments from different participants. The production of narratives, thus, do not concern only their contents but also the rights associated with narrating.

In SHARMED, the construction of narratives used photographs as a pivot. Narratives can focus on both the image in photographs and the situations and circumstances behind and beyond photographs (Baraldi & Iervese 2017). The construction of narratives was seen as an opportunity for children to connect the image channelled by a photograph with insights about situations and circumstances that lie behind the image, exploring social and cultural contexts of photographs as well as constructing and sharing new stories linked to images.

SHARMED understood photography as a technology for documenting life and a powerful medium for social engagement and collaboration. Photographs were not only utilised to trigger children's responses, but they were also seen as a resource for facilitation to promote classroom dialogue in a range of conversations through, about and with photographs.

3.3 Facilitation

For SHARMED it was essential that children's voices were promoted through a non-hierarchical form of interaction. For this purpose, a method of facilitation was designed to promote personalised versions of cultural meanings, enabling the creation of small cultures through dialogic negotiation based on enhanced children's agency.

The concept of children's agency is popular in childhood studies (James 2009; James & James 2008; Oswell 2013) where agency is identified when children show the availability of choices that are consequential because they can open different courses of action (Harré & van Langhenove, 1989). In line with childhood studies, SHARMED recognised children's agency as a form of active participation enhanced through the availability of choices of action that can bring about change for all participants in the social encounter (Baraldi 2014a).

It is important to emphasise that children's active participation can happen anytime in communication; however, the achievement of agency needs the promotion of children's choices. Enhancement of children's agency and recognition of a children's right to construct their own narratives contribute to the upgrade of their epistemic authority, that is, their authority to produce valid knowledge (Heritage & Raymond 2005).

Attribution of agency depends on social conditions and structures (Bjerke 2011; James 2009; Leonard 2016; Moosa-Mitha 2005) and structural limitations can be particularly inhibitive for children's agency (Alanen 2009). The nature of adult-children interactions is therefore a crucial variable for the enhancement of agency.

With regard to educational contexts, research on teacher-children interaction has highlighted some methods to enhance children's active participation in education that are related to teachers' actions (e.g. Mercer & Littleton 2007; O'Connor & Michael 1996; Walsh 2011). Several recent studies show that facilitation is achieved in specific interactions, including organized sequences of adults' actions that enhance children's agency, and children's actions that display agency (Baraldi 2014a, 2014b; Baraldi & Iervese 2017), highlighting the effectiveness of facilitation of children's agency (Baraldi 2014a, 2014b; Baraldi & Iervese 2017; Hendry 2009; Wyness 2013).

Facilitation of the production of narratives as a way to promote children's in the context of educational PBW is based on a vision of children as agents who can choose if, when, how and with whom narrating their perspectives and experiences, while their choice can influence the social situations where they are involved.

In facilitation, adults' active listening supports children's self-expression, takes children's views into account, involves them in decision-making processes and shares power and responsibility with them (Sakr & Scollan, 2019; Shier 2001; Wyness 2013). Facilitation thus enhances the conditions for dialogue as a specific form of communication that "implies that

each party makes a step in the direction of the other”, without expecting that “that they reach a shared position or even mutual warm feelings” (Wierbizka 2006: 692). In adults-children interactions, dialogue is “the starting point, whereby children are consulted and listened to”, ensuring that “their ideas are taken seriously” (Matthews 2003: 268). Facilitation can also enable the construction of narratives that represent an alternative to established ones (Winslade & Williams 2012), for instance concerning identity therefore enhancing hybridisation through dialogue.

4. What happened in the classrooms: methodology of an action-research

SHARMED methodology was implemented in schools across the three European countries. The participating classes were chosen by the schools, according to teachers’ interest and the inclusion of children with migrant backgrounds. SHARMED activities were centered on the collection of two sets of photographs: the first set included photograph collected from family or children’s personal archives (digital or printed formats); the second set included photographs taken by the children first-hand.

The project activities were centered around series of four PBWs, facilitated by experts. As an educational methodology, PBW are characterized by (a) children’s work on important knowledge and skills, originated from their memories; (b) children’s engagement in an extended process of coordination of different perspectives and developing “shared narratives”. In the course of the first two PBWs, children were invited to describe and discuss the first set of photographs, initially within small groups, subsequently with the whole classroom. Triggered by the photographs, both personal narratives and dialogue were enhanced through the interaction between children and facilitators. In the third PBW, children were invited to describe the photographs in a written form, guided by some loose guidelines. These descriptions provided useful information to better understand the meaning of photographs for children. The fourth and last PBW was dedicated to children’s presentations of the second set of photographs. This meeting was rather similar to the first one, although children were asked to make short video-recordings to describe the photographs they took, supported by the facilitators where necessary. The aim of video-recorded descriptions was to further support children’s autonomy, in line with an upgraded role as authors of the photograph.

Activities in the PBW were evaluated combining participants’ views and analysis of interactions. As the first form of evaluation, participants’ view on the activities were promoted by distributing pre-test and post-test questionnaires, as well as using a final focus group. Audio-recorded interviews were administered to teachers and facilitators. The second evaluation strategy concerned the analysis of interactions; half of the activities in the classrooms were video-recorded, and the recordings were transcribed and analysed to understand the efficacy of the facilitation in promoting innovative education.

Throughout all its phases, the research followed the key-principles of ethical research, securing the emotional well-being, physical well-being, rights, dignity and personal values of research participants. Procedures were in place for the management of any form of data produced in the research.

This contribution analyses the facilitative methodology utilised in SHARMED. The analysis concerns the evaluative research of PBW that was interested in how facilitation can promote children’s agency as authors of narratives as well as constructors and negotiators of identities. The data discussed in this section concerns the evaluation of interactions, that is, the development of facilitation as a methodology to promote dialogic communication within PBWs.

Our analysis of SHARMED activities has highlighted different styles of facilitation. Differences may relate to the type of settings, including the specific national school systems as well as to different ways of communicating in specific classroom contexts. Differences can

also depend on facilitators' styles. With the support of examples taken from video-recorded and transcribed interactions during PBW, two highly successful forms of facilitation, both characterised by a great variety of supporting and enhancing actions, will be discussed.

The first form of facilitation is particularly important in Italian PBW, characterised by the combination of questions and prevalently expanded feedback, developed across several turns of talk. This is a rich form of facilitation, implying a continuous enhancement and support of narratives' variety and unpredictability. This form of facilitation appears to be very effective in enhancing expansions of personal stories, therefore promoting a great number of narratives that whilst often linked to the same photographs developed without a precise order.

Second form of facilitation was mainly observed in PBW in England and it is characterised by extended complex turns. Facilitative actions such as expanded feedback, comments, personal stories and appreciations, are frequently combined in the same turn. Comments and appreciations are particularly used. This form of facilitation supports the production of narratives through complex turns that function as connectors between different narratives. This form of facilitation is very effective in enhancing interlacements of narratives in ordered sequences of contributions.

5. Presenting and discussing results

5.1 Facilitation as combination of questions and expanded feedback.

The form of facilitation discussed in this section is often centred around on what Ian Hutchby (2007) defines Question Answer Formulation sequence (QAF). In QAF sequences "formulations" are the third-turn that follows a question-answer dyad: the participant who initiates the sequence with a question continues it with a formulation that summarizes, makes explicit or develops the "gist" of the answer provided in the second-turn position. Formulations: (1) "advance the prior report by finding a point in the prior utterance and thus shifting its focus" (Heritage 1985, 104), (2) project a direction for subsequent turns by inviting new responses from answerers (Huchby 2007) thus (3) making interlocutors' decisions in the next turn relevant, as either confirmation or disconfirmation (Heritage and Watson 1979).

In SHARMED PBW formulations were used as a specific form of feedback to children's answers to facilitators' questions. Questions were used to enhance children's narratives and formulation were used to make explicit the meaning or implications of the narrative as well to support its further development.

As a facilitative action, formulation is neither an evaluation of children's answers nor a form of "active listening" (Rogers and Farson 1987). It is not an evaluation because it aims to promote children's active participation rather than assessing children's learning by distinguishing between correct and incorrect answers. Formulation is not mere active listening because it does not aim to "reflect" the content of children's utterances; rather it aims to enhance the gist of children's narratives. Nevertheless, formulations can be integrated in active listening: QAF sequences are produced in longer and complex sequences where active listening, for example actions of repetition, minimal feedback and short comments is also produced.

The analysis of video-recorded interactions indicates two types of formulation used by the two facilitators employed in the PBWs in Italy: 1) explications; 2) developments.

Formulations as explications make the gist of the children's utterances explicit for the facilitator and the classmates. This is useful for mutual understanding and possible development of narratives and co-telling. Extracts 1 and 2 represent this type of FAQ sequence.

Example 1 concerns a photograph taken in Nigeria, where the child is portrayed with a woman and a man who wear traditional attires. In extract 1, turn 1, the facilitator why the photograph, was taken; the question is followed by a short explanation that refers to the special dresses pictured in it. The child's answer about the meaning of the dresses is provided over three turns (turns 2, 4 and 6). After two minimal feedback showing active listening (turns 3 and 5), in turn

7 the facilitator makes the gist of child's answer explicit with a formulation concerning the meaning of the dresses, introduced by an explanation showing surprise (Aston, 1987). The formulation is confirmed by the child using non-verbal communication (turn 8).

1.

1. FAC: but: for what reason was the photo taken? Because I see that you have the same special dresses what tell us what does it mean

2. F1: eh that: we are united, which is not true because that is not my father but my uncle,

3. FAC: yes

4. F1: e: (.) wearing dresses made of the same tissue

5. FAC: yes

6. F1: It seems that we are one

7. FAC: Ah the idea that you have the same dress the same: tissue it's union

8. F1: ((nods))

Example 2 is part of the same interaction but shows a more complex use of formulations as explications. The child is explaining why her father was not at the wedding. He was living in Italy and he could not go back to Nigeria to get married. In turn 1, the facilitator asks the reason of the child's father's immigration, and in turn 3 he asks where the man used to live in Italy. After the child's minima answers, the facilitator formulates the gist of the conversation. In this case, the child does not confirm the formulation only; she also adds a comment about the replacement of his father at the wedding (turn 6). This projects a new facilitator's formulation to propose an explication of the apparently "strange" situation. After a new minimal confirmation of the formulation, the facilitator provides a third formulation to conclude the explication, clarifying the meaning of the photograph, portraying the child's uncle marrying the child's mother as a proxy of the father. It is interesting to note how narrative oscillates between the event pictured in the photograph and the story of migration of the child's father: narratives about the image are intertwined with narrative about the story underpinning the image.

2.

1. FAC: And why did he came here? To looking for job?

2. F1: Yes

3. FAC: And do you know where did he live?

4. F1: In ((city))

5. FAC: in ((city)) ok and the wedding between you dad and you mum took place without you dad,

6. F1: ((nods)) but there was someone who took his place

7. FAC: So ((points at the photo)) e he took your father's place she didn't marry your uncle

8. F1: no

9. FAC: They needed a male figure

10. F1: ((nods))

The second type of formulations observed in Italian PBW proposes developments of the gist of the children's utterances beyond their immediate meaning. This type of formulations is riskier because facilitators may of course mis-interpret the implications of children's contributions. Nevertheless, formulations as developments are actions that can fruitfully propose the art of interpretation to the narrating child and the classroom. Moreover, children's possible rejections of facilitators' interpretation are not a problem for facilitation; rather, rejections invite clarification and, through clarification, they promote further developments of narratives.

Examples 3 and 4 illustrate formulations as developments. In example 3, turn 1 and turn 3, the facilitator asks the reason of the child's choice of photograph. In turn 1 he asks the questions

which is rephrased in turn 3, without leaving time to F2 to complete the answer, only initiates in turn 2. The child provides a minimal negative answer to the second question in turn 4, and the facilitator asks a third question in turn 5. The child provides a new minimal answer and starts to add something; however, F2 appears somehow hesitant. The facilitator does not pursue the completion of the turn, allowing F2 time to complete her answer, which comes after five seconds. After that, the facilitator develops the child's answer to include a discussion of the meaning of Saint Valentine, in this way connecting the image of flowers with their symbolic meaning. The child confirms the facilitator's formulation as development in non-verbal way.

3.

1. FAC: And how was that you chose to bring us just this picture=

2. F2: e: because:

3. FAC: I mean this picture gift that your uncle did to your aunt is one thing that you too liked?

4. F2: Yes

5. FAC: Because you like flowers?

6. F2: ((nods)) and (5.0) I took the picture because it was the day of Saint Valentine

7. FAC: Which is the day of lovers

8. F2: ((nods))

Example 4 illustrates the rejection of a formulation as development. The sequence reported follows a child's long narrative concerning his grandfathers, supported by several turns where the facilitator provides minimal feedback to show active listening.

In turn 1, the story of one of the child's grandfathers comes to end with his death during combat in WWII. In turn 2, the facilitator displays keen interest in the story, following that form of appreciation with a formulation which develops the narrative by inferring possible consequences of the child's grandfathers untimely death. After the child's confirmation, the facilitator produces a second formulation as development to suggest that the child's grandmothers died before the child's birth (turn 4). However, the child's rejects this interpretation, showing agency by choosing to use the rejection of the formulation as the foundation of a narrative about his grans grandmothers. Although rejected in its content, the formulation as development in turn 4 still successfully promotes M1 access to the status of author of knowledge in turn 5. In this form of facilitation, narratives are co-constructed through the interlaced contributions of facilitators and children. If facilitators' actions are perceived by children as forms of personalised participation they enhance children's agency, even when it is displayed in form of contradiction of the facilitator's view.

4.

1. M1: And he sank with the whole submarine

2. FAC: Wow! And so the grandmothers remained alone

3. M1: Yes

4. FAC: That however you didn't know

5. M1: No no these ones are still there well my grandmother that of the one who died in the submarine died this year

This form of facilitation is based on a variety of supporting g actions that h are provided across several discrete turns of talk. Example 5 invites to appreciate the complexity of this form of facilitation, showing the facilitator supporting of an emotionally intense narrative by combining questions, formulations (both as explications and developments) and continuers. Before this example, M2 had already share about his parents' separation and revealed that his father found a new fiancée, who M2 does not like much.

In turn 1, the facilitator asks a focused question to check whether M2 really dislikes his fathers' new fiancée, which is replied positively by the child. In turn 5 a formulation infers that M2's

judgement is not based on actual knowledge of the woman (turn 5); the formulation is rejected by the child. The facilitator repairs the misunderstanding producing another formulation as an explication (turn 7). M2 confirms the second formulation, adding further information about his parents.

In the next phase of the interaction, the facilitator supports the narrative through a two-parts formulation as development (turns 9 and 11), a continuer (turn 13) and another formulation as development (turn 15). The story becomes very intimate and emotional, as suggested by F3's exclamation in turn 17.

The facilitator continues to support the ongoing narrative using more formulations as developments (turns 19 and 21) that do not only invite M2 to continue the narrative but also display the facilitator's access to the role of co-teller. In turn 21, a new formulation as development leads to a shift in topic, that moves from M2's parents to the photograph itself. The facilitator investigates if M2's mother is aware of the child's choice to bring the photograph to the PBW (turn 25). M2's answer is linked by the facilitator to two further formulations as developments regarding M2's mother attitude (turn 27 and 31). Both formulations, however, are rejected by M2. These rejections are followed by the facilitator's active listening (turns 33 and 35) of M2's narrative. In turn 37, the facilitator proposes a formulation as development using an interrogative format, reacted by M2 with a somehow contradictory statement about his mother's feelings (turns 36 and 38). In turn 39, the facilitator tries to repair the partial confusion in the interaction with a last formulation as development, which is confirmed by M2 in turn 40.

5.

1. FAC: Because you may not like her?

2. M2: mh ((shaking his head))

3. ?: h

4. M2: I and my brother don't like her at all [a

5. FAC: [but you don't know her yet

6. M2: eh: actually I know her

7. FAC: Ah so you know who she is

8. M2: Y:es that: that ac- that actually they were g- they were alright together only

that:

sometimes when my father was taking was losing control because he to- he was taking lots of medicines for something that I don't [know

9. FAC: [and they make him strange

10. M2: eh? [he, my mother

11. FAC: [those medicines

12. M2: One she threw the medicines out

13. FAC: ah

14. M2: and: he m: one day in the following days after he started shouting at her,

beating [her,

15. FAC: [because

he could not find the medi[cines

16. M2 [eh

17. F3: [oh my god

18. M2: Yes and then and my bro- and my father no I mean my mother a: she was:

((makes an horizontal gesture with the hands)) she was going

19. FAC: I mean she didn't agree with this behaviour

20. M2: no

21. FAC: Mh so you keep this photo

- (..)
22. M2: I ke- [I: kept it in my mother kept it in a red box with glitters
23. FAC: [or or ((after)) yes
24. M2: And: th- then I took it because it reminds my of that
25. FAC: But your mum gave it to – does she know that you were bringing this photo?
26. M2: Yes ((nods))
27. FAC: And so your mum cares about this photo
28. M2: e: actually not ((shakes head))
29. FAC: no?
30. M2: No be- because she can't stand my father anymore and so she: she just – in fact she put it away it from my drawers
31. FAC: She took it off it from from the album
32. M2: Y:es no it's not an album it was a photo frame
33. FAC: eh
34. M2: It's not an album a photo frame the: I don't know the name
35. FAC: Yes yes a photo frame
36. M2: And then and then she put it away in one of my drawers in my bedroom
37. FAC: But then did she want you to keep it?
38. M2: She didn't want to throw it away but she wanted to keep it because it's because mum says that l- she is not in love with dad but she loves him very much
39. FAC: Because after all [they hav- have did some important things [in their life together
40. M2: [((nods)) [together yes ((nods))

5.2 Facilitation as production of extended complex turns

In this form of facilitation actions such as expanded feedback, comments, personals stories and appreciations are frequently combined in single complex turns that connect more stories. This form of facilitation appears to enhance orderly interlacements of narratives. Complex turns of talk are pivot for the promotion of children's authorship of narratives. Within complex turns, facilitators' comments and appreciations are particularly common; the personal commitment of the facilitator creates favourable conditions for children's participation.

Example 6 illustrates how an extended and complex turn works as a pivot for the development of dialogue. In turn 2, the facilitator displays engagement and appreciation for the long story narratives produced by M1 in turn 1. The display of appreciation that acknowledges M1's legitimate status as author of knowledge, therefore upgrading his epistemic status. Turn 2 is complex not because of its length, but because it includes more actions. The appreciation is followed by the facilitator with several actions: a clarification, a question addressed to another child, a comment on sharing memories, a repetition of part of M1's turn to repeat appreciation of it. In the final part of turn 2, the facilitator emphasises the connections between different stories produced in the PBW. The complex turn 2 appears to promote M1's agency; this is suggested by turn 3 in the example, where the child displays choice and autonomy by constructing an unpredictable development of a possible implication of the facilitator's previous contribution.

6.

1. M1: When I went to Chessingtons, I was really scared of the rides and my brother forced me to go on this ride, he kept forcing me, forcing and my uncle kept forcing me (..) they didn't go themselves because they were both scared but then I said come on, why are you both forcing me to go and come yourselves and then they came along (..) and there was this ride that was really dangerous because you had to stand up and lean against this tiny part and it had this

tiny belt and it kept going up and down and like this ((does hand gesture; child sitting near him makes same gesture)) and I was on and then after my brother forced me to go on another ride and I was really scared of it because I thought there was snakes there but there weren't, there were electric snakes and everything was ghost pictures and I thought there were real ghosts and I said I don't want to go and I said and I sat next to my uncle and my uncle was on the safer side and I told him to move to move here I said it's better because I wanted to move to the safer side but then we had to see the scary part and we had a gun to us, a fake gun just like with a light and then I picked up the gun and then I shot it, I kept shooting the monsters (..) it didn't make a noise and I thought it was a real gun and then I started screaming but then I realised (..) and at the end of the ride before the train stopped I took off my belt and ran outside before it stopping ((class giggles))

2. FAC: Wow, so you went to Chessingtons and someone here (..) you went to Chessingtons? ((indicates another child)) so you guys share a memory as well, so you have a shared something (..) and you have (..) um your uncle did I hear right, your uncle went on a ride with you and your uncle went on a ride with you (..) wow, so there's a connection there ((indicates children)) like a triangle

3. M1: It's kind of like a rollercoaster

Similarly to turn 1 of example 6, the first unit of facilitator's turn 2 of example 7 is utilised to display appreciation for M2's story in turn 1, upgrading the child's epistemic status as author of valid knowledge, which is an essential aspect of agency. The second part of the turn advances a possible explanation of the child cousin's behaviour. Again, this displays engagement in the child's contribution, supporting his agency. M2 is thus supported in his access to authorship of narratives, also the facilitator's focused question in turn 4. The question concerns a detail in M2's narrative. Nevertheless, it is an important action of active listening. Turn 6 channels a second question from the facilitator to M2. This time the question concerns M2's feelings and an open format is chosen to allow as much space as possible to the child's reaction. Turn 8 is a complex turn as it includes two actions: the first action is a formulation that summarises the gist of M2's narratives in the previous turn 7. The second action is a question based on the child's narrative which is therefore acknowledged as a valid foundation for the development of the interaction, again upgrading the epistemic status of M2. In turn 10, the facilitator produces a short personal story followed. Personal stories are an important action of facilitation, because they display facilitator's willingness to engage with children based on interpersonal relationship rather than role hierarchy. Sharing personal stories is for the facilitator a way to show trust in children and can be seen as role-modelling to promote expectations of personal expression.

Turn 14 is another complex turn, composed by an initial comment on M2's contribution and a subsequent invitation to talk to other children, to extend the area of active participation by linking new narratives to the ongoing one. F2 takes the floor, following this invitation (turn 15). Turn 16 is functionally equivalent of turn 10, because a short story based on childhood's memory displays facilitator's personal engagement in the conversation. Facilitation appears to be successful, supporting the interlacement of narratives between turns 17 and 22, with the active participation of several children. Turn 23 is another complex turn. The first action is a comment on memories of scaring situations or fears that display the facilitator's interest and attention to the contributions of children, again upgrading their epistemic status. The second action is a personal story introduced by a question. The interaction is a context of agency: this is demonstrated by turn 24. Although the facilitator uses the last part of the complex turn 23 to introduce a shift of topic, F3 takes the personal initiative to produce another narrative. Turn 25 is the last complex turn in the interaction. Initially the facilitator comments on scary stories, followed by a commitment to return to the topic in the next PBW, the appreciation for

children's contributions and gratitude to children for their participation. These three successive actions in turn 25 converge in supporting children's epistemic status and in reinforcing expectations of active participation.

7.

1. M2: On that day, I met one of my cousins (?) and he came to the wedding. He didn't like me that much but like whenever I got closer he'd scratch me on my face.

2. FAC: Oh wow, some cousins might do that sometimes when they're younger.

3. M2: And there was (..) I can remember that my oldest cousin he used to play cricket, he made this rumour that he met one of the famous players, a cricket famous player and then I got into him and he made me do stuff, like he made me do stuff that I didn't want to do, like go to the shops (?) and he would show me a picture of when I was a baby and it made me feel embarrassed.

4. FAC: Were you very small?

5. M2: yeah

6. FAC: And what do you (..) when you look back at this picture how does it make you kind of feel, like to think of the time together with family, generations?

7. M2: We're apart now, we're in different countries. My other cousin (?) like sometimes I cry about it because I never met them. I meet my grandparents every five years. When I met them this year, last year, I was so emotional and I kept sort of like following them and slept with them, but when I was leaving they cried their hearts out.

8. FAC: They didn't want to leave you, yes. Can I ask why you slept with them - was it to feel close to them and to get in with them?

9. M2: Yeah.

10. FAC: I used to sleep with my grandma when I was little.

11. M2: My grandma she's (..) well, when I was in Afghanistan, we have this house, my cousin told me it was haunted and in one of the [unclear] they put their hands (?) in one of the pictures and told me like there's a ghost and a hand appeared.

12. FAC: So, you want to sleep with your grandma to be safe?

13. M2: ((Gesticulates with hands)) (?) in the new house we had (..) my brother even told me as a child stories, scary stories that because they had like plastic bags covering their balcony (?) and she told me that, she told me they were covering that up because the ghost doesn't like coming through the balcony.

14. FAC: So, lots of scary stories about ghosts. Did anybody else get told stories about ghosts from their grandparents or siblings or their cousins?

15. F2 ((Standing up, hands of chair of girl in front)): My cousin, my cousin told me when I was in my Nan's house, and all of my cousins were there, and at night when we were all sleeping my eldest cousin told us this scary story and then when we went to sleep I just couldn't stop thinking about it. Yeah, it gets quite scary doesn't it when you hear (..) especially at night time, things get a bit scary at night time when the lights off, doesn't it.

16. FAC: I know I get a bit scared sometimes. I have to put a cheeky light on to make me feel a bit safer, so I can see what's going on.

17. M3: When I was at my cousin's house, he told my brother because he lived opposite a forest, and he told my brother that there was a man called the Bear Man in the forest, when he was like little. So, then when he went outside and it was dark he started crying. And there was this other time, it was like maybe a month ago. My sister she hates Michael Jackson because the rumour of everything that he did, and then he was sitting next to the window when it was dark outside and my cousin he put the music on and he screamed, and he said like it was Michael Jackson behind her and she got so scared.

18. FAC: So, she was really freaked out

19. M3: Yes and she's like 13, so

20. FAC: so, some more scary stories.
21. M4: So, basically when I was about five or six when I was sleeping in my bed and they said to me there's a man underneath your bed. There was a phone, it was ringing and I just jumped and ran to my mum and said mummy, mummy there's a man under my bed. And then I had to sleep with my mum because I was scared and then when I was asleep and she took me in the bed
22. M5: ((smiles)) So, when I was really young my dad used to make up these, not scary ones, but about the snake who used to come to our house, he said that it was going to come for me, so I stayed next to him every single time and as I grew up I didn't really believe him at the time.
23. FAC: Yeah, isn't it funny how we get these memories and these fears and you don't know whether to believe them or not, it's a bit scary. Did anybody ever think there was somebody in their wardrobe? Sometimes, when I was a little girl, I used to look in my wardrobe to make sure there was nobody in there, there was never anybody in there but I used to get scared sometimes. I'll come back and see you next week, if that's okay.
24. F3: When I was little, my auntie, because I had like these two wardrobes next to my bed either side, it had murals on it, so my auntie said it was (?). So, when I was sleeping I used to leave the cupboards open, they faced me. So, when I go to bed I used to look at the mirrors and I would scream and go under the duvet and get my torch out and see if there's anything there and go back to bed (?) see it again (..) my duvet.
25. FAC: Do you know what I think a lot of people do that sometimes, get a little bit jeebie when the light goes off. I think we can talk about this next time I come back, this is a huge area that you're sharing, all of these kind of haunted stories, all from this picture. How did we know that we were going to start talking about hauntings and ghost stories all from a picture like this. Your memories are just so vast and the emotion of your picture that you began to tell us really shared lots of things. So, thank you so much and if you would like to bring in some pictures for next week and if you've taken a picture that would be great to bring that in, okay. So, thank you so much and shall we say thank you very much for sharing today, thank you, well done guys, thank you, thank you and thank you for the videotaping ((Applause)) So, who would like to bring in some pictures next week?
26. M?: Me.
27. FAC: Bring them all in then, I'll look forward to seeing them, thank you.

6. The outcomes of the research: some reflections and a conclusion

The two types of facilitation discussed in the previous sections, are based on facilitators' intense activity of co-construction of narratives. The difference between the two forms of facilitation relates to contingency of turn-by-turn co-construction (first form of facilitation) and ordered sequence of more complex turns and narratives (second form of facilitation).

The first form of facilitation is effective in enhancing expansions of personal stories, promoting a community of dialogue based on several discrete contributions, often linked to the same photograph and developing contingently. Dialogue between children on the same photograph or topic and individual, unpredictable contributions are facilitated.

The second form of facilitation is effective in enhancing a community of dialogue through interlacements of narratives, produced over one or more turns in orderly sequences that develops from the facilitator's extended and complex contributions.

Examples 1-7 do not aim to represent the complexity of facilitation in the context of SHARMED PBW. However, they aim to show that facilitation is a flexible methodology that can adapt locally to different school systems, class demographic and ways of communicating in the specific classroom contexts. The examples discussed also aim to acknowledge the importance of facilitators' styles. Forms of facilitation are different in different situations and

it can be expected for facilitation to be influenced by individual style as much as the cultural contexts of facilitators' work.

References

- Alanen, L. (2009), "Generational order". In: J. Qvortrup, G. Valentine, W. Corsaro and Honig, M.S. eds 2009. *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. Pp. 159-174.
- Alred, G., Byram, M., and Fleming, M. (2003). *Intercultural experience and education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bamberg, M. (2011), "Narrative practice and identity navigation". In: J.A. Holstein and Gubrium J.F. eds. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*. London: Sage. Pp. 99-124.
- Baraldi, C. (2014a), "Children's participation in communication systems: a theoretical perspective to shape research". *Sociological studies on children and youth*, 18, 63-92.
- Baraldi, C. (2014b), "Formulations in dialogic facilitation of classroom interactions". *Language and Dialogue*, 4 (2), 234-260.
- Baraldi C. (2015), "Intercultural Communication Systems and Discourses of Cultural Identity". *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6 (1), 49-71.
- Baraldi, C. and Iervese, V. (2017), "Narratives of memories and dialogues in multicultural classrooms". *Narrative Inquiry*, 27 (2), 398-417.
- Bjerke, H. (2011), "It's the way to do it. Expressions of agency in child-adult relations at home and school". *Children & Society*, 25, 93-103.
- Byrd Clark, J.S., and Dervin, F. (2014), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education*. New York: Routledge.
- Dervin, F. and Liddicoat, A.J. (2013). *Linguistics for Intercultural Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Farini, F. (2019). The paradox of citizenship education in early years (and beyond): The case of education to fundamental British values. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 17 (4), 361-375.
- Fisher, W. (1987). *Human communication as narration: toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Grant, C.A. and Portera, A. (2011). *Intercultural and Multicultural Education. Enhancing Global Interconnectedness*. New York: Routledge.
- Guilherme, M. (2012). "Critical language and intercultural communication pedagogy". In: Jackson, J. ed 2012. *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication*. London: Routledge. Pp. 357-371.
- Gundara, J.S. (2000). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Gundara, J.S. and Portera A. (2008), "Theoretical reflections on intercultural education". *Intercultural Education*, 19 (6), 463-468.
- Harré, R. and Van Langenhove, L. (1999). *Positioning Theory*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and Restoring Respectful Relationships in Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond G. (2005). "The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68 (1), 15-38.
- Hosftede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills & London: Sage.
- Holliday, A. (1999). "Small cultures". *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (2): 237-264.
- Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication and ideology*. London: Sage.
- Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding Intercultural Communication. Negotiating a Grammar of Culture*, London: Routledge.
- Holliday, A and Amadasi, S. (2020). *Making Sense of the Intercultural. Finding DeCentred Threads*. London: Routledge.
- Jackson, J. (2014). "The process of becoming reflexive and intercultural: Navigating study abroad and re-entry experience". In: J.S. Byrd Clark and Dervin, F. eds. *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education*. London: Routledge. Pp. 43-63
- James, A. (2009). "Agency", in J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro and Honig, M.S. eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. Pp. 34-45.
- James, A. and James, A.L. (2004). *Constructing Childhood. Theory, Policy and Social Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- James, A. and James, A.L. (2008). *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies*. London: Sage.
- Kramsch, C. and Uryu, M. (2012). "Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space". In: Jackson, J. ed. *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication*. London: Routledge. Pp. 211-225.
- Leonard, M. (2016). *The sociology of children, childhood and generation*. London: Sage.
- Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Mahon, J. and Cushner K. (2012). "The multicultural classroom". In: Jackson, J. ed. *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication*. London: Routledge. Pp. 434-448.
- Matthews, H. (2003). "Children and regeneration: Setting and agenda for community participation and integration". *Children & Society*, 17, 264-276.
- Mercer, N. and Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and development of children's thinking*. London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, S., Foulger, T., Wetzel, K. & C. Rathkey (2008). The Negotiated Project Approach: Project-Based Learning without Leaving the Standards Behind. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 36, 339-346
- Moosa-Mitha, M. (2005). "A difference-centred alternative to theorization of children's citizenship rights". *Citizenship Studies*, 9, 369-388.
- Norrick, N. (2007). "Conversational storytelling". In: Herman, D. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 127-141
- Oswell, D. (2013). *The Agency of Children. From Family to Global Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Piller, I. (2007). "Linguistics and intercultural communication". *Language and Linguistic Compass*, 1 (3), 208-226.
- Portera, A. (2008). "Intercultural education in Europe: epistemological and semantic aspects". *Intercultural Education*, 19 (6), 481-491.
- O'Connor, C. and Michaels, S. (1996). "Shifting Participant Frameworks: Orchestrating Thinking Practices in Group Discussion". In: Hicks, D. ed. *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 63-103.
- Sakr, M., Scollan, A. (2019). "The screen and the sand-timer: The integration of the interactive whiteboard into an early years free-flow learning environment". *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 17 (3), 190-204.
- Schell, A. (2009). "Schools and cultural difference". In: H. Kotthoff and Spencer-Oatey, H. eds. *Handbook of intercultural communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 303-321
- Shier, H. (2001). "Pathways to participation: openings, opportunities and obligations". *Children & Society*, 15, 107-117.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Franklin, P. (2009). *Intercultural interaction. A multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Tupas, R. (2014). "Intercultural education in everyday practice". *Intercultural Education*, 25 (4), 243-254.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London: Routledge.
- Winslade, J. and Williams, M. (2012). *Safe and Peaceful Schools*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Wierbicka, A. (2006). "The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective". *Discourse Studies*, 8 (5), 675-703.
- Wyness, M. (2013). "Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis". *Childhood*, 20 (4), 429-442.