Final Report

Edited by Claudio Baraldi

In collaboration with
Chiara Ballestri
Luisa Conti
Federico Farini
Vittorio Iervese
Angela Scollan

Chapter 1. On SHARMED

Chapter 2. Background research

Chapter 3. Pre-test

Chapter 4. Analysis of the activities

Chapter 5. Post-test and effects of activities

Chapter 6. Evaluation of the activities

Chapter 7. Educational and societal implication

References

List of extended reports

Backgound Research
Pre-test
Report of the effect of SHARMED and children's satisfaction
Activities in classrooms

List of outcomes

Policy Briefs (www.sharmed.eu Section Publications)
Guidelines (www.sharmed.eu Section Your SHARMED)
Evaluation package (www.sharmed.eu Section Your SHARMED)
Training Package (www.sharmed.eu Section Learning Platform
Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) (www.sharmed.eu Section Learning Platform)
Archive (www.sharmed.eu section Archive)

Chapter 1. On SHARMED

1. Objectives of the SHARMED project

SHARMED (Shared Memories and Dialogues) is a project funded by the European Commission (Erasmus +, Key-action 3, innovative education), coordinated by the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (Italy), with the partnership of the University of Jena (Germany) and the University of Suffolk (United Kingdom). The project started at the beginning of 2016 and has been concluded at the end of 2018.

SHARMED regarded the promotion of new experiences of teaching and learning, with specific consideration for promotion of intercultural dialogue in multicultural classrooms. Its general objective was producing, comparing and relating, in a dialogic way, children's memories of personal and cultural roots in multicultural classrooms, through the collection and use of visual materials (in particular photographs), thus providing opportunities for children's narratives of contents and meanings about and around these materials. SHARMED pursued this objective by enhancing empowerment and recognition of children's contributions to classroom communication and production of narratives. In short, four core aspects characterised SHARMED:

1. Collection and use of photographs, regarding children and their families' memories.
2. Provision of opportunities for children's choices of photographs.
3. Production of children's stories about the contents and meanings of photographs and memories in classroom.
4. Facilitation of description, comparison and sharing of photographs and stories through dialogic communication.

Specific objectives of SHARMED included methodological aspects, analysis, support of applications and dissemination. For what concerns methodological aspects. SHARMED promoted a facilitative methodology in the classroom and the integration of this methodology with competence in working with visual materials (in particular, photography), developing synergetic connections in the school (among teachers) and between schools and their contexts (among teachers, external experts and families).

Analysis regards the sociocultural context of schools and children, facilitative methodology and use of visual materials, and children's participation and narratives, leading to reflect on assumptions and tendencies in classrooms and schools, opening up and questioning them, with the possibility of imagining new ones.

SHARMED supported the application of facilitative methodology and use of visual materials in different areas of teaching and learning (e.g., oral communication and writing, Art, History, Geography, Intercultural Education). Moreover, SHARMED developed a training package, including a Massive Online Open Course (MOOC), provided guidelines for facilitative methodology and future activities, provided a multimedia archive with photographs, videos and texts, to promote exchanges among the classrooms and dissemination in European countries.

The first and most important target groups of SHARMED included the native and migrant-background children, aged 8-13. In relation to this group, a second target was the children's parents,

who were invited to support the project and the children in their choices of photographs, as well as in responding to questionnaires. A third important target group included the teachers who were invited to collaborate to the project supporting the activities and motivating the children and their parents. Finally, the project involved the facilitators working in schools or supporting school activities. In short, according to the collected data, SHARMED involved 987 children in 48 classes (16 for each country) in 20 schools, 1004 parents, 40 teachers and 9 facilitators. During the project, 1683 images were collected (and 1374 archived with consent). In the 48 classes, the project was realised through 192 activities (384 hours of work), half of which were video-recorded for purposes of analysis and archiving.

The project also involved local and regional stakeholders (school offices, local authorities, foundations, associations), while national and international institutions were contacted through documentation, meetings and seminars. These partnerships ensured a network through which the project was disseminated. In some cases, these contacts could multiply the impact of SHARMED, by influencing local and regional practice and policy (see Chapter 7).

2. The theoretical approach

SHARMED was based on six conceptual dimensions: (1) narratives; (2) meaning of using photography; (3) meaning of memory, related to narratives and photography; (4) facilitation (5) relevance of intercultural communication and cultural identity; (6) conflict management. These dimensions will be synthetically presented in this section.

2.1 Narratives and memory

The SHARMED project was based on the use of photography to facilitate narratives in classroom interactions. As the concept of narrative is of primary importance, we shall start from it to explain our theoretical approach.

In a broad perspective, theory of narratives includes two general frameworks. The first theoretical framework has been developed in the context of Communication Studies (Fischer 1987), and in the context of sociology (Somers 1994). According to Fischer, narratives are produced in all communication processes. All forms of communication are stories, situational, as well as historically and culturally grounded, therefore "narration is the context for interpreting and assessing all communication" as it is omnipresent in communication (Fisher 1987: 193). Narratives are conceived as social constructions, in which the observed reality is interpreted and 'storied' in different ways. Somers (1994) describes the ways of narrative construction, differentiating among narratives of the self (the so-called ontological narratives), public narratives, conceptual narratives, including scientific concepts, and metanarratives, concerning "the epic dramas of our time" (Somers 1994: 619). This classification highlights that narratives concern any production of information in societies. Somers shows the links between narratives concerning the individual self and narratives concerning society (public narratives, metanarratives). An important implication of narratives is that the meaning of the observed reality may be narrated through different sets of categories, therefore in plural, and sometimes competing, ways.

The second theoretical framework concerns production of narratives as storytelling in face-to-face interactions (Norrick 2007). The interactional construction of narratives does not only concern their contents, but also and above all the *rights* associated to the activity of narrating. Three aspects are particularly relevant to consider these rights in our analysis. Firstly, each participant may contribute to constructing and negotiating a narrative in the interaction as teller, co-teller, listener, or elicitor of new narratives. Secondly, narratives can be either first-person narratives or *vicarious* narratives, when someone narrates about or on behalf of someone else (Norrick 2013). Thirdly, narratives can receive different comments from different participants; in particular, each narrative can be followed by response narratives that refer to it, and this enhances the production of *interlaced* stories (Norrick 2007).

The analysis of SHARMED regarded the narratives of children's memories and the ways in which these narratives are constructed and negotiated in classroom interactions, with which effects ad with which level of satisfaction. In the context of an interactional framework, the important question here is "how to exploit memory for constructing narratives" (Norrick 2012: 195). The interactional construction is an important resource to give meaning to narratives of the self (Somers 1994), as based on autobiographical memory (Norrick 2012; Skowronski & Walker 2004), which has been defined as a "situated activity in spatiotemporally localized events embedded in social and material environments" (Bietti 2015: 5). According to Nelson, "memories become valued in their own right (…) because they are shareable with others" (1993: 12), and "the process of sharing memories with others becomes available as a means of reinstating memory" (1993: 177), i.e. as a means to connect individual remembering and communication. Autobiographical memory is always communicated (Assman 2011) and in particular it may be performed in the interaction. Narrating autobiographical memory is an interactional achievement involving those who share and/or are interested in sharing memory. In telling their narratives, participants "create and recreate" their past in the light of their "present needs and concerns" (Norrick 2007: 139) as they are defined in social interactions. Thus, autobiographical memory is contextualised in public narratives.

The interactional construction of narratives of autobiographical memory highlights the meaning of the identity of the narrating persons (Bamberg 2005, 2011). It means construction of a unique self-history, which can be clearly distinguished from others' self-histories (Nelson 2003). The narrative of events allows the construction of the self in time, thus producing the development of identity, and telling stories of past experiences means influencing the construction of autobiographical identity (Norrick 2012). Self-history can establish and communicate the position of the teller within a shared history (Hoerl 2007; Norrick 2012), which can be linked to personal preferences, interpersonal relationships or group membership.

Exploiting memory for constructing narratives also means activating ideas through remembering that must be encoded in the language and narrative format (Norrick 2012). For what concerns this activation, two types of narrative have been stressed (Berntsen & Rubin 2012; Conway 2005; Conway & Pleydell-Pearce 2000):

(1) Declarative narrative, referring to specific facts, data or events that can be recalled "from the unique perspective of the self in relation to others" (Nelson & Fivush 2004: 488)
(2) Semantic narrative, referring to general knowledge of the world, in terms of facts, ideas, meanings and concepts. Semantic narratives activate ideas through remembering but it is not part of an autobiographical narrative, rather it is a possible enrichment of this narrative.

A last important aspect of narratives is their "tellability" in public contexts, such as classrooms. Tellability of narratives may be limited by a sense of irrelevance of the narrated contests, by contents that are considered inappropriate in the context (e.g. sexual contents, private contents), and also by embarrassment in telling a story in public. The last aspect is particularly relevant in the project, as the children were asked to tell in front of their classmates.

In Chapter 4, we will analyse examples of narrative that were produced during the project. These examples allow the analysis of the interactional construction of narratives of children's memories, including the following seven aspects:

(1) Types of produced narratives
(2) Classification of narratives as either declarative or semantic
(3) Ways of narrating, as either first-person (the child is protagonists of the photo) or vicarious (the child reports others' narratives about the photo)
(4) Ways of interlacing narratives, i.e. connecting different narratives
(5) Ways of contextualising narratives in past or present time
(6) Ways of constructing identity through narratives
(7) Possible problems of tellability.

2.2 Photography and memory

Recent research shows that memory of past experiences can be shaped through the interplay of multimodal components, where different traces of memory interact and merge (Barsalou 2008; Stones & Bietti 2016). Memory does not only depend on people's awareness of their past, but also on social interactions with other people, sharing the same past, recalling the same past in a different way, interested in sharing their memories. Therefore, remembering is a socially situated activity, rather than an individual introspective operation. Against this background, images, e.g., photographs, can work as media that trigger the transformation of individual traces of memory, i.e. engrams, into the material, perceivable forms, i.e. exograms. Engrams are internal traces of memory, while exograms are external hints or traces. Exograms are activators or entry points of memory, which are particularly effective in connecting the lived experience with data that are more general or external to this experience. Memory is therefore made evident in the relation between engrams and exograms, and this relation activates recollection. Images, and photographs are powerful social exograms, which can activate the complex dynamics of memory. According to Edwards:

Photographs provoke acts of memory recalling us to things, places, and people. They establish connections across time and space, including chains of association. What will be dredged up in memory's driftnet cannot be predicted in advance: an item of clothing or decor in a picture can spark connections and associations (Edwards 2006: 121)

According to Edwards (2006), photographs are "a form of interlocutors", because they unlock memories and allow knowledge to be transferred or passed from the past to present. Photographs may be observed as both traces of a lived past and as produced and performed. Photographs invite people to interact with them. They allow people to recall their lived experiences, and their meanings depend on how they are delivered in communication. In this view, photographs can be considered as perceptual media of communication. Photographs, as any other perceptual media, "can be recognized only by the contingency of the formations that make them possible" (Luhmann 2000: 104). On the one hand, photographs are visual forms that can be transmitted through the media and across contexts and can be retrieved and manipulated via an array of resources. On the other hand, photographs are media that can take narrative forms in communication processes. They can be retrieved and manipulated through these narrative forms.

The use of photographs implies that the interactional production of narratives depends on past actions (taking pictures) that were designed for other purposes and only later do they become important in the specific context of the interaction. The use of photographs to trigger narratives involves much more than simply recalling details of what occurred in the recorded events. Photography can be understood not only as a technology for documenting life, but also and above all as a powerful medium for social engagement. While photographs allow capturing moments of personal lives instantly, expressing personal feelings and preserving memory, they can also enhance storytelling and invite connections.

It has been shown that the use of visual materials can engage children in creative workshops (e.g., Baraldi & Iervese 2017; Moline 2011). Therefore, photographs can be powerful media to stimulate personalised and interactive storytelling in educational settings. Photographs do not only elicit children's comments or responses to visual inputs, but they can also be the starting point of participated dialogue in the classroom. In other words, children can participate in classroom communication *through*, *about* and *with* photographs.

Photographs can work as exograms that enhance the interactional production of narrative. Exograms enhance narratives about the frame of the image, and behind the frame of the image, i.e. the story of the photograph and the situation or circumstances in which it was produced. Narratives, about the frame or behind the frame, can enhance new first-person, vicarious or interlaced narratives. These

narratives can be either declarative narratives (referring to specific facts, data or events), or semantic narratives (referring to a general knowledge of facts, ideas, meanings and concepts).

In SHARMED, the narrative production was enhanced through private photographs picturing events that children considered relevant for their memory. In such a context, narratives focus on both photographs, which concern past events, and on what is behind and beyond photographs, i.e. (1) the social and cultural context of the photographs and (2) new stories linked to the photographs (Baraldi & Iervese 2017). Therefore, narratives of past events can evolve into narratives of children's lived experience, behind and beyond photographs. Consequently, not all the narratives can be considered as storytelling regarding past events (Norrick 2007, 2012). Any telling of past events can evolve in other types of narratives, starting from co-telling and listeners' comments. While memory may be encoded in the format of storytelling, the complex chain of telling, co-telling and comments enhances different narrative formats, e.g. when linked to previous stories. This complex articulation shows that narratives can be considered as omnipresent in communication (Fischer 1987) because they cannot be reduced to a specific format. In this report, therefore, the concept of "narrative" is used to include *all* the ways in which the observed reality is interpreted and storied.

In chapter 4, we shall analyse the ways of using photography as a medium that conveys exograms. We shall show the construction of narratives of the self and public narratives, by connecting what is in the frame with what is behind the frame of the image, by enhancing declarative and semantic narratives of children's memories, and by promoting the interlacement of narratives and thus the production of new narratives.

2.3 Facilitation

The interactional dimension was particularly relevant in SHARMED. The context of this interaction was the classroom. Two general aspects of classroom interactions were primarily relevant (Baraldi & Corsi, 2017; Luhmann, 2002). First, classroom interactions convey knowledge, which can be specified with respect to specific issues and specific pupils. Second, classroom interactions include ways of testing the results of this conveyance. Evaluation must be produced in classroom interactions to highlight the outcomes of conveyance, by distinguishing between pupils' better and worse performances, and showing their learning. Communication conveying knowledge, on the one hand, and communication evaluating the outcome of conveyance, on the other, are both necessary and intertwined in classroom interactions.

This combination of conveyance of knowledge and evaluation of its result is shown by a traditional sequence organisations: the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Mehan 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), which is made up of teacher's Initiation (often questions), students' Responses and teachers' Evaluation, and its variations and mitigations (e.g. Farini 2011; Margutti 2010; Seedhouse 2004; Walsh 2011). This is a hierarchical structure, limiting the opportunities of children's participation (James & James 2004; Wyness 1999) and representing the hierarchical generational order which permeates the relations between adults and children in society (Alanen 2009).

This traditional form of education can face serious problems when children's active contribution to the development of the interaction and dialogue need to be provided. In these cases, the two key-concepts, to consider in the classroom, are children's agency and dialogue.

Agency is a key concept in childhood studies (James 2009; James & James 2008; Leonard 2016; Oswell 2013). At a first glance, agency seems to stress a view of children's participation as the ability to act autonomously from external conditions. In this perspective, children's agency can be defined as 'the capacity of individuals to act independently' (James & James 2008: 9). What is basically asserted here is that children's actions are not simple outputs of children's experience of adults' inputs, i.e. they are not determined by adults' actions. Agency can be better conceptualized as the particular form of active participation that can enhance social change. Showing agency means showing the availability of choices of action, opening different possible courses of action, so that a specific course of action is one among various possibilities (Baraldi 2014a; Harré & van Langhenove 1999). Therefore, children's agency can be observed if children's active participation shows the

availability of choices of action, which can enhance alternative actions, and therefore change in the interaction.

It has been observed that the concept of children's agency implies the relationship between children's actions and social structures. Therefore, the analysis of agency must also focus on its social conditions and structures (Bjerke 2011; James 2009; Mayall 2002; Moosa-Mitha 2005; Valentine 2011). The structural limitation of individual participation in social processes seems unavoidable, and particularly relevant for children, who are included in a hierarchical generational order. However, the concept of agency implies that both individual actions and social structures are involved in the constitution of society (Giddens 1984). This means that the range of individual actions cannot be completely predefined by social structures and relational constraints. The constructive interplay between children's action and social structures does not allow a completely predefined hierarchical order.

However, it is important to distinguish between two conditions of participation. While children's active participation can happen anytime in communication, with predictable consequences, the achievement of children's agency needs specific conditions, i.e. it needs the promotion of specific opportunities of children's active participation as choice and construction of knowledge. In classroom interactions, agency is shown by the assigned rights of constructing knowledge, that is as children's autonomous access to domains of knowledge. This is what Heritage (2012) calls **epistemic status**, and children's rights and responsibilities for constructing knowledge, what Heritage and Raymond (2005) call **epistemic authority**.

Opportunities of children's agency (and epistemic authority) are provided through **promotional** forms of communication. Promotion of children's agency is visible as a chain of alternate adults' actions and children's actions. This chain shows that the relevance of children's action for social change (children's agency) depends on the relevance of adults' action in promoting children's actions; in other words, children's availability of choices of action depends on adults' choices of action. This is a paradox, which originates from the position of children, who have no access to the most important decision-making processes in social systems; this position determines the differences between children's opportunities and adults' opportunities to practice agency (Bjerke 2011; Valentine 2011). In these conditions, children' agency can be observed only in paradoxical chains of actions, including both the display of children's choices of action and the display of adults' actions that promote these choices.

Although paradoxical, promotional forms of communication create the conditions for children's active contributions to knowledge and decisions (see Baraldi, 2012, 2014a, 2014b; Clark & Percy-Smith, 2006; Graham & Fitzgerald, 2010; Matthews, 2003; Shier, 2001, 2010; Sinclair, 2004; Wyness, 2013). Promotional forms of communication can change the hierarchical distribution of epistemic status and authority in the adult-children interaction. This change affects the structure of education, as combination of conveyance and evaluation of knowledge, hierarchical differences between adults' and children's roles, and forms of expectations.

Research on teacher-children interactions has highlighted some mitigation of hierarchical forms of epistemic status and authority, depending on adults' promotional actions (e.g. Mercer & Littleton 2007; Walsh 2011), such as actions of scaffolding (Seedhouse 2004; Sharpe 2008) or re-uttering (O'Connor & Michael 1996). Research has also highlighted a more radical change, based on **facilitation** of children's agency (e.g. Baraldi 2014a, 2014b; Baraldi & Iervese 2017; Hendry 2009; Wyness 2013). Facilitation is achieved in specific interactions, including organized sequences of adults' actions that enhance children's agency, and children's actions that display agency. Facilitators' actions systematically upgrade children's epistemic status and authority. Facilitation is based on the positive value of children's active and equal participation, on the treatment of children as persons who can express their own perspectives, experiences and emotions, and on expectations of unpredictable personal expression. These characteristics indicate that facilitation concerns dialogic communication.

Dialogue is a specific form of communication. According to Wierbicka, dialogue "implies that each party makes a step in the direction of the other", while it does not imply "that they reach a shared

position or even mutual warm feelings" (2005: 692). Dialogue is "the starting point, whereby children are consulted and listened to", ensuring that "their ideas are taken seriously" (Matthews 2003: 268). In dialogue, adults' actions show active listening, support children's self-expression, take children's views into account, involve them in decision-making processes, and share power and responsibility with them (e.g. Shier 2001). The adjective "dialogic" explains the methodology of facilitation. In dialogue, facilitators are agents of change, who facilitate children's authorship of stories and empowerment.

By upgrading children's epistemic status and authority in the interaction, facilitation can lead to change the traditional structures of conveyance and evaluation of knowledge, children's roles and expectations of children's learning. Thus, facilitation also enables the construction of new, alternative narratives with respect to existing ones (Winslade & Monk 2008; Winslade & Williams 2012). Agency can be observed in the interactional production of narratives (Bamberg 2011), which highlight children's availability of choices of action. Facilitation of narrative production can be analysed as dealing with children as agents who can choose the ways and contents of narratives regarding their perspectives and experiences, thus influencing the social situations in which they are involved (Baraldi & Iervese 2014, 2017; Wyness 2013). The interactional construction of narratives displays children's autonomous production of knowledge, i.e. epistemic authority. Facilitation of narratives displaying children's epistemic authority can be observed as the social condition of children's agency in the classroom. In general, facilitation can produce the alternative meta-narrative of the identity of the competent child, by creating opportunities for children's contribution to social change.

In chapter 4, we shall analyse the ways of facilitating the interactional production of narratives about memory, starting from photographs. Facilitation can (1) promote children's agency as epistemic authority, including children's autonomous initiatives in narrating and in constructing their contingent identities, and (2) promote dialogue among children, and thus interlacement of different narratives, including narratives of present social experiences.

Children's autonomous initiatives are particularly interesting in showing children's agency. Children's initiatives can be facilitated in different ways. On the one hand, facilitators' actions can enhance children's elicitation of narratives. On the other hand, children's contributions can enhance either facilitators' co-telling of narratives or facilitators' listening.

2.4 Facilitative actions

Facilitation of classroom interactions is based on participants' positioning. Positioning makes participants' actions intelligible (Van Langhenove & Harré 1999), as it is shown by participants' ways of acting. The positioning of facilitators and children is primarily based on their roles. However, positioning is always "sensitive to the subtleties and nuances of moment-by-moment interaction" (Winslade & Monk 2008: 98). Therefore, the facilitator's and children's actions show the specific ways in which they position themselves and their interlocutors (mutual positioning), as well as the ways in which each of their positioning is based on other participants' positioning (reflexive positioning). The structure of mutual and reflexive positioning characterises the facilitation of dialogue, which cannot be completely predefined by roles, and is shown by facilitative actions.

According to previous research (Baraldi 2012), facilitators' dialogic actions can be included in different categories, aiming at classifying the ways in which facilitation can promote children's participation in the interactions, enhancing dialogue.

Some actions focus on children's emotions, experiences and perspectives, introducing their positive connotations, and therefore facilitating their expression. These actions are: (1) **appreciations**, which display an "unconditionally positive regard" (Mearns & Thorne, 1999), supporting children's personal expression and creating positive connotations of their utterances; (2) **acknowledgement tokens** as claims of receipt of the prior turn (Gardner 2001), giving positive feedback; (3) **non-verbal affective behaviours** (e.g. smiling), as manifestations of "affect attunement" (Legerstee 2005) that support children's personal expression.

Other actions explore children's meanings, showing understanding and acceptance of them. Thse actions "can allow group members with disparate views to begin to understand the truthfulness and coherence of one another's opinions" (Black 2008: 109). They support children's contributions, permits facilitators to check their perceptions, or enhances feedback on the effects of previous actions in terms of understanding and acceptance. These actions are:

(1) **continuers** and **repetitions** of previous utterances or parts of utterances, used to offer an opportunity to speak (Gardner 2001) and displaying "active listening" (Rogers & Farson 1979), thus showing sensitivity for the interlocutors' needs and feelings

(2) **formulations** of the meanings expressed by children, which are actions that shift the focus and draw on the gist of previous interlocutors' actions, which may be glossed, made explicit, or developed (Heritage 1985), thus displaying support, attention and openness to the interlocutors' actions. Formulations may demonstrate attention and sensitivity to the interlocutor's expressions, and project a direction for subsequent actions, by inviting responses, in this way strengthening the interlocutor's agency (Hutchby 2005, 2007).

A third category of actions enhances self-expression and narratives, describing, explaining and legitimising them. Promoting expressions and new narratives means creating the social conditions for the construction of children's stories and encouraging children to consider new ways of dealing with different perspectives. The actions facilitating self-expression and narratives are:

(1) **promotional questions**, enhancing opportunities of participation, creating the conditions of "double listening" (Winslade and Monk 2008), i.e. listening for pieces of information as indications of more complex stories, promoting the emergence of unstoried experiences and the clarification of partially storied ideas;

(2) **direct invitations** to contribute, which enhance children's expression of personal opinions and collective reflection, i.e. the emergence of narratives of personal needs, ideas and feelings;

(3) **personalised suggestions**, which show facilitators' first-person involvement in narrating stories, without imposing perspectives, thus empowering children's actions while respecting their right to decide.

These facilitative dialogic actions may be organised according to different ways of facilitating communication. In any case, they seem to be successful in facilitating: (1) equal distribution of personal expressions, and (2) coordination of these expressions. The result is that participation can display children's agency in coordinating with both peers and facilitators. Children do not simply understand facilitators' actions and information; they are also able to develop the gist of their proposals and make efforts to explain them and to support their interlocutors' understanding, reaching successful coordination of new narratives in the interaction.

2.5 Facilitation of intercultural communication

One main point in SHARMED was the meaning of "multicultural classrooms", where the project was applied. In the school system, multicultural classrooms are often observed as based on the cultural variety of participants (Mahon & Cushner 2012). However, SHARMED focused on the construction of narratives in communication processes, rather than on cultural variety of participants. In particular, it focused on the ways in which narratives presented **cultural** issues and identities.

Studies on intercultural education have analysed a great variety of ways of handling cultural meanings of identity (e.g. Gundara & Portera 2008; Herrlitz & Maier 2005). Against the background of this variety, intercultural education is frequently interpreted as focusing on problems and value of cultural identity (e.g. Gay 2000; Gundara 2000; Mahon & Cushner 2012). In this perspective, identity is associated with membership of specific cultural groups, thinking and participating in communication as members of these groups (e.g. Hofstede 1980; Schell 2009; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009; Ting-Toomey 1999). Therefore, the recognition of cultural identity is the condition of (positive) intercultural communication and education. This interpretation has been criticised as "essentialism", 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).

Intercultural education is also frequently interpreted as focusing on relationships and dialogue among cultures (Alred, Byram, & Fleming 2003; Grant & Portera 2011; Portera 2008). Essentialism emphasizes intercultural dialogue as acknowledgment of difference among cultural identities as enrichment (Guillerhme 2012). The anti-essentialist view stresses the prefix **inter** and warns against insisting on predefined cultural identities (Byrd Clark & Dervin 2014). Identity is seen as fluid, malleable, and contingently constructed in communication (Byrd Clark & Dervin 2014; Dervin & Liddicoat 2013; Piller 2007, 2011; Tupas 2014). Some authors conclude that the primacy of cultural identity is replaced by the construction of hybrid identity (Jackson 2014; Kramsch & Uryu 2012; Nair Venugopal 2009), but this conclusion is not shared by all anti-essentialist views (Benjamin & Dervin 2015; Holliday 2011, 2012).

The analysis of the SHARMED activities also focuses on the ways of narrating cultural meanings of identity. Different ways of narrating cultural meanings of identity are connected to different ways of facilitating communication. On the one hand, facilitator's actions may promote essentialist narratives of cultural identity, if children's personal experience and knowledge is used to facilitate dialogue on cultural identity. On the other hand, the relevance assigned to children's agency can prevent the categorisation of children as members of cultural groups and the narrative of primary cultural identities, by promoting personalised versions of cultural meanings (Abdallah-Pretceille 2006). These are personalised narratives of **small cultures** (Holliday 1999), i.e. contingent constructions of cultural meanings trough dialogic negotiation. Facilitation may enhance narratives of small cultures as encapsulated in children's personal experiences and depending on these experiences. In this perspective, a classroom can be called "multicultural" as it is the communicative production of personalised narratives of small cultures, rather than the sum of individuals with different cultural identities. This second form of facilitation focuses on **personal** experience and knowledge, **deconstructing** narratives of cultural identity.

2.6 Facilitation and mediation of conflicts

By enhancing children's agency, as autonomous choice of action, facilitation can enhance the emergence of conflicts involving children. However, while facilitation aims to change hierarchical structures by promoting children's agency, it has not the function of helping the participants to manage their conflictive relationships. Facilitation is associated with co-operative and relation-oriented communication, rather than with the management of conflictive communication. Therefore, an important aspect of classroom facilitation in the SHARMED project is the management of possible conflicts.

In classroom interactions, conflicts arise as **communicated contradictions** (Luhmann 1995). Being communicated contradictions, conflicts may block or challenge the existing conditions of interactions. However, conflicts may also provide a starting point for new conditions of communication (Jeong 2008; Luhmann 1995), for instance for new ways of facilitating the classroom interaction. Conflicts may open up new possibilities for facilitative actions, creating opportunities for children's expressions of intentions and/or communicated contents.

The main problem with conflicts in classrooms, as well as in many other contexts, is that communicated contradictions are managed through **judgemental actions**, siding with a "right" party against a "wrong" party. This right/wrong distinction is associated with a form of communication that can be defined as **monologue**. In monologues, participants in communication: (1) give more value to their own action than to their interlocutors' understanding, (2) show certainty of their own understanding, attributing errors to their interlocutors' actions, (3) show indifference towards the consequences of their own actions on their interlocutors, (4) lack any explicit attention towards their interlocutors' feelings and thoughts. Monologues attribute values (right) and errors (wrong).

Mediation of conflicts aims to avoid right/wrong distinctions: the function of mediation is to lead the parties to settle their disputes rather than imposing a judgement (e.g. Mulcahy 2001). Mediation is a

way of co-ordinating conflicting parties, dealing with their opposing preferences and modifying their relationship. In mediation, "a third party helps disputant resolve conflicts by enabling parties to find their own solutions" (Picard & Melchin 2007: 36), facilitating communication between them (Bowling & Hoffman: 2000), and helping them to appreciate each other and to work together. Therefore, **conflict mediation may include facilitation**. Mediators may facilitate and encourage participants' contributions, check reciprocal understanding, and avoid dominance behaviours, which can block communication (Ayoko et al. 2002). In other words, mediation is a collaborative dialogic process.

Facilitative actions may enhance mediation as a collaborative **dialogic process** (e.g. Bowling & Hoffman 2003; Poitras 2005) by (1) distributing active participation fairly in the interaction and (2) showing sensitivity for the other participants' interests and/or needs. Dialogic mediation empowers participants' actions through a treatment of disagreements and alternative perspectives as ways of enriching communication. Mediators' dialogic actions are supposed to enhance mediation, empowering both participants' personal expressions and effective communication among them.

A form of dialogic mediation, enhanced through facilitative actions, is **transformative mediation** (Bush & Folger 1994). Transformative mediation promotes the participants' empowerment in defining issues and autonomously deciding about them, and fosters mutual recognition of their points of view. In the SHARMED project, children's empowerment leads to the production of narratives of their conflicts. **Narrative mediation** (Winslade & Monk, 2008) is therefore particularly important in the context of this project, as it is based on facilitation of the parties' production of narratives. Facilitation gives voice to the children's first-person stories and supports their observation of conflictive relationships from new points of view. By adopting a narrative approach, facilitators may actively intervene as providers of opportunities to talk, inducing the children to introduce and deal with particular issues and constructing narratives.

To sum up, mediation may use facilitation to "transform the adversarial narrative into an emergent, co-created, collaborative narrative" (Stewart & Maxwell, 2010: 77), in particular enhancing narratives of the conflictive situations and conditions. Both empowerment and authoring of narratives need facilitation of participants' agency as a source of change. Thus, facilitation may be a component of a dialogic form of mediation in situations of conflict involving children. Narrative mediation of conflicts is based on facilitative actions, which empower children during communication processes. Chapter 4 will show if and how narratives may be an effective way to manage conflicts.

2.7 Conclusions

The combination of narratives, memory, facilitation (and facilitative actions), intercultural communication and conflict management constitute the conceptual basis for innovative education, as it was proposed in the SHARMED project. Therefore, these concepts are also a guide for practicing SHARMED-like projects. However, this practice, as a practice, cannot be reduced to guidelines. Social research is useful to compare theoretical approaches with empirical phenomena. We have presented here a preliminary set of knowledge, which was tested in the classroom activities. The analysis of the activities highlighted what SHARMED meant in practice, which will be shown in the following chapters.

3. SHARMED activities

SHARMED activities were foreseen in a plan (including objectives, type of proposed activities and agenda) that was distributed to schools and stakeholders. The interest of the schools was tested through a series of meetings with principals and teachers to explain the project. Formal letters were sent to the schools that accepted to collaborate, attesting their interest in the planned activities. After this preliminary phase, the classes participating in the activities were chosen by the schools, according to interest of teachers and presence of children with a migrant background. Clear written and oral

information was delivered to the children and their parents; the schools organized new meetings. Authorizations for the activities were collected.

Once formalized the institutional participation and the interest of children and parents, background questionnaires were administered and analysed. These questionnaires regarded the children's and their parents' social and cultural background. The questionnaire for children was designed to investigate some general data (sex, age, spoken language, geographical origins were permitted) and to understand the children's views regarding the following aspects:

(1) Competence in speaking the national language
(2) Relationships and feelings regarding classmates and teachers
(3) Level of pleasure and possible problems in relationships with relevant interlocutors in daily life
(4) Communication on and sharing of personal matters with relevant interlocutors in daily life
(5) Assessment of peers and adults behaviours
(6) Level of agreement with reference to gender differences and different habits
(7) Possible disagreement with relevant interlocutors in daily life and management of this disagreement
(8) Overall assessment of dialogue in the classroom, with classmates and teachers (feelings and positive/negative aspects).

The questionnaire for parents was designed to collect the general data about children, and to investigate the following aspects:

(1) Competence in speaking the national language
(2) Feelings about settlement in the local community and school (with other parents and teachers)
(3) Positive and negative features of relationships in the local community and school
(4) Feeling about involvement in the school community

The questionnaires were administered in anonymous form, directly at school for what concerns children, and through children's delivery for what concerns parents. The elaboration was simple, including general percentages and the impact of general variables of gender, age, type of school and spoken language. The analysis this part will be presented in Chapter 2.

The third step was the training for teachers and facilitators. The training was based on both a face-to-face session and a Massive Online Open Course (MOOC). It included a final assessment of the acquired abilities of the trainees, and was evaluated by the trainees through a questionnaire concerning both the face-to-face training and the MOOC. The questionnaire regarded:

(1) Degree of satisfaction of the trainees about the most important aspects of the training, including quality, organisation, active participation, relations developed during the training, future potential use in educational activities
(2) Perception of the training support to the trainees in their work
(3) Perception of the increase of knowledge according to the training objectives
(4) Development of interest in the training objectives
(5) General evaluation of the training
(6) Perception of problems about the training. The analysis of this part will be briefly presented in Chapter 6.

The fourth step was administering a pre-test questionnaire immediately before the classroom activities to understand the relational situation and the attitudes of the children, in particular in relation to the specific objectives of SHARMED. The questionnaire dealt with:

(1) Ways and topics of routine classroom communication, for what concerns storytelling and children's attitude towards taking pictures
(2) Perceptions of the classmates' reactions to self-expression
(3) Personal reactions to classmates' storytelling
(4) Identity of the addressees of children's narratives of memory
(5) Positive/negative assessment of expressions of diversity
(6) Meaning of photographs

This questionnaire was also used for comparison with a post-test questionnaire (see below).

The activities started at the beginning of 2017. The first step was the collection of the photographs, through the acquisition of parents' consent about use in the school context and for archiving, respecting the European Union General Data protection regulation 2106/679. The general instruction was to choose one image, for each child, to establish equity for what concerned opportunities of presenting and narrating, though some children did not follow this instruction bringing more photographs. The material prevalently included photographs taken by children or their parents, but also images from the Internet. In many cases, the content of photographs was not remembered or personally experienced by children, therefore parents collaborated in constructing the narratives of memory. On the one hand, this enhanced the relationships between children and their parents. On the other hand, this ensured children' possibility to narrate the content and the context of the photographs. The choice of photographs was free for what concerned specific content, context and format. The paper photographs were scanned to show them during the activities and to archive them (were the consent was given). Where possible, the photographs were shown on a screen, so that all children could see them while they were described. Where this was not possible for technical reasons, digitalized copies of the photograph were distributed in the classroom. Digitalisation was also useful for a quick return of the photographs to the children.

Meetings with children were organized for presenting and discussing the photographs. The organization was adapted to the local planning and reflection about how it was better to work with the photographs. The number and content of meetings, however, was planned at the level of partnership. Different types of activities were organised and realised.

First type of activity: seeing, describing and discussing the photographs. This initial phase was a group activity, which allowed for the enhancement of dialogue from the beginning. Children were divided into small groups, each of them working on few photographs that had not been brought by members of the group. At the end of the short group workshops, the children presented their reflections, which were followed by the stories told by those children who brought the photographs. Depending on the way of facilitating, each presentation of the group and each narrative describing the photo could be followed by the following phases: (1) children's stories behind the photo (declarative and semantic narratives); (2) classmates' questions and comments; (3) interlacements with other narratives; (4) comparison between photographs. In these phases, similarities and differences between the photographs were identified either by the facilitator or by the children. This promoted the connections between photographs and stories. Two meetings were employed for this type of activities. These meetings provided a large amount of materials, in terms of both photographs and stories, for further exploitation in future classroom activities.

Second type of activity: written description of the photographs. This description was loosely guided by written guidelines, which followed the oral description to avoid perception of repetition during the narrative phase. This written description provided some useful materials for further activities in the classroom and the archive.

Third type of activity: working on the photographs taken by children. If children (and their families) did not possess a device to take photographs, they were invited to take the photo with the help of devices possessed by their classmates or teachers. The classroom activity with the new photographs was similar to the first type of activity, but children were asked to make short video-recordings in which they described the photograph, autonomously and only supported by short questions from

facilitators where necessary. This was important to enhance the autonomy of children's presentations, as authors of the photographs. This presentation facilitated the following process of telling stories in the classroom, which were more personalized than those of the first phase.

For what concerns the first and the third types of activity, the facilitators clarified the aim of the activities, suggesting the importance to participate not only through the presentation of photographs and narratives around photographs, but also through questions, comments and any other dialogic intervention during the activities.

Fourth type of activity: evaluation. At the end of the activities, during an additional meeting, a questionnaire and a focus group were administered with the children. This meeting was coordinated by a researcher. The questionnaire included a post-test, which was compared to the pre-test and to try to understand some effects of the activities. A second part of the questionnaire collected the children's assessment of the activities. The focus group added quality to the analysis. This evaluative phase was completed with interviews to the teachers of the involved classes and to the facilitators.

The post-test questionnaire was used to compare the results of the pre-test with the results of the activities. The questions were the same as in the pre-test, but prefaced by "during the activities" or "after the activities". This comparison presented several limitations. First, the impact of SHARMED short intervention was low for many aspects; probably longer and systematic interventions could be better tested with this tool. Second, some answers could be conditioned by other events, as they were not explicitly linked to the activities (in the case of the prefacing "after the activities"). Third, some children were disoriented as they were invited to answer very similar questions to those included in the pre-test.

The second part of the questionnaire was much more effective. It was designed to provide basic information about the way in which children experienced the activities, regarding three aspects: types of activities, relations with the classmates and relations with the facilitator. This pat included questions about: (1) level of enjoyment of the different activities; (2) feelings experienced about the activities; (3) quality of relationships with the classmates; (4) definition of role identity of the facilitator; (5) quality of relationship with the facilitator; (6) perception of the value of self-expression and difference of opinions; (7) general evaluation of the activities.

The focus group was useful to discuss the results of this part of questionnaire. It was based on the presentation of some simplified tables from the questionnaire, which enhanced discussion about children's previous evaluation, addressed to the whole classroom. The focus group did not aim to reassess the quantitative data, but to collect further comments and explanations about them. In some settings, the focus group was recorded.

Interviews were administered to both teachers and facilitators. These interviews aimed to understand how they perceived the activities, their level of success, their possible problems. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. They regarded the meaning assigned to and the opinion on the activities. The questions focused on facilitative methodology (and its difference from that generally adopted in the classroom), children's acceptance and level of participation, children's degree of autonomy, relations among children and their expression of different opinions, observation of problems and conflicts, general assessment of the impact and degree of success of the activities.

4. The plan of the report

Chapter 2 will present the background research. Chapter 3 will regard the results of the pre-test. Chapter 4 will include several transcriptions as examples to understand the meaning of the activities and the ways in which SHARMED was implemented. Chapter 5 will present the comparison between pre-test and post-test, therefore the effects of the project. Chapter 6 will include the analysis of evaluation by children, teachers and facilitators. The connections between Chapter 4 regarding the activities, on the one hand, and Chapters 3, 5 and 6, regarding effects and assessment of the activities, on the other, is far from being perfect. On the one hand, only about half activities were video-recorded, while questionnaires and focus groups regard all activities. On the other hand, there are important limitations in the use of questionnaires. Nevertheless, some interesting connections will be

highlighted. Chapter 7 will include reflections about application and dissemination of SHARMED-like projects.

Chapter 2. The background research

1. Introduction

This chapter regards the background research, in classes and among parents involved in the SHARMED project. The involved classes were 48, 16 in Italy (12 Modena and 4 in Monfalcone and Udine, in the Region Friuli-Venezia Giulia, FVG), 16 in Germany (8 in Turingia and 8 in Saxony-Anhalt) and 16 in UK (in London Barnett). 938 children responded to the questionnaire. In Italy and UK, almost all children attending the classes responded to the questionnaire, while in Germany, some parents did not allow children's participation.

The percentage of males is a bit higher than that of females, but the difference is thin. The percentage of respondents in primary and secondary schools is similar in Italy, while respondents in primary schools prevail in Germany and are the total number in UK, for the specificity of the national school system. It was not possible to ask questions about the national origin of respondents, as this was not permitted by the German school authorities. Therefore, we only asked about spoken language at home, as indicator of "non-national" origins of children. This led to divide the respondents between those who only speak the national language (National Speaking Children, NSC), those who only speak another language at home (Children Speaking Foreign Language CSFL) and those how speak both languages (Bilingual Children, BC). The percentage of NSC is very high in Germany and very low in UK, with Italy in the middle. In UK, CSFL and above all BC are about two third of respondents, while in Italy, there is a minority of CSFL and BC. In Germany, SHARMED was implemented in two federal states of the former GDR, where immigration is quite recent, with re-location of refugees.

Table 1. Students

Nationality	Total number and %	% Males	% Females	% Primary Schools	% Secondary schools	% NSC	% CSFL	% BC
Italy	358 (95,7%)	50,7	49,3	53,1	46,9	56,2	18,6	25,1
Germany	223 (63,5%)	50,9	49,1	66,8	33,2	81,8	13,6	4,6
United Kingdom	357 (92%)	51,3	48,7	100	-	34,2	65,8	

Table 2 include the data about 1004 parents who responded to the questionnaire. The involvement of parents was high. Parents' participation was successful above all in Italy (more than 60%), while it was less successful in Germany (less than half), and above all in UK (one third), where not all parents were involved by the school staff. The percentage of females is clearly higher in all countries (in particular in Germany), showing that mothers are much more involved in children's school

experience. In Italy and Germany, the distribution of parents in primary and secondary schools is very near to that of children.

We distinguished between national speaking parents (NSP) and parents speaking a foreign language and bilingual (PSFLB). PSFLB are migrants, while NSP may also be migrants. With the exception of Germany, the percentage of NSP is higher than that of NSC. Therefore, it seems that migrant parents were less involved, though the questionnaire was translated for not German speaking parents. Table 2 also shows that the percentage of younger parents is much higher in Germany and UK than in Italy. The higher percentage of older parents is in Italy; although partially explained by the different distribution of children in schools, could be also explained with a different pattern the age of parenting.

Table 2. Parents

Nationality	Total	Males	Females	Primary Schools	Secondary chools	NSP	PSFLB	24-39	40-49	50+
Italy	455 (60,8%)	42,9	56,8	52,5	47,5	62,6	37,4	29,9	54,9	15,2
Germany	302 (43%)	33,4	66,6	69,5	30,5	80,1	19,9	61,6	30,1	8,3
United Kingdom	247 (31,8%)	41,1	58,9	100	-	44,6	55,4	56,2	34,9	8,8

In the following sections, we shall highlight the relevant results. For what concerns the Italian setting, when relevant we shall distinguish between Modena and Friuli-Venezia Giulia (FVG), as the type of migration in the two geographical areas is different.

2. Children's perspective

2.1 Spoken Language

The situation regarding the language spoken at home is different in different settings.

- Italy. The majority of children speak Italian at home. However, e great number of children (the majority in FVG) speaks *also* a foreign language. In particular, in FVG a high percentage of children *only* speaks a foreign language (CSFL). Moreover, in FVG the percentage of children who do not speak Italian very well is much higher than in Modena.
- UK. Children who reported having a first language other than English as a first language (SOL) are a strong majority. Almost all these children can speak English very well or well, lifting the percentage of children that can be defined as bilingual to a very high value (94%). This explains why the creation of a related sub-group was not required.
- In Germany, only 4,7% of children speak German as well as other language(s) and 13,5% speak at home one (or more) foreign languages. As the number of bilingual children is small, differentiation is drawn between the categories of those who speak at home foreign languages (Children speaking foreign language + bilinguals, CSFLB) and those who speak only German (NSC). CSFLB are more represented in primary schools. The majority of children speaks German very well (including 43% of CSFLB). Few children speak German "not so well yet".

2.2 Relationships between children and teachers

Good relationships with all teachers are rather frequent, though they are not generalised. Perception of "critical" relationships between children and teachers ranges from 17% (Germany) to 30% (Italy-

Modena). In all settings, the very large majority of children feels very happy or happy with their teachers, while very few feel unhappy or very unhappy with them.

- CSFL (Italy) perceive more frequently critical relationships with teachers, while SOL (UK) feel more frequently happy with teachers.
- In Italian secondary schools, children are less satisfied for their relationships with teachers.
- Females have good relationships with all teachers, with whom feel very happy, much more frequently than males in Italy, while they are more critical than males in Germany.
- Children are much more frequently very happy in primary schools in Italy and Germany.

2.3 Problems of communication

Children have prevalently problems with schoolmates and friends. Problems with teachers are more frequent in UK and less frequent in Germany.

- CSFL (Italy) and CSFLB (Germany) perceive less problems of communication than NSC. However, CSFL perceive more problems with their parents and other people. SOL (UK) perceive less frequently problems with teachers and more frequently with friends. Therefore, there is no general correlation between problems of communication and language barriers or diversity.
- Problems are more frequently perceived in primary schools (Italy and Germany), in particular with friends and other people. In these schools, children show more frequent sensitivity for problems of communication.
- Females perceive less frequently problems, with the exception of FVG (Italy) where they perceive more frequently problems with schoolmates.

2.4 Children's interlocutors

Children prefer to talk with friend and it is very infrequent that they dislike talking with them. Very few children prefer to talk with teachers and parents. Children prefer to talk with classmates more frequently in Italy than in Germany and UK. Talking about personal matters is a more focused activity implying more intense interpersonal relationships. Not surprisingly, friends (more frequently in Italy and UK) and parents (more frequently in UK and Germany) are the primary interlocutors of talk about personal matters. Children who do not talk of personal matters are few.

- CSLF (Italy) and SOL (UK) less frequently talk with friends, though CSFL more frequently talk with classmates. SOL and CSFLB (Germany) more frequently talk with parents, while a high percentage do not like to talk with classmates. CSFL dislike more frequently communication with classmates and teachers, while dislike for talking with teachers is less frequent among CSFL and SOL. CSFL and CSFLB perceive much more frequently difficulties in talking of personal matters with parents, while SOL talk more frequently of personal matters with parents. CSFLB avoid more frequently to talk about personal matters with teachers.
- In primary schools, pleasure of talking with parents is more frequent. In Italy, dislike for talking with teachers strongly increases in secondary schools, while in Germany it is the opposite. In Italy, children attending primary schools are also particularly sensitive towards talk with parents. In all settings, males more frequently prefer to talk with friends. The importance of classmates tends decreases in secondary schools. In Italy, teachers are considered more frequently interlocutors in primary than in secondary schools.
- Females talk more frequently of personal matters with classmates in Italy and with parents in UK, where they talk less frequently with teachers.

Children frequently feel that talking about personal matters at school is both helpful and embarrassing, "normal" in some settings (Italy-FVG and Germany). However, while in Italy talking of personal matters is more frequently helpful than embarrassing, in UK and Germany it is the opposite. Moreover, talking is less frequently helpful than strange in UK and frequently strange in Germany. These data show the ambivalence between positive and negative feelings about talking of personal matters. In general, the slight majority of children in Italy show positive feelings (helpful, normal and funny), while the majority in UK show negative feelings (embarrassing, strange, impossible and waste of time). In Germany, the two categories have a similar weight.

- CSFL perceive talking of personal matters as more frequently helpful and funny in FVG (Italy), while CSFLB (Germany) perceive it more frequently useful, strange and funny, and less frequently normal and embarrassing.
- In primary schools, talk about personal matters is more frequently impossible in Germany. In secondary schools, talk about personal matters is more frequently embarrassing in Modena, less frequently helpful and more frequently strange in Germany.
- In UK, males consider talking of personal matters more frequently as both a waste of time and normal, while females perceive this social situation much more frequently as helpful. This suggest that males talk more often of personal matters, but either do not fully trust or personally disclose or do not discuss of personal *and* important matters, while females trust talking of their personal matters much more than males. For this reason they experience personal sharing with more emotional engagement. In Germany, females consider talk about personal matters more frequently normal, embarrassing and impossible.

2.5 Perception of other children and adults

Children frequently see other children as friendly. Moreover, other children are perceived as funny and helpful, more frequently in UK and Germany than in Italy. Many children find other children nice. A complete negative assessment of other children is absent in UK, almost absent in Italy, but more frequent in Germany. Explicit negative assessments of other children are provided by non-marginal minorities: they are assessed as boring, nasty, aggressive and above all annoying, in particular in UK (more than 40%). It is therefore possible that, more in UK than in the other settings, children produce ambivalent, fickle and dynamic narratives of their peers' behaviours.

- The most relevant differentiation regards CSFL (Italy), CSFLB (Germany) and SOL (UK). CSFL consider other children as more frequently helpful, but also as aggressive, boring and annoying. CSFLB consider other children as less frequently helpful, nice and more frequently nasty. SOL consider peers as more frequently nasty and annoying, and less frequently helpful. These data show a polarisation regarding CSFL and a negative trend regarding CSFLB and SOL. This confirms that language diversity is associated with more problems with peers than with adults.
- In Italy and Germany, children attending primary schools consider much more frequently other children as nice and helpful (also funny in Germany). Moreover, these children never find other children boring, nasty and aggressive. On the contrary, children in secondary schools rarely find other children nice and helpful. In general, therefore, children in primary schools show a more optimistic narrative of their own generation, at least in Italy and Germany, while this consideration is not completely confirmed in UK.
- In Italy and Germany, females perceive less frequently other children as helpful, more frequently as boring, nasty and above all annoying (Italy), and more frequently as helpful (Germany).

The very large majority of children find adults helpful, in particular in Italy and Germany. Moreover, a large majority of children find adults nice. Many children also find adults as friendly, and funny,

above all in UK. However, between 20% and 25% of children finds adults rarely and never friendly, more frequently in Italy and UK. They are boring for a percentage between 24% (Germany) and 40% (Italy), and annoying for a percentage between 11% (Germany) and 35% (UK). Much more problematic, though less frequent, is the assessment of adults as nasty, for a percentage between 40% (UK and Germany) and 50% (Italy), and aggressive for a percentage between 25% (in Italy) and 40% (UK). In general, the assessment of adults is more frequently positive in Germany.

- CSFL consider adults more frequently funny, nice and friendly, and never boring and annoying in Modena. They however also consider adults more frequently nasty. CSFLB (Germany) consider less frequently adults always nice and friendly, and more frequently as boring, nasty, annoying and aggressive. Therefore, CSFLB show a more negative assessment of adults' behaviours. On the contrary, SOL (UK) show a more positive outlook regarding adults as nasty and aggressive, though with limited variations.
- In Italy and UK, females consider more frequently adults funny and friendly, much less frequently nasty. On the contrary, in Germany females have a less frequent positive consideration of adults, as aggressive, boring, not helpful and not nice. The perception of adults' perspective suggests some tendency to consider females more collaborative and nicer than males in Italy and UK. It seems that this tendency is absent in Germany.

2.6 Agreement and disagreement with other people

Differences of gender and cultural habits are problematic for a high percentage of children. Complete agreement with males, females and children with different habits is impossible for the majority of children. Around 50% completely agree with males and females (less frequently in Germany). However, males agree much more frequently with males than females, and females agree much more frequently with females than males; this is more evident in Italy than in UK and Germany. For many children, disagreement between males and females is not particularly relevant, but for a minority, both males and females, it is a problem of radical dissent.

Difference of cultural habits is particularly problematic. Agreement is more frequently difficult in Italy and Germany. This seems to respond to a difference in terms of cultural variety, which is less relevant in a metropolitan and transnational city with a long tradition of migration as London.

- In Modena, CSFL perceive less frequently agreement with both males and females, while CSFLB in Germany perceive more frequently agreement with males and females. Moreover, in Italy, lack of complete agreement with females is more frequent in primary than secondary schools. Two third of the CSFL declare some agreement with children having different habits, while this is true for only 50% of CSFLB (Germany). However, these differences do not indicate a generalised tendency.

The most frequent disagreement regards classmates (around 30%). In Italy and much more frequently in Germany, classmates are followed by friends, while in UK they are followed by parents, However, in UK disagreement with friends is more frequent than in Italy and Germany. Disagreement with teachers is much less frequent. Finally, it is particularly interesting that almost 25% of children does not disagree with anybody in Italy, against around 10% in UK and Germany. Clearly, the general level of disagreement is lower in Italy than in Germany and UK.

- CSFL (Italy) less frequently disagree with anyone but much less frequently disagree with friends and classmates. On the contrary, CSFLB (Germany) and SOL (UK) disagree slightly more frequently with friends and classmates.
- In secondary schools, disagreement is less frequent with friends, while it is much more frequent with adults, while in primary schools it is more frequent with peers. This indicates an evolution in the way in which children consider their problematic relationships.

- Males much more frequently disagree with teachers in Italy and above all in UK, and disagree more frequently with classmates in Italy and Germany. Females much more frequently get along with everybody everywhere, while they disagree more frequently with parents.

Almost 50% of children prefer to manage disagreement by understanding others' point of view in Modena and Germany, and by persuading others in FVG. Siding is chosen by about 13% of children in Italy and by very few children in Germany. In UK, these three options do not differ much, though understanding is slightly more frequent and siding less frequent. This is interesting if read in light of the relatively low percentage of respondents who usually try to understand other's points of view in case of disagreement: respondents seem weary of disagreements, but at the same time not particularly inclined in exploring the reason of disagreement including the other's perspective in their reflection. Against this background, dialogue, which includes both understanding others' point of view and mediation, is preferred by the majority of children in Modena and Germany, but only by one third in UK. In UK, the more frequent difficulties of communication with peers is thus confirmed.

- CSFL (Italy), CSFLB (Germany) and SOL (UK) manage much less frequently disagreement through understanding, and more frequently through persuasion and siding. However, CSFL and SOL more frequently accept help of those who work out different viewpoints. CSFL, CSFLB and SOL show a less frequent dialogic approach, with the partial exception of their preference for mediation.
- Males manage disagreement more frequently through persuasion and less frequently through understanding and help in Italy and UK. Therefore, females show a more frequent interest in dialogue.

Forcing opinions on others is very frequent everywhere and is primarily correlated to blame, critique, and failure of understanding. The behaviours that more frequently trigger the attempt of forcing opinions on others are blaming and criticising (very frequent in Italy, frequent in UK and infrequent in Germany) and failing to understand (very frequent in UK and Germany; frequent in Italy). Less relevant are not doing the right thing (in UK and Germany) and lack of caring (in Italy and Germany, but very low in UK). Only a small minority of children (11% in Modena; 14% in Germany; 15% in UK; 18,5% in FVG) say that they never force their opinions on others.

- CSFL (Italy) show much less frequently lack of understanding, blaming and criticising. CSFLB (Germany) more frequently react forcing their own opinions on others when others do not behave carefully or do not do the right thing. SOL (UK) much more frequently force opinions on others when they fail to understand, and much less frequently when they do not do the right thing. Therefore, SOL are less inclined towards understanding others' point of view and more inclined towards forcing opinions on others when they fail to understand. This combination might suggest a certain level of distrust in the possibility of mutual understanding and reactivity towards misunderstanding.
- In secondary schools, children force their opinions more frequently. In particular, in German secondary schools, children more frequently force their opinions when others blame and criticise.
- Males in Italy and females in UK and Germany force their opinions more frequently when others blame and criticise. Females in Italy and males in UK force opinions more frequently with those who do not the right thing.

2.7 Attitudes to dialogue

The questionnaire tested several dialogic actions: equality of participation, listening before talking, believing the interlocutor, worrying about (i.e. minding) the consequences of own actions on other people, asking for confirmation and clarifications, checking interlocutors' feelings before expressing

own feelings, respect and understanding of interlocutors' opinions, lack of judgement, looking for shared solutions of disagreements.

Although there is some ambiguity concerning "dialogue" with teachers, the data show that communication with classmates is not so differently perceived from communication with teachers. Therefore, there is a certain (and somewhat surprising) degree of symmetry in the perception of dialogue. In more details.

1. A large majority of children perceive equality of participation with teachers and classmates. However, this perception decreases from UK, to Germany to Italy. A very high percentage of children perceive equality with teachers in UK. A relevant percentage of children do not perceive equality, not only with teachers (with the exception of UK), but also with classmates.

2. Children frequently perceive that they listen to both teachers and classmates. However, in UK children listen to teachers and above all to classmates much less frequently than in Germany and, above all, Italy. Therefore, in UK equality is not frequently associated with listening.

3. A large majority of children believe teachers and classmates. However, in UK children believe classmates much less frequently than teachers.

4. Children frequently mind the consequences of their actions on classmates, but less frequently in UK. Few children do not worry the consequences of their actions on teachers; this probably indicates some fear for the consequences of teachers' evaluation.

5. The majority of children ask for confirmation and clarifications to classmates in Italy and Germany, but not in UK (42%). In Italy and Germany, children ask for confirmation and clarifications less frequently to teachers. The asymmetry in relationships with teachers is thus partially confirmed, but not for UK, where the frequent negative communication with classmates is confirmed.

6. The difference between checking feelings with classmates (more frequent) and with teachers (less frequent) is more relevant in Italy and Germany, than in UK. This indicates both lower level of intimacy with teachers in Italy and Germany, and usual lower level of intimacy with classmates in UK.

7. Respect of opinions is very frequent with classmates and teachers. Understanding opinions is frequent in Italy and Germany, while it is much less frequent than respect in UK, above all with teachers. This confirms that children's assessment of understanding is not so frequent in UK.

8. Judgement is the most controversial dialogic action. The majority of children shows lack of judgments with classmates and teachers, more frequently in UK and above all in Italy. In Germany, on the contrary, the majority of children judge teachers and (slightly more frequently) classmates.

9. Looking for shared solutions of disagreement, with both classmates and teachers, is very frequent in Germany, and less frequent, although signalled by the majority, in Italy and UK.

- CSFL (Italy) and CSFLB (Germany) more frequently perceive positive relations with adults, in particular teachers, and less frequent positive relations with peers. They perceive equal relations and listening more frequently with teachers than with classmates, and respect teachers more frequently. Moreover, CSFLB believe teachers much more frequently. They (and SOL) also perceive less frequently to listen to the classmates and believe classmates much less frequently. CSFL and CSFLB are also more frequently active in asking to classmates and above all to teachers (this including SOL). They check classmates' feelings much less frequently, and share solutions with classmates less frequently. SOL and CSFLB check teachers' feelings more frequently (SOL also understand teachers more frequent), while

CSFLB understand classmates less frequently. CSFL avoid judgements much less frequently, while CSFLB avoid judgements much more frequently. These data show a frequent difference between CSFLB and NSC.

- Dialogue seems to be more frequent in primary schools, where children more frequently perceive equality with teachers and classmates (Italy-FVG), believe, respect and understand (Italy) teachers, do not judge (Italy-Modena), actively ask to classmates (Modena-Italy and Germany) and teachers (Italy-FVG and Germany), checking classmates' feelings (Germany). Equality with classmates and believing classmates are more frequently perceived in secondary schools in Germany. Shared solutions of disagreement with classmates are perceived more frequently in secondary schools in Italy.

- Listening to and understanding classmates, believing classmates and teachers, finding shared solutions of disagreement with classmates are more frequent among females, in particular in UK. Moreover, in Germany, females mind the consequences of their actions more frequently than males, avoid judgements and are active in asking to classmates much more frequently. In Italy-Modena and Germany, females are more active in asking to teachers.

2.8 Positive and negative aspects of relationships with classmates

Almost all children choose a great number of positive aspects regarding relationships with classmates, such as fun, friendship, peace, respect, agreement, recognition of abilities and trust. Calmness (above all in Germany) and interest (above all in UK and Germany) are other very frequent positive aspects perceived by the children. Collaboration is very frequent in Italy and Germany, and much less frequent in UK where, as we have seen, there are several signals of difficulties with classmates. Only freedom is chosen by a minority of children, as constrained by the specific school context.
The negative aspects of relationships with classmates are much less frequent than the positive ones. The negative aspect of rules is important for about 50% in Italy and Germany, but very infrequent in UK. In UK, few other negative aspects with some frequency (between 20% and 30%) are worries, disagreement and competition (below 15% in the other settings). Lack of respect is below 20% in Germany and lack of trust is around 17% in Italy. Problems of exclusion and lack of friendship are perceived much more frequently in UK. Violence is also much more frequently perceived in UK (23,4%), than in Italy-Modena (11,6%, but 16,7% in secondary schools and 14,3% of females), in Germany (9,8% but more among CSFLB and above all males), and in Italy-FVG (9%). These data confirm that problems of communication with classmates are more frequently perceived in UK.

- CSFL (Italy) and CSFLB (Germany) show less frequently positive relations, though these are in any case positive for a majority. These data confirm the most relevant difficulties of the CSFL/CSFLB in interactions with classmates. Rules, worries, luck of trust, exclusion, lack of friendship, boredom and lack of respect are more frequently perceived by CSFL, while CSLFB more frequently perceive ignorance of abilities (above all), competition, indifference, lack of trust. Disagreement is perceived more frequently by SOL (UK).

- Types of school are relevant only occasionally and only for Italy, where peace, agreement, respect, trust and calmness are more frequent in primary schools, while freedom is more frequent in secondary schools. Rules are more frequently perceived in primary schools in Italy-Modena. In secondary schools, children perceive more frequently disagreement and friendship in Italy-Modena and lack of respect in Italy-Modena and Germany.

- Some data confirm the relational attitude of females. In Germany and above all UK (where the difference is really striking, 72% vs. 32%), females are more frequently collaborative. In Germany, females also choose more frequently peace and interest. Females more frequently perceive competition in UK, ignorance of personal abilities in Italy, and worries in Germany. Moreover, competition and indifference are more frequent among males in Germany.

Friendship (above all in Italy-Modena and much less in Germany and UK) and fun (above all in UK and Germany) are more frequently associated with good feelings, followed by trust in Italy and UK, and collaboration in Germany. Peace and respect follow, but much less frequently.

For what concerns the negative side (feeling bad) of relationships with classmates, lack of trust is the most important aspect in Italy and UK, and the second one in Germany. Violence is the first choice in Germany (one third), but it is less frequent than in Italy, where it is the third choice (about 38%), while in UK it is less frequent (about 23%). In Italy-Modena, exclusion is also very important (around 45%), but it is much less frequent in UK (around 24%) and Germany (around 19%). In UK, disagreement is also important (29%), while it is rare in Italy and Germany. In Germany and UK, competition is above 25%. In Germany, also rules are above 25% and worries above 20%. Lack of trust is the only aspect that is common in the different settings, confirming that trust is the basis of sociability. On the other hand, violence in al settings and exclusion above all in Italy are the most important negative aspects, much more than lack of friendship. In Germany and UK, competition is another important negative aspect of relationships. Disagreement is not so frequently disturbing (with the partial exception of UK) as the previous aspects, though the dialogic management of disagreement does not seem widespread. Indifference and worries are irrelevant for many children.

- CSFL show less frequent interest in friendship, trust and fun in Italy-Modena and less frequent interest in peace in Italy-FGV. However, CSFLB (Germany) show more frequent interest in respect and fun and SOL (UK) show more frequent interest in friendship. Exclusion is not associated with language diversity, as both Italy and Germany it is less frequently important than for the NSC. Violence in Italy and lack of trust in Germany are also less relevant for CSFL/CSFLB. CSFL are more frequently upset by lack of respect and ignorance of abilities. CSFLB are more frequently upset by presence of rules, indifference, lack of rules and boredom.
- In Italian primary school, children show more frequently interest in friendship, peace, rules and trust, while the secondary school children show more interest in fun, trust, respect and recognition of abilities. In Germany, friendship, collaboration and respect are more frequent in secondary schools. However, secondary schools seem to be more problematic. In Italy, several aspects create problems more frequently than in primary schools: lack of trust, exclusion, violence, lack of respect and indifference, lack of rules, disagreement, lack of respect and boredom (also in Germany). In primary schools, some negative aspects are lack of friendship (Italy-Modena), exclusion (Italy-FVG) and lack of friendship (Germany).
- The more frequent relational attitude among females is confirmed. Females show more frequently interest in collaboration and peace in Italy-Modena and Germany, friendship and freedom in Germany, trust in Italy-Modena. Males show more frequently interest in recognition of abilities in Italy-Modena, fun in UK and Germany, competition in Germany. Females feel more frequently bad for exclusion in Italy and Germany, lack of friendship, and disagreement in Italy-Modena, lack of respect, boredom and competition in Italy-FVG, ignorance of personal abilities, lack of trust, and particularly violence (38,4%) in Germany. Males feel more frequently bad for boredom, ignorance of abilities, and rules in Italy-Modena, exclusion and worries in Italy-FVG, lack of rules and respect in UK.

2.9 Positive and negative aspects of relationships with teachers

The most positive feature of relationships with teachers, chosen by almost all children, is peace. It is followed by collaboration, trust, and respect, but much less frequently in UK. Other important positive aspects are agreement (above all in Germany), recognition of abilities and friendship, but all less chosen in UK. Interest, calmness (above all in Germany) and fun are also chosen frequently. Not surprisingly, freedom is chosen only by few children (fewer in UK). In general, in UK, the children observe less frequently positive relationships with teachers. The most important aspects to feel good in relationships with teachers are trust in Italy and (less frequently) UK, and fun in Germany (followed

by trust). Moreover, in Germany, collaboration is near 40%, while in Italy fun and collaboration are chosen by more than a third of children, and in UK respect is near a third. In Italy-Modena and Germany, respect and peace are chosen by around 25%. All the other aspects are less frequent.

The negative aspects of relationship with teachers is rules, more frequently in Italy than in Germany and above all in UK. The other negative aspects are much less frequent. In Germany, less than 20% perceive lack of friendship, boredom, disagreement and lack of respect. In Italy, less than 25% perceive boredom, worries and ignorance of abilities. In UK, near 30% choose lack of friendship and less than 25%, indifference, boredom, worries and disagreement. Violence and exclusion are chosen by very few children, which should not lead to ignore this very small area of problems. Negative feelings with teachers are different in different settings. The most important aspects (around 40% of children) are lack of trust in Italy, judgement in UK, and rules and boredom in Germany. In Italy, lack of trust is followed by judgement, and boredom. In UK, judgement is followed by worries, boredom, and lack of trust (much less frequent than in Italy). In Germany, rules and boredom are followed by lack of trust and worries. In Italy, lack of rules, worries, rules and indifference are the less frequently feared negative aspects. In UK, exclusion is much more frequently chosen than in Italy and violence is less frequently chosen. Violence and exclusion are more frequently chosen in Germany.

- Language diversity shows a certain variability, but in general CSFL (Italy) and CSFLB (Germany) choose positive aspects. CFSL choose more frequently freedom, recognition of abilities and friendship (Italy-Modena), interest (Italy-FVG). CSFLB choose more frequently collaboration, friendship, freedom. SOL (UK) choose more frequently trust and friendship, but less frequently freedom. Good relationships with teachers do not require so much good feeling for CSFLB, choosing much more frequently interest, respect and fun, and much less frequently collaboration and trust. In Italy-Modena, CSFL consider frequently relevant collaboration, respect and recognition of abilities. CSFL choose less frequently the negative aspect of rules, indifference and disagreement (FVG), ignorance of abilities (Modena). However, in Italy-Modena, they show more frequent worries. CSFL more frequently choose lack of trust, lack of rules and judgement, while they less frequently choose boredom and violence. In Germany, the situation is more problematic: 20% of CSFLB choses lack of respect, and 6,1% violence; ignorance of abilities is also much more frequent, while lack of friendship is less frequent. CSFLB much more frequently choose boredom, worries, indifference and lack of rules, while they less frequently choose lack of trust. SOL (UK) more frequently choose lack of trust, and lack of recognition of abilities.
- For several aspects, primary school children are more positive. They choose more frequently trust, respect, agreement and friendship, recognition of abilities and interest, fun (Italy.Modena and Germany), calmness (Italy-Modena), friendship, agreement and freedom (Germany). In Italian primary schools, relational attitudes are much more frequent, while in secondary school relationships with teachers are more frequently based on recognition of abilities and absence of conflict. In general, trust, collaboration, peace, friendship, interest and fun are more frequently important in primary schools, while respect, agreement and recognition of abilities, freedom to act are more frequently important in secondary schools. In Germany, the only relevant differences between primary and secondary schools regard fun, which significantly decreases in secondary schools, and respect whose importance increases in these schools. In secondary schools, the decrease of positive relations with teachers is particularly evident, as boredom, worries, rules, lack of friendship, lack of trust, violence (Italy), indifference, ignorance of abilities, disagreement, exclusion, lack of respect (Italy and Germany). In Italy, lack of trust and lack of rules are much more frequent in primary schools, while boredom is much more frequent in secondary schools. In Germany, boredom, worries and above all judgement are more frequent in secondary school, while lack of trust and above all violence are more frequent in primary schools.

- Gender differences are not the same in different settings. However, females show a more frequent relational attitude. They more frequently choose agreement (UK and Germany), interest (Italy-Modena and Germany), collaboration and agreement (Italy-Modena), friendship (Italy-FVG), respect and friendship (Germany). Males more frequently choose recognition of abilities (Italy-Modena), trust (UK and Italy-Modena), respect, agreement, fun (UK and Germany), recognition (UK), rules (Italy-FVG and Germany), peace (Italy-Modena). Among negative aspects, males choose ignorance of abilities, boredom and indifference (Italy-FVG and Germany), lack of trust and disagreement (Italy-FVG, UK), judgement (Italy and UK), worries and above all lack of respect (UK). Females choose lack of respect, lack of friendship and worries.

2.10 Concluding remarks about children

It is important to summarise some common results of the previous analysis.

1. Relationships are more frequently problematic with peers, in particular classmates, than with adults, in particular teachers. In UK, children are more frequently negative with classmates and this is one of the most striking differences among the three settings. Moreover, relationships with classmates are more frequently problematic among children who speak another language at home. In UK, however, this difference is less frequent than in Italy and Germany; it seems evident that the mélange of different languages and origins is more consolidated in UK.
2. Problems with teachers are rather limited, though not absent. Positive aspects in relationships with teachers are much more frequent than negative aspects. There is some indication of a good, but not affective, relation between children who speak other languages and teachers. Relationships with teachers get worse in secondary schools.
3. Positive relationships with both teachers and classmates work on the primary bases of trust. However, there may be some important differences among the settings for what concerns these relationships. In UK, the problem of judgement is particularly relevant and in Germany children are particularly sensitive to rules.
4. Apart its impact on relationships with classmates and teachers, language diversity has different consequences in different settings. It is important to note that problems with the school system in Germany has prevented from using national origins as a variable in the research, and this has probably restricted the possible differences that could be analysed among the children.
5. For many aspects, the transition from primary school to secondary school is problematic, in Italy and Germany. Communication is more difficult in secondary schools, with both teachers and, although for a more limited range of aspects, with classmates. However, this tendency is not confirmed by the data collected in UK, where secondary schools were not included in the project but some problems are relevant in primary schools.
6. Gender differences have a limited impact on many relational aspects. There is a rather widespread tendency to show the relational attitude of females, but the difference is rarely striking.

3. Parents' perspectives

3.1 General data

In Italy-Modena, 34% of the parents either speak only another language or are bilinguals (PSFLB), while in Italy-FVG, the majority of parents are PSFLB. In Germany, 20% of parents either speak only another language or are bilinguals (PSFLB). In UK, 55% of parents have a language other than English as first language (SOL). However, this percentage is lower than the percentage of children

with the same characteristic (63,5%); this suggests a somehow limited engagement in the research of SOL families if compared to the families speaking English as first language. With National Speaking Parent (NSP) we will indicate the native parents.

In Italy-Modena, the majority of the parents are 40-49 y.o., followed by those who are under 40 y.o. In Germany, UK and Italy-FVG, the majority of the parents are under 40 y.o., followed by those who are 40-49 y.o. Few parents are 50 and over in all settings. PSFLB and SOL are younger than NSP, women are younger than men and, rather obviously, parents in primary schools are younger than those in secondary schools.

In Italy-Modena a larger percentage of parents filled the questionnaire in secondary schools while in Italy-FVG, a much larger percentage of parents filled the questionnaire in primary schools. In Modena, the majority of the PSFLB filled the questionnaire in primary schools and the majority of NSP in secondary schools. In Modena, there is a rather fair correspondence between the percentage of parents and children. In Italy-FVG, parents are in higher percentage in secondary school. In Germany, parents are in higher percentage in primary schools. In Italy-Modena and Germany, moreover, there is a stronger presence of PSFLB in primary schools.

The majority of parents speak the national language very well, more frequently in Germany than in Italy, almost all in UK. The percentage of those who speak not so well yet the national language is similar in Italy-Modena (9%) and Germany (10,7%), while it is very low in UK (3,6%) and much higher in Italy-FVG (one sixth). PSFLB in Italy and Germany declare to speak Italian very well less frequently, and to speak the national language "not so well yet" much more frequently. In Italy-Modena, younger parents and in Germany older parents speak well the national language less frequently. Moreover, in Italy parents in primary schools speak Italian well less frequently than those in secondary schools, while in Germany there is no difference.

3.2 Level of integration

A very large majority of parents feel integrated and very few do not feel integrated, with the exception of Italy-FVG, where almost one fourth does not feel integrated. While in Italy-Modena and Germany, the percentage of those who do not feel integrated increases among PSFLB, in Italy-FVG the percentage of PSFLB feeling integrated is higher than that of the ISP.

A large majority in UK and about half parents in Italy and Germany feel comfortable to talk with all neighbours; few feel uncomfortable. In Italy and Germany, a higher percentage of PSFLB feel uncomfortable with most of all neighbours. While it is clear that problems with the neighbours may be independent from language and culture, these data highlight that a relatively large minority of PSFLB has problems in having positive relationships with neighbours in Italy and Germany, while this does not happen in UK.

In UK the large majority of parents feels comfortable to talk with all other children's parents, while in Italy-Modena and Germany only a minority feels comfortable to talk with them. This is a rather striking difference: in Italy-Modena and Germany, almost 20% of parents feel uncomfortable, against only 7% in Italy-FVG and 2,2% in London. In Italy-Modena and Germany, problems are more frequent among PSFLB, who feel much more frequently uncomfortable with other children's parents. Thus, a part of PSFLB confirms a perception of difficulties in relationships. In Modena-Italy, moreover, feeling uncomfortable is more frequent among males, and this may be explained by the traditional differentiation of roles in Italian families for what concerns the relationship with school.

In Italy and London, the large majority of parents feel comfortable to talk with all teachers and in Germany with at least some teachers. Few parents declare to feel uncomfortable. In Italy-Modena and Germany, PSFLB feel much more frequently uncomfortable, although the percentage is very low. Problems are also higher in secondary schools, where parents feel more frequently uncomfortable. This may be explained with the strong increase of the number of teachers in secondary schools in the Italian system.

It is interesting to note that in UK data regarding talk with teachers is not different from those related to talk with neighbours and with other parents. Primary school classes in England have only one

teacher, in charge of all pedagogical activities. However, other figures, including assistant teachers and other professionals, have some interactions with parents. It could be the case that respondents referred also to such figures who no not correspond with the strict definition of teaching staff in their answers. In Italy and Germany, the most difficult relationships are with other children's parents. In particular, difficulties of PSFLB strongly increase in the school environment, although the majority seems to have no problems. Moreover, there are different results about feeling of integration of PSFLB between Italy-Modena and Italy-FVG.

3.3 Social relations

The positive aspects of relationships with neighbours are chosen by the large majority of parents. The most frequently chosen aspect is respect. The second one is agreement in Italy, harmony in Germany (very frequent in Italy-FVG too), trust in London. Interest is much less frequently chosen in, but by the large majority of parents. In Italy-Modena, PSFLB more frequently choose friendship and less frequently interest and harmony. In Germany, PSFLB more frequently choose almost all variables, but interest and agreement. In UK, SOL more frequently choose harmony and less frequently understanding.

In Italy, indifference is the only negative feature of relationships with neighbours that is frequently chosen (near 30%) and in UK, it is the only variable around 20%. In Germany, the same situation regards lack of friendship, disagreement and indifference. The other negative aspects range from 1% to 16%, with some higher percentages in Germany. Lack of respect and exclusion are chosen by very few parents. Among PSFLB, indifference is more frequent in Italy and Germany. In Italy, tensions and exclusion are also more frequent among PFSLB. Although exclusion is only perceived by a small minority, indifference is much more frequent.

The large majority of parents chooses the positive aspects of relationships with other children's parents. Almost all parents choose respect, understanding, trust, appreciation, harmony, and agreement (less relevant in Germany). In Italy respect and harmony are more frequently chosen by parents in secondary schools. PSFLB choose more frequently all aspects in Germany, only friendship in Italy.

The most frequently chosen negative aspect of relationships with other children's parents are indifference, lack of friendship and disagreement. Lack of respect and exclusion are very rare. In Germany some negative aspects are slightly more frequent and percentages are higher than that related to relationships with neighbours. In Italy, indifference is chosen more frequently by males. Differences between PSFLB and NSP are irrelevant, except for lack of friendship in Italy, chosen much less frequently by PSFLB, and exclusion in Germany, chosen much more frequently by PSFLB (although by few). In Italy, the most frequent difference regards the type of school. In secondary schools, indifference is more frequent, but in primary schools there are more frequent tensions, lack of respect and exclusion. These data show that the relationships among parents in primary schools are more problematic than those in secondary schools.

All positive features of relationships with the teachers are chosen by almost all the parents. In Italy, males stress understanding less frequently, while PSFLB are more cautious in choosing interest. PSLFB (Germany) are generally more frequently positive than NSP, and SOL (UK) choose more frequently harmony, although they choose less frequently interest.

The negative features of relationships with teachers are very few. In particular, in Italy they range from tensions at 5% in Italy-Modena and indifference at 9,5% in Italy-FVG. In Germany disagreement is chosen more frequently (11,5%). Lack of respect and exclusion are almost absent. In Italy, males stress misunderstanding more frequently than females, PSFLB choose more frequently indifference, misunderstanding, lack of trust, exclusion and lack of respect, but in very few cases. In Germany, no respondent feels excluded and almost all PSFLB choose interest.

Finally, a vast majority of parents feels involved in school community, although only a minority (23% in Italy-Modena, 30% in Italy-FVG, 32,8% in Germany) feels *strongly* involved. On the other hand, 25% of the parents in Italy, 13,6% in Germany and 13,3% in UK do not feel involved. In Italy,

PSFLB are more polarised: they feel both more frequently strongly involved and not involved. SOL (UK) less frequently affirm that they are involved in school community. In all contexts, males are much less frequently involved than females. In secondary schools, parents feel less involved in school community. Although still high, the percentage of male respondents and PFSLB/SOL who feel involved in the school community indicates some potential areas of disengagement or marginalisation.

3.4 Conclusions

Parents clearly feel integrated in the social context and display positive relationships with all interlocutors (neighbours, other parents, teachers). The level of commitment is variable, but in general rather high, above all with teachers. Relational problems are not absent, but they regard small minorities, therefore they do not characterise local communities. In general, PSFLB and SOL (UK) do not present relevant differences from NSP for what concerns positive relationships with neighbours, other children's parents and teachers. However, there are some more relevant differences for what concerns the negative aspects, above all indifference (and lack of trust and exclusion in school settings), although they concern a small minority of PSFLB. Finally, involvement in the school community is much more frequent among females and in primary schools, and is more polarised among PSFLB.

Chapter 3. Pre-test

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we provide the general frequencies for a series of data regarding the pre-test administered during the SHARMED project. We shall also add few relevant data regarding the differences between native speakers and foreign language speakers, children attending the primary and the secondary schools, females and males. We shall not provide these data systematically as they are not systematically relevant. The relevance of differences between categories (males vs. females; native speakers vs. foreign language speakers; primary schools vs. secondary schools) have been calculated through the chi square test, considering a value (the Sig. Asint. 2 way) that is = or < 0,05. The missing or invalid cases are very few, therefore they are not counted.

The pre-test was administered both in the groups were the activities were done (AG) and in a control group (CG). The CG should have been very similar to the AG. However, this was not possible. Each class had its own features and it was impossible to find strong similarities among different classes. Moreover, there were relevant difficulties in finding students to include in the CG, in UK in particular; thus, the CG in UK is very small and it is particularly difficult to compare the AG and the CG in this setting. In Italy, too, where the conditions were much more favourable, some differences between AG and CG are anyway relevant. For this reason, in section 4 we shall describe the most important differences between the AG and the CG, without discussing the details.

2. General data

The number of children who participated in the pre- tests, in both the Activity Group (AG) and the Control Group (CG), is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Total number of respondents

	Pre-Test AG	Pre-test CG	Total
Italy (Modena, Monfalcone, Udine)	350	307	657
Germany (Turingia, Saxony-Unhalt)	280	211	491
United Kingdom (London Barnett)	357	40	397
Total	987	558	1545

The number of participants in the AG is much higher than the number of participants in the CG. This difference is mainly due to the difficulties in finding classes to include in the CG, in particular in UK. This difficulty depended on the fact that almost all primary schools involved in UK included one single class; therefore, the choice of include other children in the CG meant to involve areas where SHARMED was not planned. Some difficulties were also found in Germany, for similar reasons. Only in Italy the proportion is approximately respected.

The large majority of questionnaires was collected in primary schools, as in UK all the involved children attended these schools. In Germany, vice-versa, children were more numerous in secondary

schools. In Italy, the percentage of collected questionnaires in the two types of school was almost the same.

Table 2. Primary and Secondary Schools (general data)

	Total	Primary schools	Secondary schools
Pre-test Activity Group	987	687	300
Pre-test Control Group	558	252	306
Total	1545	939	606

Table 2.1. Italy

	Total	Primary schools	Secondary schools
Pre-test Activity Group	350	198	152
Pre-test Control Group	307	140	167
Total	607	338	317

Table 2.2. Germany

	Total	Primary schools	Secondary schools
Pre-test Activity Group	280	132	148
Pre-test Control Group	211	72	139
Total	491	214	287

3. Pre-test in the Activity Groups (AG)

In the AG, the percentage of females and males is very similar.

Table 3. Sex (%)

	Females	Males
Italy	50,1	49,9
Germany	49,3	50,7
United Kingdom	49,4	50,6

As we have seen in Section 1, in Italy, a slight majority of respondents come from primary schools, in Germany, a slight majority come from secondary schools, finally in UK all respondents come from primary schools.

Table 4. School grade

	Primary school	Secondary school

Italy	56,6	43,4
Germany	46,7	53,3
United Kingdom	100,0	-

In Italy, the majority of children speak only Italian at home (National Speaking Children, NSC), while 42% speak another language in combination or not with Italian (children speaking foreign languages and bilinguals, CSFLB). In Germany, the majority of children speak only German at home (NSC), while 23,5% speak another language in combination or not with German (CSFLB). In UK, a vast majority of children use languages other than English as their main medium at home (SOL, 68,5%), compared to 31,5% who use English as the medium of choice when at home (English as First Language, EFL). This does not imply that children who use other languages at home are not competent users of the English medium, as the background research (see Chapter 2) showed that 94% of these children consider themselves to be at least good speakers of the English medium. The empirical observation of children's participation in the activities supports their self-assessment.

In Italy, NSC are almost equally divided between primary and secondary schools, while the majority of CSFLB is included in primary schools (68%). In Germany, as well, the majority of CSFLB is included in primary schools (57,6%), while the majority of NSC is enrolled in secondary schools (56,7%).

Table 5. Distribution according language

	Total NSC	Total CSFLB (SOL in UK)	NSC Primary school	NSC Secondary school	CSFLB/SOL Primary school	CSFLB Secondary school
Italy	58,0	42,0	48,3	51,7	68,0	32,0
Germany	76,1	23,9	43,3	56,7	57,6	42,4
UK	31,5	68,5	31,5	-	68,5	-

A general observation is that in UK, almost no specific relationship could be extrapolated between the independent variables, sex and language mainly used at home, and any of the dependent variables. A possible explanation concerning the independent variable "language at home" is that almost all children are fully competent users of the English medium, this is the language that they share in all social contexts outside of the family. Another point (see Chapter 2) is that most children who use a language other than English as their preferred medium during family communication are second generation migrants. Finally, it could be noted that the catchment areas for all schools involved in the research, whilst being hyper-diverse in terms of nationality of the residents, are not characterised by specific large national communities, multiplying the opportunity for inter-groups relationships.

Table 6 shows that **relationships among classmates** are perceived as largely positive, in particular, for what concerns the pleasure of talking together and the assessment of getting along. However, the sharing of personal matters is observed less frequently, in particular in Germany (38,4%), but also in Italy (46,4%) and UK (48,1%). In general, in UK positive relationships are more frequently observed, while in Germany are less frequently observed. In Italy and UK, a larger number of children chose "always" rather than "often" for "like to talk" and vice versa for "getting along well". This might suggest that the intensity of intra-group communication can allow room for some conflict, when children do not get along well. Against this background, frequent troubles with classmates are observed by a minority of children, smaller in Germany (18,3%) than in UK (26,4%) and Italy (29%).

Table 6. My classmates and I (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Like to talk	91,6	86,1	91,6

Get along well	94,5	90,8	95,2
Learn from each other	61,0	65,8	76,3
Have different opinions	63,7	66,3	72,5
Tell each other stories	53,5	34,5	61,3
Share personal matters	46,4	38,4	48,1
Have some troubles	29,0	18,3	26,4

In Italy, CSFLB perceive some troubles more often (31,3% vs. 20,4%), and less rarely (52,1% vs. 67,7%) than NSC. This result is in line with the results of the background research, which revealed as the relationships between CSFL and NSC are not very positive. In Germany, secondary school children perceive the make explicit different opinions more frequently than in primary schools (71,2% vs. 60,7%). In UK, a much higher percentage of females perceive that stories are always shared in the classroom (35,2% vs. 9,4% of males) and that mutual learning is achieved (46,9% vs. 35,7%).

Table 7 shows that the perception of **classmates' participation** in the classroom is very positive. However, children's positive perception of classmates is more generalised in UK. In particular, the difference between UK, on the one hand, and Italy and Germany on the other, is very high for what concerns the sharing of feelings (71,6% in UK, 38% in Italy and 37,9% in Germany). This data can be influenced by the fact that in UK all children come from primary schools.

Table 7. Classmates (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Have the same chance to express ourselves	62,0	71,2	85,5
Share opinions and experiences	70,5	68,7	84,8
Express different points of view	80,5	76,2	84,1
Share feelings	38,0	37,9	71,6

In Germany, primary school children share their feelings more frequently than secondary school children (44,4% vs. 31,9%). In Italy, females share feelings much more frequently than males (46,7% vs. 29,3%). In Germany, only 8,7% of females say that they never share their feelings with their classmates, while 24,6% of males chose this answer.

Table 8 shows that **interest in classmates** is also widespread, but it changes in the different settings. In general, it increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy to UK (higher level), above all for what concerns feeling and thinking. As seen for Table 7, this result can be influenced by the fact that in UK all children come from primary school. In Italy and UK, moreover, the most frequent interest regards classmates' feelings, while in Germany it regards classmates' experiences. Classmates' thinking is also rather underestimated in Germany.

Table 8. I am interested in what my classmates (% very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Feel	61,3	42,9	70,1
Think	58,4	38,3	63,7
Know	49,6	40,1	54,1
Experience	48,3	50,8	60,4

In Italy and Germany, primary school children are more interested in their classmates' experiences (Italy, 53,8% vs. 40,9%; Germany, 60,0% vs. 42,6%). Moreover, in Germany, females are much more frequently interested in what their classmates feel than males, while males are more frequently interested in what their classmates think and above all know (table 8.1).

Table 8.1 Relevant differences between females and males in Germany (%)

	Very much females	Very much males
Think	34,4	42,0
Feel	57,3	29,3
Know	31,3	50,0

Table 9 shows that **children's perception of classmates' interest** is much lower than their perception of their own interest in classmates. This highlights children's clear tendency to perceive themselves as more concerned with classmates than classmates with them. The differences among the settings are similar to those in Table 8: interest increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy, to UK (higher level). In this case, in Italy, the most frequent classmates' interest is perceived for knowledge, while in Germany it is perceived for experiences (as in Table 8) and in UK it is perceived for thinking, which, as in Table 8, is rather underestimated in Germany.

Table 9. My classmates are interested in what I (% very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Know	39,8	28,8	47,0
Feel	39,1	23,4	49,4
Experience	36,8	35,8	47,5
Think	32,6	21,3	49,9

In Italy NSC more frequently perceive that their classmates are interested in what they think (39,2% vs. 23,4% of CSFLB). This result, as that observed about Table 6, is in line with the results of the background research, which revealed as the relationships between CSFL and NSC are not very positive. In Italy and Germany, primary school children think more frequently than secondary school children that their classmates are interested in their experiences (Italy, 42,9% vs. 28,9%; Germany, 43,4% vs. 29%). In Italy females more frequently think that their classmates are interested in what they know (47% vs. 33,1% of males). In Germany, about 27,4% of females think that their classmates are interested in what they feel compared to 19,7% of males. Accordingly, about 25,2% of males perceive that their classmates are not interested at all in what they think compared to 11,5% of females.

Table 10 shows that, when **in the company of classmates**, the highest percentage of children **tell stories about themselves**. However, confirming a general trend, telling of stories increases from Germany to Italy to UK. While talking of **photographs and videos** is slightly more frequent in Italy, talking about **cultural background**, **place of birth** and **family** is more frequent in Germany and, above all, in UK, where 45,4% of children talk of their places of birth or living, around 35/37% talk of their families, and 33,9% talk of their cultural background. In general, these results highlight the potential discrepancy between speaking the same language and attending the same class, on the one hand, and being interested in cultural differences, on the other.

Table 10. With my classmates I (%, always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Show my favourite photos/videos	33,9	29,8	33,6
Tell stories about me	51,2	47,4	56,8

Talk about my cultural background	21,7	27,8	33,9
Take photos/make videos	24,1	20,5	27,2
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	25,5	28,1	45,4
Talk about places linked to the story of my family	14,5	24,7	35,4
Tell stories about my family	18,1	27,8	37,4

In Germany, CSFLB talk much more frequently of their cultural background and the place where they were born or used to live than NSC (40% vs. 23,5% and 45% vs. 22,6%). In Italy, NSC show their photos and videos more frequently than CSFLB, while CSFLB talk more frequently of the places where they were born or used to live and, above all, of their cultural background.

Table 10.1 Relevant differences between NSC and CSFLB in Italy

	Always + often NSC	Always + often CSFLB
Show may favourite photos/videos	38,5	27,6
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	21,9	30,7
Talk about my cultural background	14,6	31,3

In Italy, secondary school children show "rarely" photos and videos more frequently than primary school children (37,1% vs. 25,3%), but also "never" less frequently (24,5% vs. 44,3%). The same happens for making photos and videos (rarely 35,8% vs. 24,2% never 37,7% vs. 53,6%). In Germany, primary school children show their favourite photos and videos, take photos or make videos, tell stories about themselves and their family more frequently than secondary school children.

Table 10.2 Relevant differences between primary and secondary school in Germany

	Always + often primary school	Always + often secondary school
tell stories about me	51,6	43,8
tell stories about my family	32,3	23,9
show my favourite photos/videos	31,7	28,2
take photos/make videos	25,4	16,2

Finally, in Germany, 24,3% of males say that they never tell stories about their family compared to 18,9% of females.

Table 11 regards children's **perception of classmates' reactions**, when they say something deemed as important. In all settings, positive reactions are chosen by a large majority of children. However, once again, positive reactions increase from Germany to Italy and to UK. For instance, respect is chosen by 67,6% of children in Germany, 72,2% in Italy and 88,4% in UK. In Germany, trying to convince of the importance of what is said is much less frequently chosen than in the other settings. Some other important differences concern the negative reactions, which are less frequently observed in Germany. In UK, in particular, there is a more frequent observation of classmates' aggressive behaviours (20,2% vs. 12,2% in Italy and 9,9% in Germany), despite the general positive relations that have been declared throughout the questionnaire. The last result, however, is partially in line with the more frequent observation of aggressive behaviours in primary schools in Italy.

Table 11. I tell something that is important for me, my classmates (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK

Try to convince me about the importance of what they have to say	67,7	46,0	69,1
Try to understand	70,9	68,8	86,0
Try to point out the positives	62,3	63,2	75,2
Respect what I am saying	72,2	67,5	88,4
Look for shared stories	50,7	54,7	59,1
Judge me negatively	23,2	17,0	23,4
Mock what I am saying	24,0	16,5	22,6
Get aggressive	12,2	9,9	20,2

In Italy, CSFLB perceive that their classmates point out the positives more frequently than NSC, but they also perceive more frequently that their classmates mock them much than NSC.

Table 11.1. Relevant differences between NSC and CSFLB in Italy

	Always + often NSC	Always + often CSFLB
Try to point out the positives	67,0	55,9
Mock what I am saying	18,0	32,2

In Germany, NSC state that their classmates try to convince them about the importance of what they have to say more frequently than CSFLB (48,2% vs. 39,3%).
In Italy, surprisingly, the situation is observed more positively in secondary schools, as here children perceive that their classmates respect what they say and try to point out the positive aspects more frequently than primary school children. Moreover, secondary school children less frequently observe that their classmates get aggressive than primary school children.

Table 11.2 Relevant differences between primary and secondary school in Italy

	Always+ often primary school	Always + often secondary school
Respect what I am saying	65,1	81,3
Try to point out the positives	58,7	66,9
Get aggressive	16,2	6,8

In Germany, secondary school children more frequently say that their classmates respect what they are saying (75,1% vs. 58,4%), point out the positives (65,6% vs. 60,5%) and look for shared stories (55,6% vs. 53,7%). However, primary school children choose the answer "always" more frequently than secondary school children for all three questions.

Table 11.3 Relevant differences between primary and secondary school in Germany

	Always+ often primary school	Always + often secondary school
respect what I am saying	58,4	75,1
try to point out the positives	60,5	65,6
look for shared stories	53,7	55,6

Table 12 regards the respondents' **reaction to stories told by classmates**. A very high percentage of children addresses classmates' stories positively. In this case, the differences among settings are lower than for the previous variables. However, in Italy, joining in storytelling is much less frequent than in the other settings (49,4% vs. 62% in Germany and 82,9% in UK). Moreover, in UK negative reactions are slightly more frequent, though they regard a small minority of children, above all "getting bored" (25,4% vs. 17,4% in Italy and 13,8% in Germany). In Germany mocking is particularly infrequent (8,2% vs. 12,4% in Italy and 15,3% in UK).

Table 12. When my classmates tell me stories – always + often (%)

	Italy	Germany	UK
I find that nice	86,7	84,2	92,7
I am amused	83,5	71,9	70,9
I find their stories interesting	80,1	76,6	84,4
I believe them	73,2	79,5	85,6
I join them in the storytelling	49,4	62,5	82,9
I ask questions about their stories	60,8	70,3	68,5
I tell my story too	54,7	50,6	62,5
I mock their stories	12,4	9,3	15,4
I get bored	17,4	13,8	25,4
I feel annoyed	8,1	9,3	16,4

In Italy, NSC find stories more frequently interesting than CSFLB, and ask more frequently questions. CSFLB get more frequently bored and feel more frequently annoyed. Once again, this confirms the scarce involvement of CSFLB in interactions with their classmates

Table 12.1 Relevant differences between NSC and CSFLB in Italy

	Always + often NSC	Always + often CSFLB
I find their stories interesting	84,0	74,5
I ask questions about their stories	63,1	57,6
I get bored	15,5	20,0
I feel annoyed	5,0	12,5

In Italy, primary school children get bored more frequently than secondary school children (never 36,9% vs. 25,3%), probably for the influence of the larger percentage of CSFLB, while they never feel annoyed less frequently than secondary school children (64,9% vs. 76,2%). In Germany, primary school children more frequently are amused when their classmates tell them stories (75,2% vs. 69%), find their stories interesting (77,7% vs. 75,7%) and join them in storytelling more frequently (51,7 vs. 49,6%), than secondary school children.

In Germany, a majority of females say that they never get annoyed by their classmates telling stories whereas for males it is less than 1 out of 2 children that never feels annoyed (63,6% vs. 46,3%).

Table 13 captures how much **talking about memories to different categories of people** is a common experience for children. In all settings, children talk of their memories prevalently in their families, followed by friends, classmates and teachers. In Italy, however, children talk much less frequently of memories both in families and with friends. Moreover, the difference among the contexts is higher for what concerns classmates (44,7% in UK, 29,8% in Italy and only 16,9% in Germany) and also teachers (22% in UK vs. 12% in Germany and only 9,6% in Italy). In general, talk about memories is much more frequent in UK (as we have seen, in UK talking about the cultural heritage is also more frequent). On the contrary, talking of memories is particularly infrequent in Italy.

Table 13. I talk about my memories (%, very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
With my family	60,2	75,2	72,9
With my friends	47,0	52,7	60,3
With my classmates	29,8	16,9	44,7
With my teachers	9,6	12,2	22,0
Other	55,7	50,3	35,0

In Italy, NSC talk about memories more frequently than CSFLB with family, friends and classmates.

Table 13.1. Relevant differences between NSC and CSFLB in Italy

	Very much NSC	Very much CSFLB	Not at all NSC	Not at all CSFLB
With my family	65,2	53,1	4,0	7,7
With my friends	54,5	36,4	10,9	14,0
With my classmates	30,2	29,4	15,6	26,6

In Germany, a majority of NSC say that they never talk about their memories with their teachers compared to 27,1% of CSFLB. One out of five CSFLB talk about their memories with their teachers very much, whereas only one out of ten NSC state the same.

In Italy, the secondary school students talk of memories more frequently with friends and less frequently with teachers than primary school students, while they talk less frequently with their classmates.

Table 13.2. Relevant differences between primary and secondary school in Italy

	Very much primary school	Very much secondary school
With my friends	42,6	52,7
With my classmates	32,8	26,0
With my teachers	12,9	5,4

In Germany, primary school children talk about memories with their teachers much more frequently than secondary school children (17,8%. vs. 8,2%)

In Italy, females talk of memories with friends more frequently than males (52,1% vs. 42,4%). In Germany, the majority of females talk about memories with their friends (60,6%) or other people (66,7%), whereas only a minority of males state the same (44,9% and 35,1%).

Table 14 regards children's assessment **whether expressing different perspective is positive or negative**. The tendency is similar in the different settings. In particular, a large majority of children say that expressing different perspectives is neither positive nor negative, and only a marginal minority say that expressing differences is always negative. What is striking however is the difference concerning children who say that expressing different perspective is always positive, between Italy (17%), on the one hand, and Germany (36,7%) and UK (32,5%), on the other.

Table 14. Expressing different perspectives is (%)

	Always positive	Neither positive nor negative	Always negative
Italy	17,0	80,1	2,9
Germany	36,7	61,0	2,3
United Kingdom	32,5	66,1	1,4

Table 15 shows children's **use of photography**. There are some interesting differences among the settings in this use. The most important difference is between Italy and UK, on the one hand, where use of photography very frequently regards remembering and telling/sharing memories, and Germany, on the other, where it very frequently regards capturing interesting moments of life and recording what is seen. In UK, it is particularly relevant to be creative (66,4%). Moreover, in UK using photography to relate to other people (40,7%) is much more frequent than in Germany (29,1%) and Italy (26,4%). Showing emotions through photographs increases from Germany (only 33,6%) to UK (45,9%) to Italy (59,6%). Finally, in Italy, use of photography to tell stories about personal experiences (40,9%) is less frequent than in UK (50,8%) and Germany (51,3%).

Table 15. Use of photography (%, very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Remember and tell my memories	81,9	54,8	78,3
Capture interesting moments of my life	75,7	72,0	75,2
Show my emotions	59,6	33,6	45,9
Be creative	49,6	49,0	66,4
Record what I see around me	47,5	60,8	56,3
Tell stories about my personal experiences	40,9	51,3	50,8
Relate to other people	26,4	29,1	40,7

In Italy, NSC use photography to remember and tell their memories but also to show their emotions more frequently than CSFLB (respectively 86,1% vs. 76,1% and 65,2% vs. 51,8%).

In Italy, secondary school children use photography to tell stories about their personal experiences more frequently than primary school children (46,5% vs. 36,5%). In Germany, secondary school children more frequently perceive photography as a way to record what they see around them than primary school children (65,4% vs. 55,6%). In Italy, females use photography to remember and tell their memories, to show their emotions and to tell stories about their personal experiences more frequently than males.

Table 15.1. Difference between females and males in Italy

	Very much females	Very much males	Not at all females	Not at all males
Remember and tell my memories	86,4	77,9	0,0	6,1
Show my emotions	65,5	53,4	4,2	14,3
Tell stories about my personal experiences	43,8	39,4	6,9	19,4

In Germany, females more frequently use photography to capture interesting moments of their life, show their emotions and to relate to other people than males.

Table 15.2. Difference between females and males in Germany

	Very much females	Very much males	Not at all females	Not at all males
show my emotions	40,9	25,8	11,8	29,5
capture interesting moments of my life	79,4	65,9	2,4	8,5
relate to other people	32,5	24,8	12,2	24,8

3.1 Conclusions

We can sum up the most important results of the analysis of the pre-test in the Activity Group as follows.

1. The relationships among classmates are seen as largely positive in all settings. The pleasure of talking together and the positive assessment of getting along are particularly frequent. Sharing of personal matters, however, is less frequent, in particular in Germany. Problems are observed by a small minority of children, smaller in Germany than in UK and Italy.

2. The general view of classmates is similar in all settings. However, children's positive perception of classmates is more generalised in UK, as interest in classmates increases from Germany to Italy to UK. In particular, the difference between UK on the one hand and Italy and Germany on the other, is relevant for the sharing of feelings. In Italy and UK, interest is more frequent for classmates' feelings, while in Germany it is more frequent for classmates' experiences. Moreover, in Germany, the interest in classmates' thinking is rather infrequent. Children's perception of classmates' interest is much less frequent than their perception of their own interest in classmates. This highlights that children tend to perceive themselves as more concerned with classmates than classmates with them. The perception of classmates' interest also increases from Germany to Italy, to UK. In Italy, classmates' interest is perceived more frequently for knowledge, in Germany for experience and in UK for thinking, which is less frequent in Germany.

3. The highest percentage of children tell stories about themselves to their classmates. The percentage increases from Germany to Italy to UK. Talk about cultural background, place of birth and family is more frequent in Germany and, above all, in UK, however is rather infrequent in general. This highlights that interest in a different cultural background is not frequent and not equally frequent in all settings.

4. Children frequently perceive positively their classmates' reactions to their important points. However, the perception of positive reactions increases from Germany to Italy and to UK. On the contrary, negative reactions are much less perceived in Germany. Perception of classmates' aggressive behaviours is more frequent in UK, partially in line with what happens in primary schools in Italy.

5. A very high percentage of children address classmates' stories positively. Joining in storytelling is less frequent in Italy, and negative reactions (above all getting bored) are more frequent in UK, although they regard a small minority of children. In Germany, mocking is particularly infrequent.

6. Children talk of their memories prevalently with families, followed by friends, classmates and teachers. In Italy, children talk much less frequently of memories both in families and with friends. Differences among the contexts are relevant for what concerns classmates (more frequent talk in UK and less frequent in Germany) and teachers (more frequent in UK and less frequent in Italy). In general, talk about memories is much more frequent in UK, where it is also more frequent talk about the cultural heritage. On the contrary, talk about memories is less frequent in Italy.

7. A large majority of children say that expressing different perspectives is neither positive nor negative, and only a marginal minority say that it is always negative. However, expressing different perspective is much less frequently positive in Italy.

8. In Italy and UK, use of photography mainly concerns remembering and sharing memories, in Germany it mainly concerns capturing interesting moments of life and recording what they see. In UK, it is also more frequently relevant to be creative and using photography to relate to other people. Showing emotions through photographs increases from Germany to UK to Italy. In Italy, use of photography to tell stories about personal experiences is less frequent.

These data show that, in the social and cultural context of London Barnett, the positive outcomes regarding classroom communication are more frequent than in the Italian contexts and, above all in the German contexts. In the German regions, in particular, expression of emotions, telling and other communicative activities are less frequent than in the other contexts. In the Italian regions, one the one hand expression of emotions, on the other troubles and problems are more frequent (together with London Barnett for some aspects), while in the German regions they are less frequent. It is also interesting to note that females are more frequently "expressive" than males, at least in the Italian and German regions (while in London Barnett this difference does not seem relevant).

The percentage of children that have troubles with classmates, mock them, get bored with them and sometimes become aggressive should not be underestimated, although it is always much lower than

that of children who appreciate communication and get well with classmates. While London schools present the highest percentage of positive communication, the German regions seem to be less problematic for negative behaviours. The Italian regions present the most frequent problems in terms of troubles, maybe associated with more expressive behaviours.

Against this background, the differences between NSC and CSFLB are not very relevant, though they indicate less positive relations with classmates, and they are completely absent in UK. They especially concern Italy. Firstly, in Italian regions different perspectives are seen much less frequently positively than in the other contexts. Secondly, in these regions CSFLB seem to have more frequently problems with and lack of interest in classmates. However, CSFLB also look more frequently at their classmates positively. Finally, CSFLB talk much more frequently of their cultural background with classmates, which is an ambiguous outcome, as it may mean that either they can talk of their classmates of these themes, or they are included in "ethnic" groups. In more details, CSFLB:

1. Say more frequently that they have troubles with their classmates.
2. Perceive more frequently that their classmates point out the positives, and much less frequently that their classmates mock them.
3. Talk more frequently with classmates of the places where they were born or used to live and above all of their cultural background.
4. Get more frequently bored and above all feel more frequently annoyed by classmates' stories.

On the contrary, in general, NSC seem to be more frequently involved in relationships in the classroom and probably also out of the classroom. In more details, NSC:

1. Observe much more frequently that their classmates are interested in what they think
2. Show more frequently their photos and videos to classmates.
3. Find more frequently classmates' stories interesting and ask more frequently questions to classmates.
4. Talk more frequently of memories with family, and above all friends.
5. Use more frequently photography to remember and tell their memories and to show their emotions

In Germany, the difference between CSFLB and NSC are less frequent and relevant. As in Italy, however, CSFLB talk much more frequently of their cultural background and the place where they were born or used to live with their classmates. They also talk more frequently of their memories with teachers, which seems to show some interest among teachers for their condition.

4. Pre-test in Control Groups (CG)

In the CG, the percentage of females and males is almost similar. However, in Italy there were more males in the CG than in the AG, and in UK the differences were very high (see section 2).

Table 1. Sex (%) (in parenthesis the data of the AG)

	Females CG	Males CG
Italy (Modena, Monfalcone, Udine)	47,4 (50,1)	52,6 (49,9)
Germany (Turingia, Saxony-Unhalt)	48,8 (49,3)	51,2 (50,7)
United Kingdom (London Barnett)	43,6 (49,4)	56,4 (50,6)

In Italy and Germany, in the CG the secondary schools were overrepresented (and the primary schools underrepresented) if compared to the AG. Therefore, in both cases the CG is rather different from the AG for what concerns the school grade.

Table 2. School grade (in parenthesis the data of the AG)

	Primary school	Secondary school
Italy	45,6 (56,6)	54,4 (43,4)
Germany	33,5 (46,7)	66,5 (53,3)
United Kingdom	100,0	-

In Italy, there is a perfect correspondence between AG and CG for what concerns the percentage of NSC and CSFLB, although the distribution in primary and secondary schools is different (more CSFLB in secondary schools in the CG). In Germany, the percentage of NSC increases in the CG, while in UK it decreases. In Germany, the distribution changes more dramatically than in Italy, with much more CSFLB in secondary schools than in primary schools in the CG.

Table 3. National Speaking Children (NSC) and Children Speaking Foreign Language + Bilinguals (Speaking language other than English in UK) (in parenthesis the data of the AG)

	Total NSC	Total CSFLB (SOL in UK)	NSC Primary school	NSC Secondary school	CSFLB/SOL Primary school	CSFLB Secondary school
Italy	58,0 (58,0)	42,0 (42,0)	34,3 (48,3)	65,7 (51,7)	61,2 (68,0)	38,8 (32,0)
Germany	84,2 (76,1)	15,8 (23,9)	34,5 (43,3)	65,5 (56,7)	28,1 (57,6)	71,9 (42,4)
UK	27,5 (31,5)	77,5 (68,5)	27,5	-	77,5	-

What is particularly important in the analysis of the CG is the level of similarity with the AG. Therefore, where relevant, we shall not only provide the data about the CG, but above all the comparison between the AG and the CG, to observe their possible differences.

The most relevant differences between AG and CG concern UK. A number of explanations for this have been explored. The first one, and probably most important, is the very small number of cases included in the CG, which create a lack of balance between the two groups. The second one is linked to the characteristic of the population, with the age of children in the CG clustered around the younger end of SHARMED target. A third explanation is contextual to the development of SHARMED activities in the UK. Some of the participating schools asked the SHARMED team to present the project aims, methodology and overall philosophy to children's assemblies, in order to obtain a more aware and informed consent. The SHARMED team accepted the request coherently with principles of ethical research with children and young people. However, a possible consequence of this may be that children who were going to be involved in SHARMED activities were somehow conditioned in their replies due to knowing the aims and methodology of the intervention, differently from children in the CGs who did not take part in the assemblies. Upon reflection, the UK SHARMED team is considering to review the presentation of activities for future research when CGs are foreseen by the research design, including them in possible presentations of the activities.

In the CG, as in the AG, the **relationships among the classmates** are seen as largely positive. In Italy, the results are very similar in the AG and the CG. Troubles in the AG are much more frequently observed in Germany and UK, where there are some other less positive results in the CG.

Table 4.1 My classmates and I. Meaningful variation from AG to CG in Germany (%)

	Always +Often
get along well	-10,1
share personal matters	-9,7
Have some troubles	10,3

Table 4.2. My classmates and I. Meaningful variation from AG to CG in UK (%)

	Always + often

Like to talk	-8,4
Learn from each other	-16,4
Have different opinions	-13.5
Have some troubles	36,1

In the CG, the view of **classmates' participation** in the classroom does not change significantly in Italy. The changes are minimal in Germany, regarding less chances to express themselves in the CG (-9,8%). In UK, the meaningful change is that difference is observed more frequently than sharing.

Table 5.1 Classmates (%), variation from AG and CG in UK

	Always + often
Have the same chance to express ourselves	12,0
Share opinions and experiences	-12,3
Express different points of view	8,5
Share feelings	-11,7

In the CG, the **interest in classmates** does not change in Italy, while it changes in Germany, in particular for what concerns classmates' thinking (which is very low in the CG in Germany), and above all in UK, in particular for what concerns interest in classmates' experiences.

Table 6.1. I am interested in what my classmates. Meaningful variations in Germany (%)

	Very much
Think	-10,6
Experience	-7,9

Table 6.2. I am interested in what my classmates. Meaningful variation in UK (%)

	Very much
Feel	-8.5
Know	-8.5
Experience	-12.9

Children's **perception of classmates' interest** is much lower than their perception of their own interest in classmates, as in the AG. This confirms the children's tendency to perceive themselves as more concerned with others than others with them. The data about the CG show some relevant decrease of percentages in Germany. In particular, in the German CG, the perception of classmates' interest is infrequent.

Table 7.1 My classmates are interested in what I. Meaningful Variations in Germany (%)

	Very much
Think	-10,1
Know	-10,1
Experience	-9,6

In the CG, for what concerns **the company of classmates**, there are limited variations in Italy, only concerning the cultural background (+7,4%), while in Germany it is evident a less frequent interest in different cultural heritages. In UK, moreover, we can see the most relevant changes, showing a much more frequent interest in self and family and much less frequent in cultural heritage.

Table 8.1 With my classmates I. Meaningful variations in Germany (%)

	Always + often
talk about my cultural background	-9,1
talk about places where I was born or used to live	-12,6
talk about the places that are linked to the story of my family	-12,3

Table 8.2 With my classmates I. Meaningful variations in UK (%)

	Always + often
Tell stories about me	37,9
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	-17,9
Take photos/make videos	-9,6
Tell stories about my family	40,5

Children's perception of their classmates' reactions is not very different from the AG. There is only one specific change for each country. The direction of change of perception of aggressive behaviour is different in Italy (+8%) and UK (from 20,2% to zero). In Germany, the only change concerns perception of respect (-7,8%).

In the CG, children's **reaction to stories told by classmates** does not present relevant variations in Italy, while it is frequently less positive both in Germany and above all in UK.

Table 9.1 When my classmates tell me stories. Meaningful variations in Germany (%)

	Always + often
I find that nice	-11,6
I ask questions about their stories	-9,3
I believe them	-11
I join them in the storytelling	-8,2

Table 9.2 When my classmates tell me stories. Meaningful variations in UK (%)

	Always + often
I am amused	-8,4
I find their stories interesting	-19,4
I ask questions about their stories	-11,0
I join them in the storytelling	-14,3
I tell my story too	-16,4
I get bored	7,9

In the CG, the interlocutors of talks about memories do not change significantly in Italy (apart from a small increase of teachers (+ 6,4%) and UK, while in Germany there is a less frequent interest in talking with adults, both family (-16%) and teachers (-10,4%).

Table 10.1. I talk about my memories. Meaningful variations In Germany (%)

	Very much
With my family	-16,0
With my teachers	-10,4

For what concerns children's assessment whether expressing different perspective is positive or negative, the tendency in the CG and the AG is very similar in all social and cultural contexts. Therefore, that this type of data seems to be generalised.

Table 11. Expressing different perspectives is (%) (in parenthesis the data of AG)

	Always positive	Neither positive nor negative	Always negative

Italy	19,7 (17,0)	77,3 (80,1)	3,0 (2,9)
Germany	32,0 (36,7)	65,0 (61,0)	3,0 (2,3)
United Kingdom	41,0 (32,5)	59,0 (66,1)	- (1,4)

In the CG, use of photography is different above all in Germany and UK. In Italy, the only relevant change concerns showing emotions (-12,1% in the CG). In Germany, four variables are less frequently chosen, including showing emotions, remembering and sharing memories, tell stories about personal experience and relate to other people. In UK, while the decrease in tell stories about personal experience and relate to other people is confirmed and more relevant, showing emotions presents a different trend (+14,1%).

Table 12.1 Photography. Meaningful variations in Germany (%)

	Very much
remember and tell my memories	-12,6
show my emotions	-17,0
tell stories about my personal experiences	-11,6
relate to other people	-9,1

Table 12.2 Photography. Meaningful variations in UK (%)

	Very much
Show my emotions	14.1
Tell stories about my personal experiences	-33.3
Relate to other people	-30.5

In conclusion, the analysis of the pre-test in the CG shows that the Italian setting presents the less relevant differences from the AG. In Germany, and above all in UK, the differences between the AG and the CG are sometimes very relevant. Therefore, the comparative analysis is particularly difficult. More elements to understand the effectiveness of this the analysis of effects will be provided in Chapter 6.

Chapter 4. Analysis of the activities

1. Introduction

This chapter regards the activities conducted in the 48 classes selected for the SHARMED project. These activities regarded the use of photography to stimulate children's narratives about their memories and to promote dialogue in multicultural classrooms, as a way of innovating education. During the SHARMED project, the activities were coordinated by facilitators, with the task of (1) enhancing children's active participation, in particular children's agency (autonomous contributions influencing the structure of the interaction); (2) promoting narratives and dialogue.

The SHARMED project was implemented to show how these activities can become part of education in multicultural classrooms. This chapter regards the analysis of these activities, based on the videorecording of half of them. The chapter includes the following objects of analysis: (1) types and modes of production of narratives; (2) promotion of children's participation (initiation, questions, feddback); (3) facilitators' personal contributions; (4) children's initiatives and their treatment; (5) management of problems and conflicts; (6) management of cultural issues. The analysis is based on the concepts that have been presented in Chapter 2.

2. Types of narratives

The analysis of the activities shows the types of narratives that the children chose to tell and discuss with classmates and facilitators. These types of narratives either originated directly from photographs or followed previous stories which originated from photographs.

Narratives of the children's self. This was the most frequent type**.** These narratives include stories about children as persons, their past, their characters, their opinions and emotions, their experiences, and their important relationships. Children showed their interest in displaying their identities in classroom interactions, their own specificity and autonomy, observing the changes and continuity in time that made them unique persons. In particular, children told stories about trust and friendship, preferences, experiences, beliefs. Sometimes, children remembered these stories, other times the stories had been told to them by parents or grandparents.

The following example is part of a longer narrative about the birth of a friendship, after e period of difficulties and conflicts. It shows how the two children (F5 and F14) co-narrate the story of their relationship, with the facilitator's support. In the first phase (turns 1-23), the narrative regards the mutual hostility of the two girls. In turn 24, the facilitator activates the second phase, regarding reconciliation and becoming friends. The narrative primarily higlights the chidlren's (changing) feelings.

Example 1

1. F14:   siamo capitate in classe insieme
            we happened to be in the same class
2. FAC: quindi vi eravate antipatiche una con l'altra però dice ci tocca stare insieme ci

		proviamo
		So you disliked each other but as we have to stay together we try
3.	F5:	hh
4.	FAC:	così?
		Like that?
5.	F5:	sì
		Yes
6.	FAC:	ma chi è che ha abbordato l'altra?
		But which one of you went to the other?
7.	F5:	tutte e due
		Both
8.	FAC:	cioè vi siete scontrate
		You mean you collided
9.	F14:	[hh
10.	F5:	[nohh
11.	FAC:	com'è dai non ti ricordi com'è accaduto?
		How did don't you remember how did it happen?
12.	F5:	in biblioteca forse
		Maybe in the library
13.	F14:	sì siamo andate in biblioteca insieme
		Yes we went to the library together
14.	FAC:	ah
15.	F14:	e
		And
16.	FAC:	no mi piace capire il pensiero quando (.) a un certo punto voi avevate un preconcetto l'una nei confronti dell'altra sbaglio?
		No I like to know the thought when (.) at a certain point you had a preconception the one against the other am I right?
17.	F5:	((looks at F14))
18.	F14:	sì
		Yes
19.	FAC:	eh e come è avvenuto il cambiamento? Cioè
		Eh and how did the change happen? I mean
20.	F5:	eh imparando a conoscerla (.) perché io pensavo che lei mi stava antipatica perché non mi parlava e mi guardava male e quindi:
		eh learning to know her (.) because I thought I didn't like her because she didn't talk to me and she looked bad at me and so:
21.	F14:	e io la stessa cosa
		And the same for me
22.	FAC:	beh quindi in pratica eravate ostili l'una all'altra per difesa (.) nel senso che pensavate che l'altro non aveva voglia [di: di voi e quindi
		So basically you were hostile for defence (.) in the sense that you thought that the other didn't want [to: you and so
23.	F5:	[sì
		[*yes*
24.	FAC:	e e il primo a parlare chi è stato?
		And and who was the first to speak?
25.	F5:	eh chi si ricorda
		eh who remembers?
26.	FAC:	sei stata te ((pointing to F5))
		You did
27.	F5:	no! Non so
		No! I don't know
28.	F14:	no perché mi sembra che eravamo seduti lì ((indica un banco)), [all'inizio dell'anno
		No because I think we were sitting there ((points to a desk)), [at the beginning of the year
29.	FAC:	[qua

| | | ah |
| | | *[here* |

| | | ah |
| | | *ah* |

30. F5:   perché [eravamo a isole
    Because [we were in isles

31. F14:   [e   sì eravamo a isole, e io e lei eravamo di fronte a un certo
punto abbiamo tirato fuori l'astuccio era uguale e allora ci siam messe a ridere
    [and yes we were in isles, and I and she were one in front of the other and at a
certain point we pulled out the pencil case and it was the same and we started laughing

32. FAC: ah: quindi un episodio fortuito
    Ah: so an accidental event

33. F5:   sì
    Yes

34. FAC: ma vi siete mai raccontate quando vi eravate antipatiche?
    But did you ever talk about when you disliked each other?

35. F5:   [sì
    [Yes

36. F14:   [sì
    [yes

Family narratives were also very frequent. These are stories regarding family members: parents, grandparents, uncles, siblings, cousins. They describe family members, their life experiences, which sometimes are painful, children's relationships with them. The stories regard the most affective relationships involving children. Through these stories, children define either their family identity, or affirm their autonomy from family. Example 2 regards a photograph representing the child's brother. A series of questions, by the facilitator and the classmates, support the child's telling of the story about his brother.

Example 2

1.   M7:   also, das war und das war vor vier Jahren. Das war auch als wir als erstes in Magdeburg
2.   waren. Also, wir sind ja von Berlin nach also, wir sind das erstes Mal nach Magdeburg efahren an diesem Tag. Und ähm, dann waren wir erst in der Stadt und, das ist hier mein Bruder ((zeigt auf das Bild)). Und das ist schon, für mich ist das schon lange her. Nicht so viel Erinnerungen.
3.   *well, that was and that was four years ago. That was when we first were in Magdeburg. Well, we did travel from Berlin well, this day we travelled the firstest time to Magdeburg. And em, then first we were in the city centre and, this is here my brother ((points to picture)). And it is a long, for me it's a long time ago. Not so much memory.*

4.   FAC: mhm. Klasse.
5.   *mm-hm. Great.*
6.   M7:   und das bin ich hier.
7.   *and that's me here*
8.   F7:   und wer ist das dann daneben?
9.   *and who is that just adjacent?*
10.   M7:   das ist mein Bruder.
11.   *that's my brother.*
12.   FAC: ich glaub hier sind noch einige Fragen, guck mal.
13.   *I think there are quite a few questions, look.*
14.   ((M7 points to F7))
15.   F7:   wie alt warst du da?
16.   *how old were you then?*
17.   M7:   F9.
18.   F9:   hast du dich [mit dein Bruder] vertragen?
19.   *did you get [on well with your] brother?*
20.   M7:   [neun gewor-,] neun geworden.

21. *[just turn-,] just turned nine.*
22. F9:   hast dich mit deinem Bruder vertragen?
23. *did you get on well with your brother?*
24. M7:   ähm, ja
25. *emm, yes.*
26. F4:   wie alt war dein Bruder da?
27. *how old was your brother then?*
28. M7:   mein Bruder? Vier oder so.
29. *my brother? About four.*
30. F7:   ähm, wart ihr glücklich, weil auf diesem Foto sieht das nicht, also, so-
31. *emm, were you ((plural)) happy, because in the photo it doesn't look, well, so-*

32. F6:   komisch aus.
33. *looks strange.*
34. F7:   ja, also lächelnd und grade.
35. *yeah, like, smiling and stiff.*
36. F7:   also, wart ihr da glücklich
37. *well, were you ((plural)) happy?*
38. M7:   ja. Wir waren erstes Mal in Magdeburg, wir wussten eigentlich gar nicht. Also so.
39. *yes. We were firstest time in Magdeburg, we didn't even know. Well so.*

Narratives of children's personal life include important events (e.g. weddings, feasts, school trips), meaningful places, sport experiences, beloved animals (above all cats and dogs) and important objects (such as toys, puppets). The narrated events, places, sports, animals and objects affect children's life experience and the formation of their personal identities. These stories show emotional aspects of children's memories, often connected with important personal relationships or social roles. Sometimes these stories can also contribute to highlight family identities. Through their narratives of personal life, children construct their identities in relation to their experiences, needs and feelings. Example 3 regards the children's participation in weddings, which was a rather popular theme during a meeting in UK.

Example 3

1. FAC: So, would you share with us a bit about your picture
2. F1:   ((finger to mouth as she gets lost for words)) It was my aunts wedding and when I was about seven
3. FAC: What can you remember about the day, about going to the wedding, was it exciting, was the bride beautiful, the groom handsome. What was special about the day when you went to the wedding?
4. F1:   I felt really excited being there to like be there
5. FAC: And did you have a special job, were you involved in the ceremony?
6. F1:   ((Gestures to show roses being thrown)) Oh yeah, I was the rose girl so I was throwing roses.
7. FAC: Oh, so flowers. So, would you call it a rose carrier or a flower girl or bridesmaid, there's lots of different names isn't there? Flower girl
8. F1:   ((nods))
9. FAC: Okay and where did the marriage happen?
10. F1:   ((Maps out a 'big place' with hands)) I don't remember but it was this big place and that's where the ceremony was but the party was in a different place
11. FAC: Okay, was it a religious ceremony?
12. F1:   Yeah, it was a Christian.
13. FAC: It was a Christian ceremony. So, what was it like?
14. F1:   ((smiles)) After we were sat down (..) ((unclear)) it was a little bit boring.
15. FAC: It was a bit boring, was it long as well?
16. F1:   ((Uses hands to display excitement)) Yeah, but when me and ((unclear)) with the rings it was like

17. FAC: It was exciting?
18. F1:   ((Smiles)) Yeah.
19. FAC: Was it emotional?
20. F1:   Yeah.
21. FAC: It sounds really (..) has anybody else here been to a wedding?
22. ((Classroom all talks at once))
23. FAC: Who wants to share with me about their wedding favourite experiences? Who can remember going to a wedding and share something about it.
24. F1:   ((points to people in class))
25. M1:   I was at a wedding and you know the platform they go to to get married
26. FAC: The platform as in when they stand up.
27. M1:   (?)
28. FAC: Oh no, so you went to the wedding and the ceremony was on and you fell down the stairs, can you remember that?
29. M1:   Not very well.
30. FAC: So, about four maybe, maybe three or four. Oh no, and do you remember that or is it because your family told you about it, is it on video?
31. M1:   Maybe talking about it.
32. FAC: And how did it feel when they told you.
33. M1:   Embarrassment.
34. FAC: Has anybody else got a memory about a wedding they want to share?
35. F2:   I remember when I was two. I think my mum took me to Poland for her sister's wedding and we actually (..) my auntie's and a lot of people, like guests, they were basically dancing with me. I was like only two and everybody was trying to take care of me, but I was mostly crying during the wedding so (..) but I do remember like the music we had and like the cake.

Narratives of migration were particularly frequent in the Italian setting. These stories regard experiences connected to separation from beloved persons and places, journeys to new countries, experiences of returning to places of origin, aspirations to return in the future or lack of interest for this return. These stories are generally linked to personal aspirations and feelings, frequently to family bonds and only sometimes to the construction of national or group identity. Through these stories, children construct their identity much more frequently in relation to their family bonds and/or to their unique and specific desires, aspirations and feelings, than to their membership of cultural, ethnic or national groups.

Example 4 regards an important Muslim feast, in Afghanistan. The child (M2), supported by the faciitator, is able to provide some details of the event; then the story focuses on relatives and life with the child's grandmother.

Example 4

1. FAC: Why did you choose to bring that in?
2. M2:   Because it was Eid in Afghanistan.
3. FAC: So, it's in Afghanistan, so it's celebrating Eid.
4. M2:   Yeah. All of our family was gathered around in this (?) park and my grandfather unfortunately had to bring his camera because he used to be a photographer, and I think he wanted me to wear this hat and he made me put it on and it made me smile (?) picture.
5. FAC: Why did he make you wear that hat?
6. M2:   Because it was my dad's old hat.
7. F: Oh, so your dad used to wear that hat as well and how does it link to Eid, how does that link to Eid?
8. M2:   Because he wore it on the same day as Eid.
9. FAC: And does it represent something, does it mean something?
10. M2:   It doesn't mean anything it's some hats that Afghans wear.
11. FAC: In the Eid celebration. Okay, I really love all of the sequions on there and I love the way it comes out like a little pyramid, a triangle, that's really lovely . I noticed a lot (?). What else can you remember about the picture?

12. 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.
13. FAC: Oh wow, some cousins might do that sometimes when they're younger.
14. 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.
15. FAC: Were you very small?
16. M2: Yeah.
17. 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?
18. 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 .
19. 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?
20. M2: Yeah.
21. FAC: I used to sleep with my grandma when I was little .
22. 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 (?) they put their hands (?) in one of the pictures and told me like there's a ghost and a hand appeared.

Narratives of historical events and situations were much less frequent than the other types of narratives. These include two types of stories. The first type is linked to grandparents' or great-grandparent's life experiences, which were told to the children by the protagonists or by their parents. This type of narrative regards children's family heritage, transmitted through different generations, and constituting part of the family identity. It was particularly frequent in the Italian setting. In many cases, the children also display their sorry about not having spent enough time with dead grandparents or also great grandparents. A second type of stories regards the direct experience of war and displacement, in the German setting, where some refugee children have participated in the activities. These stories are more delicate as they regard experiencing war and pain, as having to flee from a conflict zone or having a boyfriend who is a soldier. These stories represent painful direct experiences for children. They remained largely unexplored in the German setting, probably for the facilitators' perception of their delicacy. Narratives of historical events can also enhance discussions about different perspectives, for instance, on war.

Example 5 regards a story about episodes involving the child's great grandmother during the Second World War. The child is able to provide many details, following the stories told to him by his grandmother and great aunt.

Example 5

1. M3: e: allora ho portato questa foto perché anche quello che mi racconta: la mia prozia e mia nonna, e: cioè mi: era interessante della sua vita e allora ho portato:
   and: so I brought this photo because even the things my grandmother and great aunt tell me, e: well to me: it was interesting about her life and so I brought:
2. FAC: ma ci sono altre cose che ti hanno raccontato di lei?
   But are there other things that they told you about her?
3. M3: sì
   Yes
4. FAC: [che cosa
   [what
5. M3: [che è successo un episodio durante la seconda Guerra Mondiale che e: lei aveva una fattoria cioè suo marito e: allora praticamente i tedeschi hanno: gli avevano: rubato un maiale

		[that an episode happened during Second World War that e: she had a farm well her husband and: so basically the Germans have: they stole a pig from them
6.	FAC:	[ah
7.	M3:	[e allora e: dopo lei aveva de- e: era andata dal capo dei tedeschi a ((città) e ha detto ma voi mi avete rubato un maiale dovete ridarmelo e quel capo dei tedeschi era bravo cioè non era cattivo
		[and so e: after that she de- e: went to the Germans' leader in ((city)) and told him you stole my pig you have to give it back to me and that German's leader was good I mean he wasn't bad
8.	FAC:	ah
9.	M3:	e: allora dopo si è trovata
		And: so then she found
10.	FAC:	perché ci sono i tedeschi bravi [e i tedeschi meno bravi
		Because there are good Germans [and less good Germans
11.	M3:	[sì sì e: ((fa un gesto con la mano, sembra indicando qualcosa di passato)) e allora si è trovata dopo il giorno dopo il maiale gliel'han dato però e:
		[yes yes and: ((gesture with the hand indicating something past)) and so she found the day after the pig that they gave back to her but e:
12.	M1:	morto
		Dead
13.	M3:	poco perché:: delle parti le avevano già mangiate e poi volevano portargli i soldi (.) del maiale
		A bit because:: they had already eaten some parts and then they wanted to give her the money (.) for the pig
14.	FAC:	ah
15.	M3:	per[ché
		Be[cause
16.	FAC:	[beh però
		[just guess
17.	M3:	pagarglielo poi mia nonna ha detto ma no guarda tenetevi voi i soldi che io non li voglio e loro han detto prendi i soldi o ti spariamo
		To pay for it then my grandmother said no keep the money I don't want it and they said take the money or we shoot at you
18.	FAC:	però
		Just guess!
19.	M3:	eh li ha presi ((sorride))
		eh and she took it ((smiles))

2. Modes of producing narratives

Children can tell their stories either as first person stories or as third person (or vicarious) stories. **First person narratives** regard children's lived experiences. Frequently, children are the source of these stories, which they experienced and remember. In some cases, however, children do not remember the stories, as they were too young at the time of events. In these cases, even if children can display their knowledge in the classroom, and are protagonists of the story, they cite a different source, such as a parent or grandparent. Example 3 regards a first person narrative, remembered by the children.
Third person (or vicarious) narratives are stories with other protagonists, such as relatives, friends and classmates. Sometimes, third person narratives are reported narratives, as the source is not the child. In case of vicarious narratives about relatives, the source can be the protagonist of the story, or another relative when the protagonist died. Vicarious narratives can also be promoted by facilitators, for instance through small group activities where children are invited to interpret and narrate the photographs of other children. In other cases, the source of third person narratives are the narrating

children, who have a direct memory of experiences of other persons. Example 4 regards a vicarious narrative, i.e. a reported narrative about the child's great grandmother.

Sometimes, the children cannot remember anything about the photograph and there is no source of information about it. These cases invite to reflect on the importance of collaboration of families to this type of activities.

3. Transitions from photographs to stories

The **transition from photograph to story** is very important in this type of activities as photographs are the systematic point of departure of this proposal of innovative education. This transition can be based on different ways of connecting photographs and narratives.

The simplest transition is based on **the description of the iconographic elements** of an image, i.e. what is represented in it. Example 6 shows as the children describe the content of the photographs.

Example 6

1. M4: also, dieses Bild, also, das ist das Land Syrien und die Stadt da heißt Aleppo und und ähm auf dem ersten Bild sieht man noch dass hier alles heile ist, dass da auch noch Menschen laufen, dass hier auch so ein rießen Turm ist und ähm dass hier auch Autos, Mopeds, und alles noch schön ist. Auch hier so ein paar Bäume. Und das wirkt da noch wie ne normale Stadt.
well, this picture, well, this is the country Syria and the city is Aleppo and em on the first picture you can see that everything is still intact, that people are walking around and that there is a huge tower here and that em there are also cars, mopeds and everything is still fine. There are even some trees here. And it looks like a normal city.

2. M5: und unten ist ähm, da war bestimmt Krieg, man sieht hier auch einen Panzer und da ist alles kaputt, also ich glaub- wir glauben, dass das das Vorher Foto und das das Nachher ähm. Die ganze Häuser sind auch kaputt und der Turm äh ist auch kaputt.
and below it's em, there was definitevely a war, you can see a tank here and everything is broken there, so I believe- we believe that this one is a before photo and this one after. All of the houses are destroyed too and the tower is broken too.

3. M4: also hat alles auch aus Trümmern und man stellt sich auch vor, dass man auch jetzt nicht gerne leben möchte und auch keinen Urlaub dort machen möchte.
so everything is just rubble and you can also imagine that people wouldn't like to live there or go there on holiday.

A second type of transition is based on the **inclusion of the photograph in a stream of personal experiences**, thus moving to tell what is not evident in the photograph itself, as outside its frame (relationships, places, events, et.) and as a memory evoked by the photograph. Examples 3 and 4 represent this type of transition. In particular, the transition can be based on **the link between the photograph and the child's personal emotions**. In these cases, there is not a direct correspondence between what is represented in the photograph and the feelings expressed by the child. Example 7 shows the mismatch between what is represented in the photograph (turn 2) and the emotional charge that the photograph implies (turn 7).

Example 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.

A third type of transition is based on the **reference to the function of the photograph**, by defining its importance for children (why did the child bring it?) and how it was used by children or other people (e.g., as a way of remembering). Example 8 shows how the child gives relevance to the castle of Dracula, which is in the photograph.

Example 8

"questa foto rappresenta il castello di Dracula, ci sono andata in vacanza nel duemila quattrodici, in Romania, e desideravo tanto visitare questo castello, e: ci tengo a questa foto perché primo perché è fatta in Romania, quindi è da dove viene mia madre, e perché era da tanto che desideravo andare lì"
"this photo represents the Dracula castle, I went there on holidays in two thousand fourteen, in Romania, and I wanted so much to visit that castle, and: I love this photo because first it's taken in Romania, so it's from where my mother comes, and because it was a long time I wanted to go there"

A forth type of transition is based on **looking at the photograph as a tangible object** and describing its technical aspects. In these cases, children talk about the support, the surface, the format, the quality of preservation of the photos they are handling. In other cases, they comment some elements of the photographic composition, such as light or perspective. In example 9, M2 notices the quality of the surface of his photo id.

Example 9

1. M2:   [è una fo- è una foto: liscia come l'olio
   [this pho- photo is smooth like water
2. FAC: è una foto tessera no?
   It's a photo id, isn't it?
3. M2:   eh liscia [come liscia come l'olio [senza niente
   Eh smooth [like smooth like water [without nothing
4. FAC: [per mettere   [liscia come l'olio
       [to keep   [smooth like water

Following facilitators' invitations to tell, children can choose a specific way of participating actively in the construction of narratives. Facilitation consists in leaving them this choice and supporting it.

4. Transitions between stories

There are different ways of producing transitions between different stories.
Change of teller. This type of transition may be accomplished by children, but it may also be promoted by facilitators. When a child narrates a certain type of experience, other children can intervene spontaneously to narrate similar experiences they lived. The facilitator can promote the narrative of an experience, extending participation to other children, by asking if they lived something similar. Example 3 represents a change of teller, from F1 to M1.
Modes of producing narratives. These are transitions from the third person to the first person. They may be promoted by facilitators, after small group activities, which are concluded through a third person narrative concerning a classmate's photograph, and followed by the "true story" of the child who brought the photograph. This type of transition allows children's telling of stories about other

children's photographs, using imagination and creating connections between stories. Facilitators can invite those who have direct knowledge to tell their versions, after the previous third person versions. **Different types of narratives**, moving from a photograph to another one. This transition can be promoted by facilitators, and accomplished by children or by facilitators themselves, when they explore a specific theme. The new narrative can be linked to something invisible in the photograph, behind its frame. Example 10 regards a transition accomplished by a child. Starting from his picture, M4 tells of when he started walking (turns 1-19), then he provides another narrative about something regarding the same day: his parents' fight that led to divorce (turns 20-30).

Example 10

1. M4:   allora là ho appena iniziato [a camminare
    So there I had just started [walking
2. FAC: [beh innanzitutto dicci perché l'hai portata
    [beh first of all tell us why did you bring it
3. M4:   perché là ho iniziato a camminare
    Because there I started walking
4. FAC: ah questo è stato il giorno in cui hai iniziato a camminare?
    Ah was this the day you started walking?
5. M4:   ((nods))
6. FAC: ma questo te l'ha detto chi?
    But who told you this?
7. M4:   mia madre
    My mum
8. FAC: tua mamma?
    Your mum?
9. M4:   ((nods))
10. FAC: che è quella che ha fatto la foto?
    Is she the one who took the picture?
11. M4:   sì
    Yes
12. FAC: ok quindi
    Ok so
13. M4:   là stavo osservando le caramelle
    There I was watching the candy
14. Many: ((laugh))
15. M4:   che erano sul tavolo
    that were on the table
16. FAC: e le guardavi da lontano perché la mamma ti aveva detto di star fermo?
    And did you watch them by far because mum told you to stay still?
17. M4:   sì
    Yes
18. Alcuni: hh
19. FAC: hh
20. M4:   poi là era il giorno in cui mia madre e mio padre hanno iniziato a litigare
    Then there was the day in which my mum and my dad started figthing
21. FAC: ah quindi è stata una giornata intensa
    Ah so it was an intensive day
22. M4:   ((nods))
23. FAC: tu hai iniziato a camminare
    you started walking,
24. M4:   ((nods))
25. FAC: e hanno iniziato a litigare nel senso che discutevano su questa cosa, (.) o ti ha raccontato la mamma anche questa?
    And they started figthing in the sense that they were discussing on this thing, (.) or did mum tell you about this thing too?

26. M4:   no che stavano litigando che poi hanno anche divorziato
           No that they were fighting and than they divorced too
27. FAC: ah quindi ha portato a un evento insomma significativo (.) e quindi per te come dire è importante da che punto di vista questa foto? più per il fatto che è la giornata in cui hai iniziato a camminare, (.) perché c'eran le caramelle che poi volevi andare a prendere, o per l'altro motivo?
           Ah so you basically brought a meaningful event (.) and so for you let's say this photo is important from what point of view? More because it's the day you started walking, (.) because there were candy that you wanted to reach, or for the other reason?
28. M4:   perché hanno iniziato a litigare e poi cioè è venuto il divorzio quindi
           Because they started fighting and then the divorce came so
29. FAC: mh quindi qui ancora erano tutti e due lì insieme anche se non si vedono
           Mh so here they were still both there together even if we don't see them
30. M4:   sì
           Yes

5. Invitations to talk

The first type of action to facilitate the production of narratives (see Policy Brief 1) is inviting the children to talk. Invitations promote both the beginning of the process of communication (presenting the photograph) and its continuation (inviting to tell its story, to add details and to ask questions to the presenter). There is a variety of types of invitations.

Inviting to present is the first and most obvious type of action that can enhance a child's narrative. In example 10, the facilitator invites F6 to tell about the photograph she brought to school. The invitation is followed by F6's telling about the function and the motivation of choosing the photograph.

Example 10

1. FAC: okay, wollt ihr das Fo- äh Foto wieder in die Mitte legen und dann fragen wir doch mal denjenigen, dem das Bild gehört, derjenigen, der das Bild gehört, ob du uns da vielleiht noch mal mehr zu sagen möchtest.
           okay, then could you put the pho- er photo back into the middle and then we'll ask the person whose picture it is if you ((singular)) would maybe like to say a little more about it.
2. F6:   also, ich komme aus Syrien und ich wohne in Aleppo und diesen Foto habe ich in Internet gesucht und da habe ich ähm, ein Krieg gesehen und da hab ich den Bomb- Bomben wie sie unten fallen und da hab ich natürlich Angst und mh das ist echt nicht gut, dass wir müssen aus dem Syrien flüchten und ich wünsche gegen den Krieg, also weg und äh Syrien wieder gut ist.
           well, I come from Syria and I live in Aleppo and I searched for this photo on internet and I saw em, a war there and and the bo- bomb how they fall down and of course I am scared and that's really not good, that we must to flee Syria and I wish against the war, well, away, and err Syria is good again.

In example 11, the facilitator stresses his question in several ways (turn 1): through a prefacing encouragement ("dai adesso), a a recommendation ("eh"), and a soliciting verbal form ("ce la racconti"). M9 simply answers yes (turn 2), therefore, the facilitator insists to ask for his possible will (turn 3: "hai voglia?"). After a new positive non-verbal answer, the facilitator repeats the invitation through an exhortation (turn 5). This exhortation finally enhances the child's narrative (turn 6). In this case, the facilitator invites the child to tell in a variety of ways, as the child seems to hesitate.

Example 11

1. FAC: **dai adesso ce la racconta eh ce la racconti questa foto?**
           Come on, now he tells us eh you tell us about this photo.
2. M9:   sì

yes

3. FAC: **hai voglia?**
   Would you like?
4. M9: ((nods))
5. FAC: **dai prova a raccontarci la storia di questa foto**
   now, try to tell us the story of this photo
6. M9: che e: ero andato in parco quando ero piccolo (.) avevo due tre mesi, (.) che ero seduto sulla sulla panchina e la mia mamma mi aveva scattato la foto, e poi:: e: poi (..) e: m: (.) che:
   that I went in the park when I was little (.) I was two three months (.) that I was sitting on a bench and my mum took a picture of me, and then and then (..) em (.) that

Inviting to ask is a way of expanding the child's narrative by inviting the classmates to ask questions. In example 12, the facilitator's initial invitation enhances the children's raise of hands, and a series of questions to M5, who presented the photograph.

Example 12

1. FAC: habt ihr eine Frage zu dem Bild?
   do you have a question about the picture?
2. ((children put their hands up))
3. FAC: ((to F2)) ja?
   yes?
4. F2: hier ist- also dieses Bild finde ich irgendwie komisch.
   here is- well I find this picture strange somehow.
5. M8: ja, das ist komisch, weil es ein Bildschirm ist
   yes, it's strange because it's a screen.
6. FAC: ja?
   Really?
7. M9: ich frage mich, wie er im Fernsehen reinkommt.
   I wonder how he got on TV.
8. M5: da war so (.) es gab ein Bildschirm, dahinter war eine Kuppel und da konnte man reingehen und das wird automatisch übertragen halt, aber das war nicht echt im Fernsehen. Es war nur so ein großer Fernseher, wo man reinkommt so.
   it was like this (.) there was a screen, behind it there was a dome. You could go in there and it would be transmitted automatically, but it wasn't really on TV. It was just a big TV where you go into it.

In example 13, the facilitator's invitation to ask concludes a long and rather complex turn, which includes the appreciation of a previous contribution and a comment on it. This invitation is followed by a series of contributions from other children: some questions (turns 2, 6 and 8) and one comment (turn 4), all responded directly by the child who is telling the story (F1). The facilitator joins the children with a question (turn 11), which enhances a long answer.

Example 13

1. FAC: Oh wow. So, we have a huge story from this picture. I was going to ask you actually why did you choose it but I think I know, I think I can see loads of happy memories coming out of it, out of your picture, loads of them. **Does anybody want to ask about the picture, about anything they can see in the picture, about memories, has anybody got any questions that you might like to ask?**
2. M: ((Points to picture)) How old were you?
3. F1: I think two and half.
4. F2: You look massive.
5. F1: I know.
6. F2: Did you do your hair up on that day?
7. F1: No, I just brushed like crazy. I had my head upside down.

8. M: Was it like a traditional dance you did?
9. F1: No, I was doing my shaking
10. ((Laughter))
11. FAC: Is that that you brought in, is that anything to do with it?
12. F1: ((Holds up folder and points to various things inside)) Yeah, that's part of what I got from the goody bag. Someone gave it to me and it's like a folder, and I can just put my personal stuff inside, and this bit he's an elephant god called Ganesh and he (?) and these are silk fabric. And sometimes in weddings you will see these two people, which is (?) and when they got married that's a part of the celebration. So, at that time we celebrated the wedding, the groom and bride were doing a dance of this music but I was doing the wrong music

Inviting to add and expand can be addressed both classmates and the child who is telling a story. In example 12, the invitation to expand follows a non-verbal signal (raising hand). The child who raised her hand asks a question to the child who is narrating and the latter answers to the question. In example 14, the facilitator links her invitation to the previous narrative about a wedding, asking if other children have attended weddings. As many children try to answer to this invitation, the facilitator expands her invitation by identifying a specific child, with the support of the teller (F1). M1 starts to expand the narrative.

Example 14

1. FAC: It sounds really (..) has anybody else here been to a wedding?
2. ((Classroom all talks at once))
3. FAC: Who wants to share with me about their wedding favourite experiences? Who can remember going to a wedding and share something about it. ((F1 points to people in class))
4. M1: I was at a wedding and you know the platform they go to to get married

In example 15, the invitation to expand is addressed to the child who is telling the story. After two questions, which clarify the general setting of the story (turns 1 and 3), the facilitator invites F9 to expand her story of the Moroccan feast (turn 5). As in example 3, the child starts to expand the narrative.

Example 15

1. FAC: ma questa fotografia in che occasione è stata fatta?
   But in what occasion was this picture taken?
2. F9: in una festa in Marocco
   During a feast in Morocco
3. FAC: una festa in Marocco (.) e: quindi la particolarità di questa foto è tipica (.) del paese: dove vivevano i tuoi?
   A feast in Morocco (.) and: so the peculiarity of this photo is typical (.) of the country where your parents used to live?
4. F9: sì
   Yes
5. FAC: ci puoi raccontare questa: questa vicenda? In cui: hai fatto questa foto te la ricordi?
   Can you tell us about this: this occasion? In which: you took that photo do you remember it?
6. F9: e: sì e: ero: cioè mia madre l'ha fatta perché dovevamo darla a mio padre (.) che era in Italia
   E: yes e: I was: well my mother took it because we had to give it to my father (.) who was in Italy

A variety of actions can enhance children's narratives, in different situations, such as presenting a photograph and its description, adding further elements to the ongoing narrative, involving classmates to expand with new narratives, or to ask for more details about the ongoing narrative. Against this background, it can be useful to combine different types of invitations, regarding presentation, additional elements, expansions and questions. In example 16, the facilitator firstly invites M1 to

present (turn 1), then she invites M1 to add further details (turns 5 and 11), finally she invites other children to ask (turn 25). F1 takes the floor to ask a question.

Example 16

1. FAC: So, there's been some extra pictures and we've got lots on here that we're going to look at in a minute, but one special one from up here. Do you want to hold it up because it's not on the screen. There you go. **Okay and can you tell us a bit about it?**
2. M1: ((smiles)) This was in St James's Park and my dad bought me an ice cream and then when I was eating it, it got all over my mouth.
3. FAC: It went all over everywhere. St James's Park in London?
4. M1: Yeah.
5. FAC: Okay and last week you were really excited about wanting to bring in a picture, didn't you, you said to us you're going to definitely bring in a picture this week to share **and why did you choose that one?**
6. M1: Because it reminds me of how I was when I was really young.
7. FAC: And how do you think you looked when you were smaller?
8. M1: ((Smiles nervously)) I'm not sure.
9. FAC: You're not sure. Well you look like you're enjoying your ice cream.
10. M1: Yeah.
11. FAC: **And do you want to share with us anything else about the picture?**
12. M1: I was four years old, I think, and my mum took this picture.
13. FAC: And (..) does it bring back some special memories?
14. M1: Yeah.
15. FAC: What sort of memories does it bring back?
16. M1: It brings back how fun it was eating it.
17. FAC: And anything else?
18. M1: ((Smiles)) My family was laughing.
19. FAC: They are. So who else was with you?
20. M1:   It was my mum, my dad and my uncle.
21. FAC: And can you remember back to that day or do you
22. M1: I remember.
23. FAC: You do, so it's your own memory of it. And what was the best, best thing of the day, do you think?
24. M1: ((Smiles warmly)) Eating the ice cream.
25. FAC: So you like ice cream? **Would you like to share anything else about your picture or would anybody like to ask you, does anybody want to ask?**
26. F1: ((Smiles)) What flavour ice cream was it?

It is important to add that problems can arise when the invitation is too general, and thus expansions are not sufficiently oriented, or when it is too specific, and thus the topic of the expansion cannot be shared or valued as interesting by the other children.

6. Questions

The examples in Section 6 show that questions are very useful to enhance the production of narratives. Different types of questions are frequently combined to facilitate the production of narratives. Through this combination, facilitators can become co-tellers of narratives, supporting their production.

There are two important aspects in asking questions: (1) the way of starting a sequence of questions, and (2) the way in which different types of questions are chained in this sequence. The SHARMED experience shows that **focused questions** seems to be more frequent than **open questions**. Questions are focused when they aim to enhance a short answer, such as a yes or no, or a choice between two alternatives. This does not imply that the answer will be short, but that the question invites a short answer. Questions are open when they suggest expanded answers, as they do not provide any

suggestion about possible answers (such as a yes/no, or possible alternatives). Open questions can more easily enhance the expansion of narratives.

Open questions are certainly useful to invite children to develop their narratives. However, open questions may be followed by focused questions, used to check and clarify the ongoing narratives. In example 17, the first open question (turn 2) aims to clarify the child's feeling about her certificate of birth, which she has presented in turn 1. Rather than responding, the child starts to tell an episode linked to this certificate (turn 3). The facilitator asks a series of focused questions, checking some details about this episode (turns 4, 6, 8 and 10). This series of focused questions supports the development of the child's narrative.

Example 17

1. F1: This shows my name, my date of birth and how much I weigh (..) I look at it now and I didn't weigh that much
2. FAC: No (..) and **how does it make you feel to look at your kind of certificate of birth to say this (..) here I am, I'm here, this is the day I was born on, the eighth of November**
3. F1: Um, I remember one thing, once I was in my room and then um, my sister was there and then I said am I really alive and then she got this and she said yes you're alive because if you weren't alive, you wouldn't have this
4. FAC: That's true (..) **and how old were you when you when you said this to your sister? When did that happen?**
5. F1: When I was four I think
6. FAC: **and do you remember that? Do you remember it? Do you remember saying that?** So the certificate saying that to your sister am I alive and she said you must be because you've got your birth certificate (..) cool (..) **I wonder if she remembers that, your sister**
7. F1: Yeah (..) she um she, she teases me because of that
8. FAC: **What, she thinks it's funny that you asked if you were alive?**
9. F1: ((nods))
10. FAC: **and how old is your sister?**
11. F1: Twelve

The importance of focused questions to clarify and check is also evident when combined to open questions, which enhance the expansion of narratives. In example 18, the facilitator asks two focused questions (turns 1 and 3) to check the way in which the photograph was taken, then he expands the narrative through two open questions (turns 5 and 7) about the reasons of the child's choice. Finally, he asks three focused questions to clarify the child's habits about taking photographs.

Example 18

1. FAC: **ma questa foto che hai scattato alla mamma (.) hai deciso tu la p- dove sei? (.) hai de- hai deciso tu la posa in cui si doveva mettere la mamma o la mamma si è messa in posa da sola?**
   But this picture that you took to your mum (.) did you decide the e- where are you? (.) did you de- did you decide the exposure in which your mum should stay or did your mum exposed herself.
2. M5: io l'ho messa
   I did it
3. FAC: **hai deciso tu?**
   Did you decide?
4. M5: sì
   yes
5. FAC: **e come mai hai scelto questa posa?**
   And how did you choose this exposure?
6. M5: e::
7. FAC: **cioè c'è un motivo per cui l'hai fatta sedere così:?**

8. M5: no è la mamma che tipo si è: (.) che si è messa in posa e: (.) io ho fatto la foto
No it is my mum who well did (.) that exposed herself and: (.) I took the photo
9. FAC: ma era la prima volta che facevi una foto alla mamma?
But was that the first time you took a picture to the your mum?
10. M5: no
11. FAC: **ti capita spesso di farle?**
Does it happen frequently that you take them?
12. M5: delle volte
Sometimes
13. FAC: **e in che altre occasioni: l'hai fotografata?**
In which other situations did you took a picture of her?
14. M5: in casa, fuori casa, (.) alle feste, (.) ai matrimoni
At home, outside my house, at the parties (.) at weddings
15. FAC: quindi te [fai sempre le foto alla mamma
So, you always take picture to your mum
   M5:   [in chiesa   ((he shrugs his shoulders and extends one harm))
                                 [in church
16. FAC: **ma solo alla mamma o fai anche altre fotografie?**
But only to your mum ar do you also take other pictures?
17. M5: gli scrivo i messaggi
I write messages to her

In example 19, the facilitator checks a detail about the photograph (turn 1), then she expands on seasons in the child's country (turn 4). After this expansion, she checks further details about the season (turns 7, 9 and 11), finally asking two additional focused questions on the mosque represented in the photograph (turns 13 and 15).

Example 19

1. FAC: mhmh ((zu F7)) und **welche Jahreszeit ist das, das Foto? Weißt du das?**
mm-hm ((to F7)) and what season is it, in the photo? Do you know?
2. F7: mh ((shakes head))
3. M12: im Januar ((lacht))
January ((laughs))
4. FAC: **welche Jahreszeiten gibt's denn bei euch?**
what seasons do you have there?
5. Child: ((sneezes))
6. Others: Gesundheit
bless you
7. FAC: **ist das so wie hier in Deutschland?**
is it like here in Germany?
8. ((F7 nods))
9. FAC: **und gibt's auch richtig Winter?**
and is it real winter, too?
10. F7: °°ja°°
°°yes°°
11. FAC: **gibt es Schnee?**
does it snow?
12. F7: °° ja°°
°°yes°°
13. FAC: ok, schön (.) und ich hab auch noch ne Frage. **Wenn da nur Männer und Jungs rein dürfen. Hast du das dann bisher nur als Foto gesehen? Oder durftest du auch schon mal irgendwo in eine Moschee?**
okay, great (.) and I have another question. If only men and boys are allowed in, did you only

14. F7: °°ja, doch auch°°
     °°yes, that too°°

15. FAC: **ja?**
     yes?

16. F7: °°ja das ist Mädchen, wo Mädchen gehen und [lernen]°°
     °°yes that is girl, where girl go and [study]°°

Series of questions are particularly effective when focused questions and open questions are combined and alternated. This combination allows to check and clarify, on the on hand, and to enhance expansions, on the other. In example 20, the alternation is between groups of questions: three focused questions are followed by four open questions. The facilitator starts with a focused question to clarify how F1 would define her father. This is furtherly checked in turns 3 and 5. From turn 9, and then in turns 11, 17 and 21, the facilitator asks open questions, first to enhance an expansion about the relations between F1 and her parents, then to explore some episodes of this relation. Turn 17 is technically a focused question, but the facilitator's intention is clearly to expand and the question is understood by F1 as open.

Example 20

1. FAC: **è un amico che: insomma: è più papà o più amico?**
     He is a friend that, in short is he more a dad or a friend?

2. F1: più papa
     More dad

3. FAC: **più papà?**
     More dad?

4. F1: sì
     Yes

5. FAC: **e quando gli chiedi di uscire cosa ti: (2.0) non fare cavolate [come al tuo amico?**
     And when you ask him to go out what does (2.0) don't do stupid things as to your friend?

6. F1:   [hh   no:
     usciamo insieme ma di più prende esce con mio fratello e quindi
     we go out together but more frequently he goes out with my brother and so

7. FAC: fanno delle uscite da tra maschi
     They go out as males

8. F1: sì
     yes

9. FAC: **ah e tu invece con chi esci?**
     Ah and instead with whom do you go out?

10. F1: con la mamma di più: ma: non così tanto né con la mamma ma di più con
     il papà diciamo
     More with my mum but not so much neither with my mum but more with my dad let's say.

11. FAC: **mh e quando uscite insieme che cosa vi piace fare?**
     Mh and when you go out what do you like to do?

12. F1: o andiamo al cinema, (.) o andiamo fuori con papà a fare a fare delle passeggiate, poi gli dico
     tutte le mie cose (.) non così tante ma quelle che non le dico alla mamma le dico al papà
     *either we go to the cinema (.) or we go out with dad for some beautiful walks, the I say him all
     my things (.) not so many but those that I don't tell to my mum, I say to my dad*

13. FAC: in modo che [se loro si scambiano le informazioni [sanno tutto di te
     So that if they exchange their information they know everything about you

14. F1:   [sì   [hh
                  [*yes*

15. FAC: **eh?**

16. F1: quasihh
     almosthh

17. FAC: **ho capitoh e: e: c'è una una una vicenda una volta particolare in cui è accaduto che ti**

ricordi (.) che: (3.0) è stato un momento per te importante del di un'uscita?

I understand and and there is one one event once particular in which it happened that you remember (.) that (3.0) there has been an important moment in going out for you

18. F1: ((she bends her head on one side))
19. FAC: no
20. F1: una volta di nascosto sono uscita con mio padre hh
    once I went out with my father secretly hh
21. FAC: **di nascosto da chi?**
    Secretly from whom?
22. F1: hh io e mio padre perché mia mamma non voleva
    Hh I and my father because my mum did not want

In example 21, the facilitator starts with a focused question to check M1's assessment of the party that the child mentioned in turn 1. This question is followed by an open question (turn 4), by a new focused question to check the meaning of the child's answer (turn 6) and by a new open question, which explores the meaning of the child's story (turn 8). This exploration continues with another open question (turn 12), followed by a focused question (turn 14) to check further details of the story. The following two open questions promote an expansion on the nature of the party (turns 19 and 23), while the final focused question (turn 25) supports the child's answer to the second open question. This example shows how focused questions can be used both as a way of introducing open questions and as a way of supporting children's answers to open questions.

Example 21

1. M1: That's my favorite toy and it reminds me of my favorite toy. I still have it. I use it as a decoration and it also reminds me of the time I went to a party, it was really fun.
2. FAC: **Was it a good party?**
3. M1: Yeah.
4. FAC: **What can you remember from it, what's your biggest memory from the party?**
5. M1: ((Hand over face)). A food fight.
6. FAC: **A food fight, at the party?**
7. M1: Yeah.
8. FAC: **And can I ask who started it?**
9. M1: ((Hand over face, laughing)) Another (..) I had another friend, he came and he threw a piece of cake at someone and the person threw it back
10. ((Laughter))
11. M1: And then a few more people started and then everyone started doing it.
12. FAC: **Was there a lot of people at the party and what did the adults do when this food fight started?**
13. M1: The adults hid behind the wall.
14. FAC: **Did you get any of the adults with the cake?**
15. M1: No.
16. FAC: They were safe, okay.
17. M1: I nearly hit my mum.
18. ((Laughter))
19. FAC: And do you remember (..) **can I ask what was the party for?**
20. MI: can't remember.
21. F1: Was it like a tradition?
22. M1: Yeah.
23. FAC: **Where was it taken?**
24. M1: In (..) I can't remember. I was just like four, five.
25. FAC: **Were you in the UK, was that in England, was that in the UK?**
26. M1: Yeah.

6. Minimal responses

Minimal types of feedback are very frequent ways of showing attention to children's contributions. Minimal feedback has two functions: (1) supporting children's active participation and production of narratives; (2) recognising the importance of specific aspect of children's stories and comments.

6.1 Continuers and repetitions

The function of supporting active participation is accomplished through the use of **continuers,** i.e. very short signals of attention, and **repetitions** of previously uttered words or parts of sentences. Continuers are very short feedback that invite children to continue to tell. They include interrogative confirmations, short confirmations and para-verbal signals. Examples 22-25 show how continuers (in bold) can effectively enhance children's narratives.

Example 22

1. FAC: ein paar Klassen höher? Magst du mal erzählen wie das, wie das war das Spiel?
   a couple of year groups older than you? Would you like to tell how, what the game was like?
2. M5: mhm. gut. ja.
   mm-hm. Good. Yeah.
3. FAC: **ja?**
   yeah?
4. M5: ja.
   yeah.

Example 23

1. FAC: seit neun Jahren. Ich weiß gar nicht, whatsapp gibts das so lange.
   for nine years. I don't even know, has Whatsapp even been around that long.
2. M1: nee, äh. Früher haben wir halt immer telefoniert.
   nah, er, before that we always spoke on the phone.
3. FAC: **mhm.**
4. M1: und dann haben wir irgendwann so geschrieben.
   and then at some point we just texted like that.

Example 24

1. F1: Um, I think it was the day before Halloween and I had a (cannot hear) red mask and um, I was underneath the cot at the time and my sister, I think I was about three…
2. FAC: **Yeah**
3. F1: I can't remember and my sister was in the cot and back when we lived in (names area) and she was in the rocking thing ((does motions with hand)) and I started rocking the thing because I was on the other side and she was sleeping on her tummy
4. FAC: **Uh huh**
5. F1: and then I came out and I put the mask on (..) when she saw my face, my actual face, she started crying and when I put my mask on, the scary mask on, she stopped crying

Example 25

1. FAC: ma che rapporto avevi col nonno? Ti ricordi?
   But what relation did you have with your grandfather? Do you remember?
2. F9: e di solito perché cioè le ultime: l'ultimo mese è stato in ospedale
   e usually because the last: the last month he has been in hospital
3. FAC: **ah**
4. F9: e poi dopo e: una dopo una [settima-

		Then after e: one after one [wee
5.	FAC:	[quindi è morto con una malattia
		[so he died with a illness
6.	F9:	sì cioè la polmonite [credo
		Yes well pneumonia [I believe
7.	FAC:	**[ah**
8.	F9:	poi dopo è tornato a casa però non a casa sua a casa nostra, perché se no cioè da solo non con la nonna non riusciva a stare, cioè nel senso non:
		then he came back home but nota at his home, at our home because if not I mean alone didn't with my grandmother he couldn't stay, I mean as he didn't:
9.	FAC:	aveva bisogno di essere [accudito
		He need to be looked after
10.	F9:	[sì
		[yes
11.	FAC:	**mh**
12.	F9:	e: e dopo una settimana però se n- è andato in cielo
		And and after a week however he went to heaven
13.	FAC:	**ah**
14.	F9:	e: quindi cioè tipo avevo quella foto stavo guardando le foto la mattina: perché se n'è andato la mattina presto, e quindi dopo cioè e: c'eravamo io e mio fratello che non capivamo perché e: mia mamma non ci svegliava, e: che dovevamo andare a scuola
		so well I had that picture I was looking at the photos in the morning because he died early in the morning and therefore after I and my brother didn't understand why and my mum didn't wake us up e. that we did go to school.
15.	FAC:	((**nods**))
16.	F9:	e quindi dopo un po' andiamo giù a cercare e troviamo la mamma e mio pa- e: mia nonna che piange
		So after a while we go downstairs to look for and we find our mum and my fa- and my grandmother who was crying.
17.	FAC:	((**nods**))
18.	F9:	e quindi dopo ci spiegan tutto e: insomma e va beh e succede
		And so then they explain us everything and: well it happens

Repetitions reproduce the previous turn or part of it, thus showing listening and encouraging further talk. Examples 26 and 27 show the use of repetitions (in bold). In example 26, the function of repetition is emphasised by the interrogative tone, which highlights the facilitator's interest.

Example 26

1.	FAC:	e: la cosa che ti ha colpito di più a Roma?
		And: what impressed you the most in Rome?
2.	F7:	il Colosseo
		The Colosseo
3.	FAC:	**il Colosseo?**
		The Colosseo?
4.	F7:	((annuisce)) sì io sì mio padre no perché ha detto che l'ha un po' deluso ma a me sì
		((nods)) yes me yes my father not because he said that it disappointed him a bit but me yes

Example 27

1.	FAC:	jetzt erstmal zu dem mit den Beleidigungen, okay?
		first of all the one with the insults, okay?
2.	F5:	nee, eigentlich ist so gemischt, manchmal is egal, manchmal nicht.
		no, actually it's mixed, sometimes it doesn't matter to me, sometimes it does.
3.	FAC:	okay, **manchmal egal, manchmal nicht.**
		okay, sometimes it doesn't matter, sometimes it does.

4. F2:   mir ist eigentlich voll egal. Jetzt wollte ich natürlich noch was fragen.
         it doesn't matter to me at all actually. Now I wanted to ask something of course.

Continuers and repetitions are very similar in all settings of SHARMED activities.This means that they can be used independently from social and cultural contexts. They display "active listening", i.e. sensitivity for the expressed contents or intentions, in particular for expressed needs and feelings. Repetitions of words or parts of sentences show listening more explicitly than continuers do. This however does not mean that they are more effective in enhancing narratives.

6.2 Acknowledgment tokens

The function of recognizing the importance of specific aspect of children's stories and comments is accomplished by **acknowledgement tokens.** These are claims of receipt of the prior utterance, stressing interest, surprise or affect. Acknowledgement tokens can show positive feedback more clearly than continuers and repetitions. This type of minimal feedback has the function of showing recognition of the interlocutor's right of talk. It shows interest or concern for the child's contribution. Examples 28-30 show different types of acknowledgment tokens (in bold), which may be used in different linguistic contexts and by different facilitators. In example 7 (Italian setting), "ah però" shows emphasised surprise for the story, followed by a second type of acknowledgment ("aia"), which shows understanding of the negative part of the story, in this case the death of the child's grandmother. Examples 8 and 9 show a similar acknowledgment token ("oh"), used in both the German and the UK setting.

Example 28

1. M2:   e è affondato con tutto il sottomarino
         And he sank with the whole submarine
2. FAC: **ah però!** E quindi sono rimaste le due nonne da sole
         Just guess! And so the grandmothers remained alone
3. M2:   sì
         Yes
4. FAC: che però tu non hai conosciuto
         That however you didn't know
5. M2:   no no no queste qua ci sono cioè la mia nonna quella di quello che è morto nel sottomarino è morta quest'anno
         No no these ones are still there well my grandmother that of the one who died in the submarine died this year
6. **FAC: aia**
7. M2:   e invece l'altra è mort- cioè l'altra invece cioè è ancora viva
         And instead the other one is d- I mean the other one is still alive

Example 29

1. F7:   war die Katze auch schon länger bei euch?
         did the cat live with you for a long time?
2. F10:   ja, die war schon ganz schön lang bei uns. So ein und ein halbes Jahr war die bei uns. pff. und dann wurde sie überfahren
         yes,she was with us for a really long time. About one and one half years she was with us. Pfft. and then she got run over.
3. FAC: **ohh.**
4. F10:   und dann haben wir sie auf der Straße gefunden, wo sie überfahren wurde.
         and then we found her on the street where she had been run over.

Example 30

1. FAC: Yes? ((nods)) it's cool, isn't it?
2. F1:   Yeah (..) but there was a green cup (..) and I was so scared because she was shaking around and screaming
3. FAC: **Oh!**
4. F1:   and then I was crying and my brother started laughing at me and calling me a scaredy-cat

Continuers and acknowledgements can be combined, showing listening and stressing important aspects of narratives: Extracts 31 and 32 show this combination ("mhm" and "oh"; "uh uh" and "oooh"; "uh uh" and "aaah").

Example 31

1. M1:   So I was in Portugal
2. FAC: **Uh huh**
3. M1:   and I was four years old and my sister was six
4. FAC: **Uh huh**
5. M1:   and um (..) my sister was with my cousin but I didn't know how to swim and then she pushed me into the water because I couldn't swim but I ended up drowning
6. FAC: **oooh!**
7. M1:   so my sister had to rescue me

Example 32

1. F3:   ähm, mein Pap-, mein Bruder hat drei Mal gewonnen in fünf Kämpfen   und ich hab fünf Mal und dann hat mein Bruder (?) weil er nur Bronze gekriegt hat.
         emm, my da- my brother won three times out of five matches and I won five times and then my brother did (?) because he only got bronze.
2. FAC: **mhm.**
   F3:   und ich hab Gold. und dann war mein Bruder lang drei Tage lang auf mich zickig.
         and I got gold. My brother was bitchy with me for three whole days after that.
3. FAC: drei tage lang?
         three whole days?
4. ((F3 nods*))*
5. FAC: **oh**

7. Formulations

In many circumstances, much more elaborated types of feedback, i.e. **formulations**, are more effective than minimal feedback to support and recognise children's stories and comments. Formulation is a type of utterance that elaborates the gist of previous utterances. Formulations are a powerful type of support for children's utterances. In the SHARMED activities, facilitators have used two types of formulations to give feedback to children's stories and comments: (1) **explications** of children's utterances, which clarify their contents; (2) **developments** of children's utterances, which add information to their content while preserving a clear reference to it. Explications can also be summaries when the formulated turn is long. Developments are more risky than explications, as their degree of elaboration of children's utterances is higher: they take the gist of previous utterances as point of departure for relevant expansions.

Example 33 shows two explications. In turn 3, the facilitator explicates the child's sacrifice in doing sport, which was previously described by M11. This explication enhances M11's confirmation and expansion (turn 4), which is again explicated by the facilitator (turn 5). The second explication enhances another expansion of the child's narrative (turn 6). Example 12 clearly shows the effectiveness of explications in enhancing expansions.

Example 33

1. FAC: e cosa ti ha spinto a fare questa fotografia?
   and what led you to take this photo?
2. M11: perché cioè volevo comunque ricordarmi anche tipo in futuro che: comunque se non avevo smesso di nuotare oppure avevo tipo litigato con i miei compagni una cosa del genere che comunque (.) avevo fatti molto sacri- avevo fatto molti sacrifici e: da quando ero ragazzo per: nuotare così tanto: fare:
   because well I also wanted to remember in the future that: anyway if I had not left swimming or I had fighted with my playmates or something like that anyway (.) I had made many sacri- I had made many sacrifices and: since I was a boy to: to swim so much: to make:
3. FAC: **perché è lo sport del nuoto implica sacrifici**
   Because swimming implies sacrifices
4. M11: sì cioè com- io faccio cinque giorni a settimana cioè e fra compiti, scuola, e: e: nuoto non riesco [molto a:
   yes well li- I practice five days a week and with homeworks, school, and: and: swimming I am [not able to
5. FAC: [**quindi lo fai a livello agonistico**
   [so you do it competitively
6. M11: sì non riesco molto a vedermi con i miei amici tipo molte volte i miei amici mi chiedono esci stasera oppure (.) a: oggi pomeriggio e io gli devo dire di no perché ho: nuoto
   Yes I'm not able to see much my friends as many times they ask me are you going out tonight or (.) a:in the afternoon and I have to say no because I have: to swim

Example 34 regards a development. The place where the child's relatives live is developed as an opportunity to see them more frequently (turn 3). This formulation enhances the child's further comment about the time he passes with them (turn 4).

Example 34

1. FAC: e invece gli altri vivono qui a Modena?
   And what about the others they live here in Modena?
2. M3:   sì a Modena
   Yes in Modena
3. FAC: **quindi li vedi più spesso**
   So you see them more frequently
4. M3:   beh sì anche se non è che ogni giorno sto con loro
   Well yes even if I don't stay with them everyday

Examples 33 and 34 show that formulations frequently follow question-answer sequences: the facilitator starts with a question, then s/he formulates the child's answer to this question. These examples also show that facilitators' pay attention to children's story successfully. Children's expansions of stories and comments signal that formulations are successful in enhancing the interactional production of narratives.

However, formulations can also be followed by very short confirmations. Children's short confirmations signal that the gist of their utterances has been correctly understood and interpreted by the facilitator, as in example 35 (turn 3, development) and example 36 (turn 7, explication).

Example 35

1. FAC: and how old is your sister?
2. F1:   Twelve
3. FAC: **so she's quite a bit older then**
4. F1:   Yeah

Example 36

1. FAC: ma: la fotografia per quale motivo era stata fatta? Perché vedo che avete degli abiti articolari tutti uguali che cosa raccontaci che cosa significa
   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. F7:   eh che: siamo uniti, cosa che non è vera perché quello non è mio padre ma è mio zio,
   eh that: we are united, which is not true because that is not my father but my uncle,
3. FAC: sì
   yes
4. F7:   e: (.) mettendo i vestiti con lo stesso tessuto,
   e: (.) wearing dresses made of the same tissue,
5. FAC: sì
   Yes
6. F7:   sembra che siamo tutt'uno
   It seems that we are one
7. FAC: **ah l'idea di avere lo stesso abito lo stesso: tessuto è l'unione**
   Ah the idea that you have the same dress the same: tissue it's union
8. F7:   ((nods))

Developments are more frequently followed by children's **disclaimers**. Children can take the opportunity offered by the formulation to assert their authority about knowledge. In example 37, the child narrates that his two grandfathers were killed in war. The facilitator, after an acknowledgement, formulates the development of the two grandmothers as left alone. The child confirms. Then, the facilitator adds another development, guessing that M2 did not know his grandmothers (turn 4). The child rejects this second development, clarifying that he has known them.

Example 37

1. M2:   e è affondato con tutto il sottomarino
   And he sank with the whole submarine
2. FAC: **ah però! E quindi sono rimaste le due nonne da sole**
   Just guess! And so the grandmothers remained alone
3. M2:   sì
   Yes
4. FAC: **che però tu non hai conosciuto**
   That however you didn't know
5. M2:   no no no queste qua ci sono cioè la mia nonna quella di quello che è morto nel sottomarino è morta quest'anno
   No no these ones are still there well my grandmother that of the one who died in the submarine died this year

In the previous examples, formulations are provided in specific and dedicated turns. In other cases, they may be encapsulated in longer turns, in which they can be prefaced by acknowledgement tokens and followed by questions. In example 38, turn 2, the facilitator acknowledges the child's utterance, explicates the child's telling about her brother who wrote her name when he was four, then she asks an open question about the reason of the child's choice of the photo. The child explains the reason with a long expansion.

Example 38

1. F1:   Well this was when my little brother ((name)) wrote my name when he was four (..) um (..) and (..) I was eight (..) and I was at my desk so he made it for me to put on my desk
2. FAC: And is that (..) **so your brother, your younger brother ((name)) was four when he wrote your name** and how come you brought that in today?

3. F1:   because I was just looking at my desk this morning and I thought it looked a little bit dull and then I started putting stickers on it and when I was putting stickers on it this (points at the photo on the projector) fell off and then I saw it and then I remembered that it was the SHARMED project today and it would be nice to bring it in

In example 39, turn 10, the facilitator develops the narrative about Christmas meetings as a "nice way of getting the family together", then she asks a focused question to know if the children have family in the area; one child confirms.

Example 39

1. M4:   trink ich auch gerne
          I like to drink them too
2. F1:   ja, trinken wir gerne.
          yeah, we like to drink those.
3. FAC: **ein Eisgetränk.** Mögt ihr das alle gerne?
          an ice drink. Do you all like that?
4. M4:   ja
          yes

Questions enhance children's reactions. With few exceptions, focused questions enhance short confirmations and open questions enhance expansions. Therefore, adding questions after formulations does not seem particularly effective in enhancing children's contributions when questions are focused. It seems more effective if questions are open. In any case, combining formulations and questions is a way to speed the interaction up, rather than to give more space to children's contributions.

Sometimes, explications and developments are combined in short sequences, aiming to enhance children's expansions. In these sequences, children's last contribution is frequently a short confirmation, signalling that both mutual understanding and joint construction of the narrative have been completed. Frequently, this confirmation follows a development. In example 40, after two preliminary continuers, the facilitator explicates the meaning of the child's utterance (turn 5) in interrogative tone (turn 6). The child confirms and adds details to her story. In turn 7, the facilitator develops the story ("to keep her happy") and the child provides a short confirmation.

Example 40

1. F1:   Um, I think it was the day before Halloween and I had a (cannot hear) red mask and um, I was underneath the cot at the time and my sister, I think I was about three
2. FAC: Yeah
3. F1:   I can't remember and my sister was in the cot and back when we lived in ((names area)) and she was in the rocking thing ((does motions with hand)) and I started rocking the thing because I was on the other side and she was sleeping on her tummy
4. FAC: Uh huh
5. F1:   and then I came out and I put the mask on (..) when she saw my face, my actual face, she started crying and when I put my mask on, the scary mask on, she stopped crying
6. FAC: ((laughs)) **so she (..) it was the other way round? ((laughs and F1 nods)) so she thought you looked better with the mask on?** ((laughs))
7. F1:   Yeah ((laughs)) and I had the mask on for literally all day until I went to bed
8. FAC: **to keep her happy**
9. F1:   Yeah ((giggles))

Example 41, which is an expansion of example 16, shows a combination between different types of formulations enhances a series of short confirmation, expanded rejection, expansion and new short

confirmation. After M2's preliminary narrative on his grandfathers, supported by the facilitator's continuers (turns 2, 4 and 6), the facilitator develops this narrative through a formulation (turn 8). As M2 has narrated that his two grandfathers have been killed during the war, the facilitator, after an acknowledgement stressing the importance of the situation, formulates the development of the two grandmothers as left alone. The child confirms this formulation and the facilitator adds the development that M2 did not know the grandmothers (turn 10). This time the child rejects the formulation, clarifying that he has known them. After the facilitator's question about the existence of other photographs (turn 14), M2 tells of old habits about photography (turn 17), and the facilitator adds a development that confirms the child's contribution (turn 18). This formulation is confirmed an expanded by M2 (turn 19), then expanded again by the facilitator's development (turn 20), until the child's final confirmation (turn 22).

Example 41

1. M2: ((annuisce)) sì perché due i cioè io avevo due nonni no?
   ((nods)) yes because two the well I had two grandfathers right?
2. FAC: sì
   Yes
3. M2: che hanno combattuto il primo è stato ucciso in guerra
   Who fighted the first one was killed during the war
4. FAC: ah
5. M2: il secondo è: sempre in guerra lui era andato in una spedizione con con un sottomarino che si chiamava il gorgo,
   the second one is: in war too he took part in an expedition with with a submarine that was called "il gorgo"
6. FAC: sì
   yes
7. M2: e è affondato con tutto il sottomarino
   And he sank with the whole submarine
8. FAC: **ah però! E quindi sono rimaste le due nonne da sole**
   Just guess! And so the grandmothers remained alone
9. M2: sì
   Yes
10. FAC: **che però tu non hai conosciuto**
   That however you didn't know
11. M2: no no no queste qua ci sono cioè la mia nonna quella di quello che è morto nel sottomarino è morta quest'anno
   No no these ones are still there well my grandmother that of the one who died in the submarine died this year
12. FAC: aia
13. M2: e invece l'altra è mort- cioè l'altra invece cioè è ancora viva
   And instead the other one is d- I mean the other one is still alive
14. FAC: ho capito ma delle foto dove loro sono insieme le hai oppure solo quelle di guerra?
   I understand but do you have some photos in which they are together or do you have only the war ones?
15. M2: no solo quelle di guerra
   No only the war ones
16. FAC: ho capito
   I understand
17. M2: perché non ci son mai state perché loro stavano cioè stavano insieme fino a cioè in quel tempo lì a quei tempi lì c'era comunque la guerra se ne stavano insieme prima di essere richiamati a fare: la guerra vera e propria e quindi cioè non avevano: la macchina fotografica
   Because there's never been because they were already well they were together until well at that time at that time there was the war and they were together until they were called for the real war and then I mean they had no camera
18. FAC: **sì non c'era abitudine a fare le foto[grafie**

		Yes there was not the habit to take pi[ctures
19.	M2:	[esatto e poi è diventata abitudine quando eran già in guerra e: [cioè non
		[exactly and then it became an habit when they were already at war and: [well didn't
20.	FAC:	**[e quindi restano solo quelle foto lì**
		[and so only that photos remain
21.	M2:	sì
		Yes

8. Facilitators' personal contributions

Facilitators' personal contributions are risky actions, since they upgrade facilitators' epistemic authority. **Epistemic authority** is a very delicate issue for facilitation. Facilitators are active in producing knowledge by coordinating interactions. It is illusory to think that authority in producing knowledge, while coordinating interactions, can be cancelled. However, facilitation aims to use this authority to upgrade children's authority in narrating, commenting, showing their feelings, i.e. in displaying their agency. Facilitators' personal contributions can be useful to enhance children's narratives; however, they are also a risky way of imposing the facilitators' authority. During the SHARMED activities, the facilitators provided four types of personal contributions: comments, appreciations, stories and displacing utterances.

8.1 Personal comments

Comment is a type of "upshot" formulation, i.e. a formulation that, rather than elaborating the gist of children' previous utterances, creates new meaning, which is thus authored by the facilitator. Facilitators' comments add external meanings to children's narratives. Their general function is stressing the relevance of these narratives. Thus, comments can be effective way of supporting children's contributions, giving them a positive meaning. In example 42, the facilitator shows her affect for M2's accident. Affect is stressed by the non-verbal touch of his neck. Moreover, the facilitator's affective action is reinforced through the final thank and further non-verbal support.

Example 42

1.	M2:	Um, so my sister, she told me to go on this ride, called Vampire and I was like, fine, I'll go on it and then I went on it and then on the last part I was going up, I didn't know if I was going to go down (..) I went down really, really fast and then my head was forward, so when you're going down, I smashed my head because I was going so fast and then at the end I said I think I broke my neck
2.	FAC:	Aah
3.	M2:	and then I went on a long ride and I went (?) and then the first one made my belly go over and the second one, I wasn't holding on so I fell out of the (..) um… (..) ride (?)
4.	FAC:	Wow (..) **that must've been really painful ((touches own neck)) (..) I can feel your (..) I can feel (..) it sounds really painful** (..) ok (..) thank you very, very much for sharing that ((gives M2 double thumbs up))

Comments can also enhance children's reflection. Example 43 shows an invitation to reflect on an important topic, which supports the children's contributions to the interaction. The facilitator asks for the permission to say something that can be difficult for the children (turn 1), then he introduces a comment, in hypothetical form, on the difference between role and person (turns 3 and 6). This difference is confirmed by some children. The facilitator asks for other circumstances in which the children are involved, as either persons or roles (turn 8). This question enhances a series of contributions (turns 9-28), supported by the facilitator through questions and formulations (turns 13, 15, 19, 21, 24).

Example 43

1. FAC: **posso provare a dire una cosa difficile?**
         May I try to tell something difficult?
2. ((some children say yes))
3. FAC: **poi mi dite se: (.) [..] può essere che quando uno è nel ruolo (.) che deve co- fare, (.) a**
         quel punto lascia un po' più da parte la sua persona poi invece quando è finito tutto –
         then you will say if: (.) it [..] may it be that when one is in a role (.) that he must co- do (.) at
         that point one leaves a bit more aside their person then when everything is concluded
4. M?:   mh mh
5. M3:   sì
         yes
6. FAC: **torna fuori la persona [è un po' così?**
         The person is back, is it a bit in this way?
7. M3:   [sì probabilmente è così
                                 Yes, probably it is in this way
8. FAC: **ma ci sono secondo voi altre situazioni che: (.) il ruolo e la persona (.) tipo a scuola voi**
         siete: (..) coinvolti come persone o come o nel ruolo?
         But are there in your view other situations which (.) role and person (.) maybe at school are:
         you (.) involved as persons or in roles?
9. M?:   nel r:[:uolo
         In role
10. M3:   [ma dipende dipende anche dal: dalle sit[uazioni
               But it also depends on the situations
11. M?:   [tutti e due
                                                        both
12. M14:   tutti e due
         both
13. FAC: **ci sono situazioni e situazioni**
         There are different situations
14. M3:   sì
         yes
15. FAC: **per cui in alcuni momenti siete più stu[denti**
         Then in some moments you are more students
16. M14:   [con le con le prof nei ruoli poi: fuori
                                                     [*with the professors in roles, then outside*
17. ?:   tra di noi:
         among us
18. M14:   persone
         persons
19. FAC: **quindi anche qui dentro e fuori**
         So here too in and out
20. M14:   sì
         yes
21. FAC: **e a casa invece? Siete più nel ruolo o più nella persona?**
         And what about at home? Are you more in a role or in the person?
22. ((many say person, comments))
23. M2:   ruolo devo pulire tutto io
         Role, I must clean everything
24. FAC: **[la persona**
         [*The person*
25. M2:   [io entro nel ruolo ruolo ruolo
         [*I am in the role role*
26. FAC: **ma il il babbo e la mamma sono due ruoli o sono due persone?**
         But are your dad and your mum two roles or two persons?
27. ((many say persons))
28. M2:   sono due persone perché devo pulir sempre io

They are two persons as I must always clean

Comments also risk undermining children's agency, as they can interrupt their narratives or deviate them towards objectives chosen by facilitators, without children's involvement. In example 44, the facilitator invites M2 to control his imagination (turns 4, 6). Then, she adds a comment about the necessity of restrictions in the use of computer games and films (turn 8). These comments stress the facilitator's authority as children's adviser.

Example 44

1. M2: ähm, immer wenn ich zocke, dann kann ich mir vorstellen, wie die, die sterben immer schön.
   emm, whenever I play video games I can imagine how they, how they always just like die really nicely.
2. FAC: ohoh, okay. Also hier ist so die Ecke, die ein bisschen mit Brutalität und Kampf zu tun hat.
   oh dear, I see. So this corner here has a bit to do with brutality and violence.
3. ((overlapping of children's utterances))
4. FAC: **da achtet aber drauf, dass die Phantasie nicht zu weit geht, ne, dass man immer noch weiß, was Phantasie und was Realität ist, das ist ganz wichtig.**
   what's important is that you make sure imagination doesn't go too far, you know, that you still recognise the difference between imagination and reality, that's very important.
5. M2: das ist bei mir schon das Problem.
   that's already my problem.
6. FAC: deswegen.
   that's exactly it.
7. M5: bei mir ist alles Realität.
   everything is reality to me.
8. FAC: **deswegen gibt's ja bei bestimmten Computerspielen und -filmen auch eigentlich Altersbeschränkungen.**
   that's why some computer games and films also actually have age restrictions.

8.2 Appreciations

Appreciations provide affective support to children's autonomous actions, stressing that children are doing well. Appreciations can regard children's personal attitudes, shown by their narratives or comments, positive interpersonal relations, events and facts. In example 45, the facilitator's appreciation (turns 1 and 3) regards the child's disclosure of his own feelings, which is confirmed by the child himself and by the teacher.

Example 45

1. FAC: **a me a me questa storia [ha colpito molto**
   I was very moved by this story
2. T: [s::
3. FAC: **perché tu parli molto sinceramente dei tuoi sentimenti**
   Because you tell of your feelings very sincerely
4. M7: [sì
   yes
5. /: [sì e quasi quasi piange[va da quanto era emozionato vero?
   Yes and he almost cried as he was very emotional
6. FAC: [eh?
7. M7: sì
   yes

In example 46, the facilitator's appreciation regards positive interpersonal relations. The facilitator appreciates the fact that F3's brother apologized with her sister.

Example 46

1. FAC: und wie kamt ihr wieder zusammen dann?
   and how did you make up in the end?
2. F3: ähm, mein Bruder hat mir mh irgendwann so gemacht. Lena, Lena, Lena. (?) Und dann ich so, nö, du bist doch immer noch auf mich zickig. Tschuldigung.
   emm, at some point my brother was calling my name, F3, F3, F3, like that (?) And then I was like, nope, you're still being bitchy to me. Sorry.
3. FAC: **ach, das ist ja toll.** Hat er sich entschuldigt. mhm. ok.
   oh, that is really great. He apologised. Mm-hm. Okay.

Appreciations regard children's actions, relations and experiences and are ways of supporting children's narratives. The problem of appreciations is that, if they are not systematic, they can be perceived as selective, i.e. as an assessment differently distributed among the children; if they are systematic, they become a routine that interrupts children's narratives. Therefore, it is important to limit appreciations as support of narratives that are particularly delicate for their content or the relations that they include.

8.3 Personal stories

Facilitators' personal stories show their involvement in the interaction and their closeness to children, thus enhancing children's narratives. In example 47, following M3's story about swimming, the facilitator tells the story of a trip to the seaside to swim, stressing his father's risky behavior, her lack of awareness of risk and her happiness in being on her father's shoulders. This story enhances M4's story about a situation in which, in the same conditions, he was instead scared.

Example 47

1. M3: I have a memory. So, I went to Dubai this waterpark is called (?) and there is like KFC and McDonald's, and they have this surfing place (?) over there. So, I just put my tummy on the ground. I didn't learn how to swim, and then there were trees like this and then I ate McDonald's.
2. **FAC:** You know when you put your belly on the ground, was it so that you could pretend to be swimming?
3. M3: Yeah.
4. **FAC: Do you know what - you really remind me when I was a little girl, which was a really, really long time ago, my dad took me swimming to Brighton which is a seaside**
5. ((Class all talk – talking about also visiting the same seaside as FAC))
6. **FAC: And my dad, he couldn't swim but I didn't know he couldn't swim. And he put me on his shoulders when I was a little girl, probably about your size, and I was on his shoulders and he took me up. And I was wondering why my mum was getting really cross. She was standing on the side of the sea and she was going like this come in, like this. And my dad was laughing. And I think he was laughing because he was kind of joking with my mum because she knew he couldn't swim. And he took me out a little bit. And I thought my dad was the best swimmer in the whole wide world and I was safe, but really he was taking me out and he couldn't swim either. And I was on his back and then he had to come back in because my mum told him off, and you've really made me remember that.**
7. M4: And my dad he took me to the deep end like 2 m and (?) and those boys over there (?) sometimes the wave comes, so what happened my dad said come here and then I went there, he picked me up and then he's like jump and I will catch you, and I was no - I'm scared and then he'd take me back.

Personal stories upgrade facilitators' contributions to the interaction. However, facilitators can also show that they have a "story" to tell, thus improving children's perception of them as committed persons, rather than as interpreters of a routine based on their role.

8.4 Displacements

Displacements are actions that enrich narratives through stories or comments that surprise and entertain children. Displacing utterances can be affective support of children's narratives, comments on children's funny family stories, or funny comment on children's experiences. In example 48, initially, the facilitator asks a question about photographs of parents' weddings. F3 starts to tell of a photo regarding her parents' wedding. The facilitator asks what F3 was doing at that very moment (turn 9). The question disorients F3, who therefore hesitates. The facilitator provides the answer to his own question (turn 11: "non c'eri"), immediately followed by F3's confirmation, showing relief as her orientation seems to be re-established. However, the children laugh for this joke and the facilitator goes on, suggesting that the child was attending a party in another place (turn 19). The child rejects this interpretation protesting that she was not born at the time, while another child accepts the joke, suggesting that she was at the disco. The facilitator acknowledges F3's rejection pretending surprise (turn 20: "ah non eri ancora nata ecco"). Then, he asks if other children were at their parents' weddings (turn 22). M5 comments that this is impossible, but the facilitator rejects this comment. F4 intervenes saying that she was at their parents' wedding as at the time she was born (turns 29, 31). The facilitator concludes stressing that things are possible in different ways, thus stressing the unpredictability of personal experiences. Then he starts with new questions about the photographs.

Example 48

1. FAC: […] Chi chi chi vuole raccontare la foto dei propri genitori? prova a dire
      Who who who wants to tell the parents' pictures? Try to tell
2. F3: una foto di quando il papà e la mamma stavano stavano entrando nella macchina
      A picture about when dad and mum were were entering the car
3. FAC: il giorno del matrimonio o un altro giorno?
      The day of their wedding or another day?
4. F3: no il giorno del matrimonio
      No, the day of their wedding
5. FAC: ah quindi (.) tu non hai una foto (.) di: della cerimonia ma del momento successivo
      Ah so (.) you don't have a picture (.) of of the ceremony but of the following moment
6. F3: sì
      yes
7. FAC: quando la cerimonia era stata fatta, e stavano salutando tutti e se ne stavano andando in viaggio di nozze?
      When the ceremony was done and they were were greeting everywhere and leaving for the honeymoon
8. F3: sì
      yes
9. FAC: e te cosa facevi?
      And what were you doing?
10. F3: io:
      I:
11. FAC: non c'eri
      You were not there
12. F3: non c'ero
      I was not there
13. FAC: eh hh
14. Some: hhh
15. FAC: perché quel giorno lì avevi una festa da un'altra parte no?
      Because that day you were at a party elsewhere, weren't you?

16. ?:   h
17. ?:   no
18. F3:   no perché non ero ancora [nata
             No, because I was not yet [born
19. ?:   [(?) in discoteca
                                        [*(?) to the disco*
20. FAC: ah: non eri ancora nata ecco
             Ah: you were not yet born I see
21. ?:   h
22. FAC: e: c'è qualcuno di voi che invece c'era (.) al matrimonio dei suoi genitori?
             And is there someone who was there (.) at their parents' wedding instead?
23. M5:   è impossibile
             It's impossible
24. FAC: no non è impossibile [perché [capita capita
             No, it's not impossible [because [it can happen it can happen
25. M3:   [((says something to M5))
26. F4:   [((raises her hand))
27. M5:   [ah!
28. FAC: te c'eri?
             Were you there?
29. F4:   sì
             yes
30. FAC: e come mai c'eri?
             And why were you there?
31. F4:   eh: perché ero già nata
             Eh because I was already born
32. FAC: vedi ((a M5)) è possibile perché le cose sono possibili in tante maniere (.) e: e avete una bella impressione di quelle foto? Cioè nel senso che i vostri genitori ve ne hanno parlato ((gesticola)) con emozione, con entusiasmo, oppure le avete trovate voi (.) andando a guardare (.) degli album di famiglia?
             You see ((to M5)) it is possible because things are possible in many ways (.) and and do you have a good impression of those pictures? I mean, did your parents talk of them to you ((he gesticulates)) showing emotions, enthusiasm, or did you find them (.) while looking for (.) family albums?

Displacements have a double function: (1) they create a positive and funny relation between the facilitator and the children and (2) they open to unpredictability of personal contributions. In particular, stressing unpredictability through displacing utterances shows that the classroom conversation is open to any possible contribution. However, the use of displacements requires a strong interest in using humour and in enhancing unpredictability.

9. Children's initiatives

Children's initiatives are unpredictable contributions that are not enhanced by facilitators' actions (such as questions or formulations). These initiatives can be responses to other children, requests of taking the floor, interruptions of conversations and stories. Children's unpredictable contributions challenge facilitators' coordination of the interaction, which should ensure that children participate without disrupting stories and violating other children's rights to talk. Children's initiatives are however important, as they highlight children's agency through unpredictable actions. When children initiate a sequence of communication, facilitators have to manage either their autonomous participation in discussions, or their interruptions of ongoing interactions and narratives.

9.1 Facilitation of discussions between children

Children can take the floor and start to discuss autonomously, putting aside the coordinator. In these cases, firstly the facilitator can live room to their contributions, without interrupting their discussion. In example 49, the facilitator asks two questions to M7 (turns 1 and 3), receiving short confirmations. In turn 5, F10 self-selects to ask a question about war in Chechnya. In the following turns, the conversation is managed autonomously by the children, through their questions (turns 9 and 13), while M7 answers to them. The facilitator only provides an acknowledgment in turn 11.

Example 49

1. FAC: und hast du manchmal Erinnerungen ähm auch wenn du das Bild siehst, an deine Heimatstadt vielleicht oder an Tscheschenien?
   and do you sometimes still remember emm maybe also when you look at the picture, do you remember your hometown or Chechnya?
2. M7: ((Nods)) ja.
   yes.
3. FAC: vermisst du das?
   do you miss it?
4. M7: mhm ((saying yes))
5. F10: war bei euch Krieg, oder?
   was there a war there, wasn't there?
6. M7: nein, bloß wegen meinem Bruder, der ist krank.
   no, just because of my brother, he's sick.
7. F10: oh.
8. M7: er kann gehen, reden, alles, aber bloß er ist krank. Und wenn wir jetzt zum Beispiel, vielleicht nicht nach Deutschland gezogen wären, vielleicht wäre er gestorben.
   he can walk, talk, everything, but just he is sick. And if we were for example, maybe we hadn't moved to Germany, maybe he would have died.
9. F7: was für eine Krankheit war das?
   what kind of sickness was it?
10. M7: ähm, weiß ich jetzt nicht aber das ist eine seltene Krankheit, sehr selten. (.) Und diese Diagnose wurde neu ge-erstellt, also die war noch nicht.
    emm, I don't know right now but it's a rare sickness, very rare. (.) And the diagnosis was made agai- was revised, so we didn't have it yet.
11. FAC: ah, okay.
    aha, I see.
12. M7: okay, das wars. (.) ah, F9.
    well, that's it. (.) ah, F9.
13. F9: war das eine schlimme Krankheit.
    was it a bad sickness.

In other situations, the facilitator's coordination regards the children's requests to contribute. The facilitator gives the floor to the children, then coordinating the interaction. In example 50, F1 tells that she has something to tell and the coordinator gives her the floor immediately (turn 2, "dimmi"), then supporting F1's story through a continuer (turn 4) and a series of questions (turns 6, 8, 10 and 12). The story continues for a long time (not shown here).

Example 50

1. F1: avrei una cosa da raccontare
   I would have something to tell
2. FAC: **dimmi**
   Tell me
3. F1: della foto di prima di M2

4. FAC: sì
yes
5. F1: e: che: anch'io ho una foto più o meno del genere
E: I too have a picture more or less like that
6. FAC: come la de- la definiresti?
How would you de- define it?
7. F1: catastrofe
Catastrophe
8. FAC: come? (.) [catastrofe?
What? (.) [catasrophe?
9. F1:   [(?)
10. FAC: ma non era una foto in cui erano insieme?
But wasn't it a picture in which they were together?
11. F1: no
12. FAC: no che foto era?
No, what picture was it?
13. F1: e: tipo una foto in cui ero piccola ero: sul letto e c'era: da una parte mia mamma e da una parte: mio padre
e: like a picture in which I was little I was on the bed and there were my mum on one side and my father on the other

9.2 Management of children's interruptions

In some other situations, the facilitator's coordination regards the children's requests to contribute. The facilitator gives the floor to the children, then coordinating the interaction. In example 51, F1 tells that she has something to tell and the coordinator gives her the floor immediately (turn 2, "dimmi"), then supporting F1's story through a continuer (turn 4) and a series of questions (turns 6, 8, 10 and 12). The story continues for a long time (not shown here).

Example 51

1. FAC: So, would it be a member of your family or
2. M3: Friends and family.
3. FAC: Both. Yeah, you see them every time there is an event.
4. F4: When was eight I went to a wedding there was some policemen in a car (?) and my mum was talking to them (?).
5. FAC: you went into them and what did he say to you?
6. F4: I felt embarrassed for the rest of the day.
7. FAC: What sort of wedding was it that you went to?
8. F4: It was in Thailand.
9. FAC: In Thailand, you went to Thailand for a wedding. So and how did the wedding, how did the ceremony work in Thailand, what was it like?
10. F4: The bride and the groom were colorful
11. FAC: So, very colourful and elaborate outfits, yeah?
12. F4: And it took place at a Temple (?) house.
13. FAC: Okay and where did you go to the wedding?
14. F4: groom's house.

Facilitators can also discourage children' interruptions when their interest in the ongoing narrative prevails or they stress that the right of talking does not admit interruptions. A rather mitigated way of discouraging interruptions consists in giving a short feedback and then returning immediately to the ongoing narrative. In example 52, F11 tells the story of her relation with her boyfriend (turns 1-8). F8 interrupts the conversation (turn 9) to provide a contextualising information. The facilitator gives

a feedback, acknowledging the information and asking for some details (turn 10), then she continues to ask questions to F11.

Example 52

1. F11: also, das ist mein Freund. ((lacht))
   well, this is my boyfriend. ((laughs))
2. ((everyone laughs))
3. F1: zeig mal T1
   show it to T1.
4. T1: ich wollte grad mal, wolte, ah sehr schön.
   I was just about to, about to, oh lovely.
5. F11: also, er ist mir halt wichtig und er schläft halt immer Samstag bis Sonntag bei mir.
   well, he is just important to me and he always stays at my house from Saturday to Sunday.
6. ((children laugh))
7. F11: und ähm ja, wir reden halt immer viel, ist auch immer sehr lustig mit ihm. Ähm ((lach)) und dieses Wochenende hat er wieder bei mir geschlafen und dann haben wir uns mit F8 getroffen und was noch. Und ((Name)) und ((Name)). Das war halt auch lustig, weil wir da ein bisschen rumgesponnen haben. Und, ja.
   and em yeah, we just talk a lot all the time, it's always really fun with him. Emm ((laughs)) this weekend he stayed at my house again and we met up with F8 and what else. And ((name)) and ((name)). That was fun too because we messed about a bit. And, well yeah.
8. FAC: mhm.
   mm-hm.
9. F8: Also, ähm, der Linas Freund ist bei der Bundeswehr und dann wenn ich dann samstags bei Lina bin meistens, dann ist er halt auch da und dann Machen wir halt auch viel dumme Sachen zusammen. Wir erzählen dann auch so, oder er erzählt dann halt über die Bundeswehr und das wird dann auch sehr spannend und lustig
   Well, F11's boyfriend is in the army and then mostly when I'm at her house on a Saturday he's there too and then we do a lot of stupid things together. We chat together or sometimes he tells us about the army and then it's really interesting and funny.
10. FAC: **ah, okay. Also kommst du auch gut mit ihm klar?**
    ah, okay. So you get on well with him?
11. F8: ja.
    yes.
12. FAC: war dir das wichtig, dass dass sie auch gut mit ihm, mit deinem Freund klar kommt?
    was it important to you that he also gets on well with he- that he also gets on well with your friends?
13. F11: ich sehe ihn halt immer nur ähm am Wochenende, ja halt, weil er bei der Bundeswehr ist.
    I only ever see him at the weekends, yeah so, because he's in the army.

Facilitators can also avoid responding children's interruptions if they think it is important to continue to support the ongoing narrative. Example 53 regards a conversation on secrets. The facilitator asks why the children do not keep secrets (turn 1). F4 answers that it is difficult and the facilitator engages in a dyadic interaction to understand her point of view. F7 takes the floor (turn 8) to say that she is able to keep secretes and it is not difficult to do so, then she adds that she was able to keep a secret from the first to the fifth class (turn 11). The facilitator ignores her contribution, continuing to ask questions to F4, and when F2 answers to his question, he acknowledges her as interlocutor. The facilitator is more interested in focusing the difficulty to keep secrets, than to involve F7 who shows her ability in doing the opposite.

Example 53

1. FAC: perché non li tieni i segreti?
   Why don't you keep secrets?

2. F4: perché è difficile
   Because it is difficult
3. M10: perché è bello dirli
   Because it is funny to tell them
4. FAC: è difficile?
   Is it difficult?
5. F4: sì
   yes
6. FAC: anche te pia- sei
   You too lik- are
7. F4: ((nods))
8. F7: no io in verità [in verità io li tengo per me non è difficile
   No, to tell the truth I keep them for me it's not difficult
9. FAC: [non non gliela fai a tenerli i segreti te?
                     Aren't you able to keep secrets?
10. F4: ((shakes her head))
11. F7: in prima mi hanno detto un segreto l'ho tenuto fino in quinta
    In the first class they told me a secret and I kept it until the fifth class
12. FAC: qual è l'ultima volta che non sei stata in grado di tenere un segreto?
    When was the last time you weren't able to keep a secret?
13. F2: stamattina
    This morning
14. Alcuni: [hhh
15. FAC: [addirittura
           [*really*
16. F4: ((says something to F2))
17. FAC: **che segreto non ha tenuto questa mattina?**
    What secret didn't her keep this morning?
18. F2: non non dico niente
    I don't say anything

10. Complexity of facilitation

Long sequences show how different types of action regarding facilitation are intertwined in the same classroom interaction. The complexity of facilitation is shown by the unpredictable variety of combinations of recurrent actions (invitations, questions, minimal feedback, formulations, personal stories, personal comments, appreciations). These combinations can support and enhance children's participation and narratives. Inventing combinations of actions that enhance and support series of contributions and narratives is the challenge of facilitation. In particular, in SHARMED project, facilitation aimed to generate interlacements between different narratives in order to involve children in a dialogic form of communication. Interlacements can be enhanced in three ways: through facilitators' invitations to expand, through facilitators' personal contributions, and through children's initiatives, which are also unpredictable. To sum up, the complexity of facilitation includes: (1) the complexity of combinations between facilitators' differently designed actions that enhance and support children's contributions and narratives; (2) the interlacement of children's different narratives, both following the facilitators' invitations and suggestions, and as autonomous initiatives. Combination of actions of facilitation and interlacements of narratives can be visible in the same sequence or separately. The analysis of the SHARMED activities has highlighted three forms of facilitation, based on the same types of actions, but differently combined. These forms are associated with the three different settings of the project (Italian, German and UK settings). This association between form of facilitation and setting depends on facilitators' different training and styles, based on both theoretical assumptions and evaluation of the social and cultural context in which facilitation is applied.

10.1 Facilitation as primary combination of a variety of actions in separate turns of talk

The first form of facilitation is based on the combination of questions and formulations. This combination is enriched through specific types of minimal feedback, rather frequent displacing actions, few personal stories. Appreciations and comments are very infrequent. Therefore, this form of facilitation is based on a great variety of supporting and enhancing actions, which are provided in separate utterances. In this form of facilitation, facilitative actions are very infrequently mixed in the same utterance. This form of facilitation implies continuous enhancement and support of narratives, based on a great number of facilitative actions and the use of displacements to enhance funny relations and stress variety and unpredictability. Narratives are frequently co-constructed through the facilitator and the children's combined contributions.

Example 54 shows a combination of questions, formulations and few continuers. The sequence regards the separation of M2's parents. Example 1 follows a first part of the story, in which M2 told of his parents' separation and revealed that his father has a new fiancée. In turn 1, the facilitator asks a focused question about the child's dislike of the new fiancée of his father (turn 1). The child confirms that he does not like her and the facilitator objects to this assessment with a development, inferencing that M2 does not know the woman (turn 5). This formulation is however rejected: the child has known her. In turn 7, the facilitator repairs his wrong inference through an explication. M2 confirms this explication and adds information about his parents, thus showing his preference for this part of the story. The facilitator supports M2's will of telling his parents' story through a development (turns 9 and 11), followed by a continuer (turn 13) and another development (turn 15). The story becomes very intimate and emotional, as it is stressed by F3's emotional exclamation (turn 17). The facilitator continues to enhance the story through other developments (turns 19 and 21). These developments invite M2 to continue to tell, on the one hand, and show the facilitator's participation as a co-teller on the other. The second development leads to a change of topic from M2's parents' conflict to the photograph (turn 21). The facilitator investigates if M2's mother is aware of M2's use of the photograph, through a focused question (turn 25), which prepares a new development regarding M2's mother attitude towards this situation (turn 27). However, this development is rejected by the child. The facilitator provides a new development (turn 31) that is also rejected. These rejections, are followed by a short phase in which the facilitator actively listen to the story (turns 33 and 35). Then, the facilitator implicitly insists in his developments, about the attitude of M2's mother, here in an interrogative form (turn 37). This leads M2 to a contradictory telling about her mother feelings (turns 36 and 38). The facilitator provides a development of the child's second telling (turn 39), which this time is confirmed by M2. The facilitator continuously enhances and supports this long emotionally intense narrative, until the final development that allows the child to conclude his delicate story with a positive feeling about his mother's attitude towards his father.

Example 54

1. FAC: **perché potrebbe non piacerti?**
            Because you may not like her?
2. M2:   mh ((shaking his head))
3. ?:   h
4. M2:   a me e mio fratello proprio non piace [a
            I and my brother don't like her at all [a
5. **FAC:**   [**ma se non la conosci ancora**
                                               [but you don't know her yet
6. M2:   eh: in realtà la conosco
            eh: actually I know her
7. FAC: **ah quindi sai già chi è**
            Ah so you know who is she
8. M2:   s:ì che: che po- che poi erano b- erano bravi insieme solamente che si: alcune volte quando

mio padre prendeva perdeva il controllo perché lui pe- prendeva tante medicine per qualcosa che non [lo so
Y:es that: that ac- that actually they were g- they were good together only that: sometimes when my father took lost control because he to- he took many medicines for something that I don't [know

9. FAC: **[e lo disturbavano**
   [and they disturbed him
10. M2: eh? [lui, mia madre gli ha
    eh? [he, my mother
11. FAC: **[queste medicine**
         [those medicines
12. M2: una volta gli aveva buttato le medicine fuori
    One she thrown the medicines out
13. FAC: **ah**
14. M2: e: lui m: un giorno nei giorni dopo ha iniziato a urlargli contro, a picchiarl[a,
    and: he m: one day in the days after he started shouting at her, beating [her,
15. FAC: **[perché non trovava le medi[cine**

                                                         [because he didn't find the medi[cines
16. M2   [eh
17. F3: o mamma mia
    [oh my god
18. M2: sì e dopo e mio fra- e mio padre no cioè mia madre e: si si stava: ((fa un gesto con le mani in orizzontale)) stava andando
    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: **cioè non era d'accordo su questo comportamento**
    I mean she didn't agree with this behaviour
20. M2: no
21. FAC: **mh ma quindi questa fotografia tu la conservi**
    Mh but therefore you keep this photo
    (..)
22. M2: la con- [la: l'ho conservata in una mia madre l'aveva conservata in una scatola rossa con tutti i brillantini
    I ke- [I: kept it in my mother kept it in a red box with glitters
23. FAC: [o o   ((dopo)) sì
            [or or   ((after)) yes
24. M2: e: po- poi l'ho presa perché mi ricorda tanto questa cosa
    And: th- then I took it because it reminded my this thing
25. FAC: **ma la mamma te l'ha – lo sa che hai portato questa foto?**
    But your mum gave it to – does she know that you brought this photo?
26. M2: sì ((annuisce))
    Yes ((nods))
27. FAC: **e quindi ci tiene a questa fotografia la mamma**
    And so yuor mum cares about this photo
28. M2: e: in realtà no ((scuote la testa))
    e: actually not ((shakes head))
29. FAC: **no?**
30. M2: no per- perché non sopporta più mio padre e quindi l'ha: l'ha proprio – infatti l'ha nascosta da dai miei cassetti
    No be- because she can't stand my father anymore and so she: she just – in fact she hided it in my drawers
31. FAC: **l'ha tolta dal dal dagli album**
    She removed it from from the album
32. M2: s:ì no non è un album era un porta foto
    Y:es no it's not an album it was a photo frame

33. FAC: **eh**

34. M2: non è l'album un porta foto la: non so come si chiama
It's not an album a photo frame the: I don't know the name

35. FAC: **sì sì porta foto**
Yes yes a photo frame

36. M2: che poi l'ha che poi l'ha messo dentro uno dei miei cassetti in camera
And then and then she put it inside one of my drawers in my room

37. FAC: **ma quindi voleva che tu la la tenessi?**
But then did she want you to keep it?

38. M2: non la voleva buttare ma la voleva tenere perché è un perché mamma dice che v- non ama papà però gli vuole tanto bene
She didn't want to throw it away but she wanted to keep it because it's because mum says that l- she isn't in love with dad but she likes him very much

39. FAC: **perché comunque [ha- hanno fatto delle cose importanti [nella vita insieme**
Because after all [they hav- have made something important things [in their life together

40. M2:   [((annuisce))   [insieme sì ((annuisce))
        [((nods))   [together yes ((nods))

Example 55 shows a combination of questions, invitations, formulations, acknowledgments and continuers. The facilitator starts asking a question about the previous work of a small group. The children tell that they have talked of their experience of grandparents. The facilitator acknowledges this information (turn 3), then he asks the children to tell what they have discussed (turn 5). M3 tells of the affect for his paternal grandparents. The facilitator provides two explications (turns 7 and 9), asks questions to clarify the place in which M3's maternal and paternal grandparents live (turns 11 and 13), then he provides a development (turn 15), partially rejected by M3. The child's contribution receives the facilitator's acknowledgment. In turn 21, F7 takes the floor, starting to tell another story regarding grandparents. The facilitator provides a continuer (turn 22), then a development (turn 24), which receives confirmation. In turn 26, M9 links to these stories with a new narrative about grandparents, which is however interrupted by F1. The facilitator explicates the gist of F1's utterance (turn 29) and she continues her narrative, ignoring M3's interruption (turn 31). The facilitator provides a continuer (turn 33), then he turns to photographs, through a focused question (turn 35). F1 starts with a new narrative, expanding the answer to the focused question. The facilitator closes the sequence with an acknowledgment, then starting to talk of the content of a new photograph (turn 37).

Example 55

1. FAC: **ma ne avete parlato e cosa che idea vi siete f[atti?**
But did you talk about it and what did you think about [it?

2. M3:   [e: noi abbiamo tipo parlato della nostra:
diciamo esperienza con i nonni
                    [e: we talked about our: let's say experience
with grandparents

3. FAC: **ah ecco**
Ah ok

4. M3: tipo sono uscite delle:
like something emerged:

5. FAC: **eh perché non ci raccontate**
eh why don't you tell us

6. M3: ah ok ((guarda F7)) sempre io? Tipo io ho raccontato che tengo più ai miei nonni paterni, che ai miei nonni materni,
ah ok ((looks at F7)) always me? I told that I care more about my paternal grandparents, than about my maternal grandparents,

7. FAC: **perché c'è un legame più:**
because theres' a relationship more:

8. M3: sì solo che loro sono giù e allora

		Yes but they are down ((in the Southern part of Italy)) so

9. FAC: **perché c'è [distanza**
Because there's [a distance

10. M3:   [non ho sì sono [dista-
*   [I dind't yes they are [dista-*

11. FAC: [**dove vivono? In Puglia?**
*   [where do they live? In Puglia ((region))?*

12. M3: Puglia e:
((same region)) and:

13. FAC: **e invece gli altri vivono qui a Modena?**
And what about the others they live here in Modena?

14. M3: sì a Modena
Yes in Modena

15. FAC: **quindi li vedi più spesso**
So you see them more frequently

16. M3: beh sì anche se non è che ogni giorno sto con loro
Well yes even if I don't stay with them everyday

17. FAC: non ho capito
I dind't understand

18. M3: non sto tutti i giorni con loro
I don't stay with them everyday

19. FAC: **ah ecco**
Ah ok

20. M3: ((looks at F7)*)*

21. F7: e: io invece e: da quando cioè da undici anni fa e: sono sempre stata con i miei nonni materni quindi comunque non è che gli voglio più bene però sono più attaccata se devo dire una cosa la dico a loro e: che è poi quella che mi ha messo il pelouche in testa,
and: instead I e: since eleven years ago e: I was always with my maternal grandparents so I don't love them more but I care more about them if I have something to tell I tell it to them e: that is the one who put the teddy bear over my head

22. FAC: **sì**
Yes

23. F7: e invece quegli altri che vengono da ((città del sud)), e: hanno: comunque sì li vedo e li ho visti per un periodo un po' più lungo ultimamente perché mio padre ha perso ha perso il lavoro e: i miei hanno divorziato quindi è stato a casa su da loro
And the others that come from ((city in the south)), e: they have: I see them and I saw them for a longer period recently because my father lost lost his job and: my parents divorced so he went to their home

24. FAC: **ho capito quindi (.) vivono qua anche loro ade[sso**
I understand so (.) they live here as well n[ow

25. F7:   [sì vivono a ((paese))
*   [yes they live in ((place))*

26. M9: io invece sono più legato ai nonni materni perché praticamente sono cresciuto con loro ogni giorno vado a casa s- a casa con loro a mangiare, e: invece con quelli paterni che è mor- e: son morti tutti e due una cioè la nonna è morta prima che io nascessi nel duemila e uno, e il nonno invece è morto quest'estate ad agosto
Insead I care more about maternal grandparents because basically I grew up with them everyday I go to their ho- home with them to eat, and: instead with the paternal ones that are d- e: they are both dead one, that is my grandmother died before I was born in two thousand one, and the grandfather died last summer in august

27. M7: (?)

28. F1: no io invece avevo un rapporto più ravvicinato con i genitori di mio padre (.) perché quelli di mia mamma sono di giù e li vedo soltanto quando vado a Natale, a Pasqua: e: nelle vacanze estive
No instead I had a closer relationship with my fathers' parents (.) because my mother's ones come from down and I see them only when I go there on Christmas, Easter and: during summer holidays

29. FAC: **hai meno occasioni per incontrarli**
          You have less opportunities to meet them
30. F1:   sì mentre con i miei nonni: di qua
          Yes while with my grandparents: who live here
31. M3:   materni
          Maternal
32. F1:   cioè tipo io ho vissuto per la gran parte della mia vita con i miei nonni ma non s- non perché: per proble- alcune alcun- per un po' era per dei problemi famigliari discussioni tra la famiglia, cioè tra le la famiglia di mia mamma e quella di mio padre quindi sono andata a vivere un po' con i miei nonni e le mie zie poi dopo va beh ci siamo persi per un po' per altri problemi sempre poi dopo ci siamo riavvicinati però poi dopo mio nonno è: morto per un tumore
          I mean I lived much of my life with my grandparents but not s-not because: because of problem- some so- for a period because of family problems of discussion between the family, that is between my mum's family and my fathers' family and so I went to live for a while with my grandparents and my uncles and then we got separated for a while because of other problems then we get closer again but then my grandfather died of a cancer
33. FAC: mh
34. F1:   e poi dopo qualche anno anche mia nonna il sette settembre del duemila e sedici è morta semp- anche lei per un tumore e tipo è stato: un colpo al cuore fortissimo [perché
          And then after some years my grandmother too the seventh of september of two thousand sixteen died of- she too of cancer and it was: hard for me [because
35. FAC: [**una mancanza
          ma [di foto ne avete dei vostri nonni?**
                                                                              *[a loss but [do
          you have photos of you grandparents?*
36. F1:   [sì   sì ne ho una del duemila e sette tre gennaio duemila e sette che è stato: che ho fatto il primo compleanno con loro, e: er- c'era mia nonna che va beh lì non aveva già: cioè stava incominciando a- cioè anche lì a- aveva avuto un tumore però era benigno quindi non era niente però dopo cioè il secondo tumore che gli è venuto e niente ha: (.) cioè [ce l'ha portata via
             [yes I have one of two thousand seven the third of January that was: that I had my first birthday party with them, e: er- there was my grandmother that okay there dind't have: she was starting to –I mean even there a- she had a tumor but benign so it was nothing but then the second tumor she had has: (.) [took her from us
37. FAC: [**ho capito e tu invece che hai portato questa foto**
          [I understand and instead you that brought this photo

These two examples do not include one important component of this form of facilitation, displacements, which have been shown in section 8 (example 48).

10.2 Facilitation as primary combination of listening and inviting

This form of facilitation is based on linear exchanges between the facilitator and one child, followed by invitation to intervene and ask questions addressed to classmates. This scheme is repeated for each photograph. The sequence of narratives is produced either through separate conversations, or through children's self-managed conversations. This form of facilitation is based on minimal feedback, such as continuers, repetitions and acknowledgment tokens, few direct questions and formulations and many invitations to talk addressed to children. This form is based on the presupposition that children's autonomous participation must be the primary focus of facilitation. Therefore, the facilitator is less active than in the previous form. The facilitator also appreciates, rather systematically, the children's contributions at the end of a sequence regarding a specific photograph.

Example 56 shows the combination of questions and minimal responses (continuers, repetition and acknowledgments), followed by the children's self-management of conversation. The facilitator asks an open question to M4 (turn 1), about the content of the photograph, which is followed by continuers (turn 3, "mh" "okay"), a second focused question about the way of taking the photo (turn 5) and a

final acknowledgment (turn 7), followed by the child's simple confirmation. In turn 9, the facilitator changes the topic of conversation and asks an open question regarding the animal that is preferred by M4. This question is followed by a focused question (turn 11), repairing the possible difficulty of answering to the first question. Then, the facilitator repeats the child's answer (turn 13), showing understanding, and asks if classmates went to the zoo (turn 15), enhancing M4's initiative to coordinate the conversation (turn 16) and some answers, showing the children's self-management.

Example 56

1. FAC: **was ist denn auf dem Foto drauf?**
   so what's the photo of?
2. M4: ähm. viele Tier. (.) Elefant und so.
   umm. Many animal. (.) Elephant and stuff.
3. FAC: **mh. (.) ok**
4. M4: und noch (?)
   and also (?)
5. FAC: **und hast du die mit deinem Handy gemacht oder [womit hast du sie fotografiert?]**
   and did you take them with your mobile phone or [what did you use to take the photos?]
6. M4:   [ja]
                                    [yes]
7. Fac: **ok (.) alles klar**
   okay (.) all right
8. M4: ja.
   yes.
9. FAC: **und welche Tiere fandest du am besten?**
   and which animals did you like the best?
10. M4: besten?
    best?
11. FAC: **gab's da welche?**
    were there any?
12. M4: ja (.) Elefant
    yes (.) Elephant
13. FAC: **Elefant**
    elephant
14. M4: ja
    yes
15. FAC: **ok (.) Wart ihr da auch mit im Zoo?**
    I see (.) Were you at the zoo too?
16. several: ja
               yes
17. M4: M3
18. M3: ähm, also wir waren im Zoo (?) Elefanten, da haben die die ganze Zeit so gemacht ((macht Bewegung)) und sind gegen die Wand gelaufen.
    emm, well we were at the zoo (?) Elephants, they were going like this the whole time ((gestures the movement)) and walked against the wall.
19. ((M5 *laughs*))
20. M10: einer ist gegen die Wand gelaufen.
    one walked against the wall.
21. F2: er hat Anlauf genommen und ist ((macht Bewegung))
    he took a run at it and did ((gestures the movement))
22. ((many children talk over one another))

Example 57 shows the facilitation of children's autonomous interlacement. F10 tells a story about a cat, solicited by F7's questions (turns 1-6). The facilitator provides an acknowledgment, showing surprise (turn 3), then she attract the attention of F10 on other children who would like to ask questions (turn 7) and coordinates the following turn taking (turn 9). After F3's question to add,

confirmed by the facilitator's continuer, the child connects to F10's story telling another story of died cat (turns 12 and 14), supported by a new continuer. The facilitator shows empathy through an acknowledgment and a comment; then she asks if other children experienced the same sad experience (turn 15). This enhances further short interventions about died cats.

Example 57

1. F7: war die Katze auch schon länger bei euch?
   did the cat live with you for a long time?
2. F10: ja, die war schon ganz schön lang bei uns. So ein und ein halbes Jahr war die bei uns. pff. und dann wurde sie überfahren.
   yes, she was with us for a really long time. About one and one half years she was with us. Pfft. and then she got run over.
3. FAC: ohh.
4. F10: und dann haben wir sie auf der Straße gefunden, wo sie überfahren wurde.
   and then we found her on the street where she had been run over.
5. F7: und wo wurde sie dann hin, die wurde ja irgendwo hingebracht oder?
   and where did she go then, she would have been brought somewhere wouldn't she?
6. F10: also, die haben wir dann in unserem Garten vergraben.
   well, then we buried her in our garden.
7. FAC: **mhm. Guck mal da gibts noch ein paar Fragen.**
   mm-hm. Look, over here there are a few more questions.
8. F3: (?)
9. FAC: **dass ihr als nächstes dran kommt?**
   that you want to be next?
10. F3: ich wollte was sagen.
    I wanted to say something.
11. FAC: mhm.
12. F3: ähm, wir hatten früher auch drei Katzen. Ne Katzenmutter, ne Katzensohn und ne Katzen- Kater. Und ähm die Katzenmutter ähm ist irgendwie, die ist aufeinmal, die war auf einmal nicht mehr da, die ist gar nicht mehr wiedergekommen. Ähm, Paul wurde überfahren und Pauline, die ähm, ist einfach so im Körbchen ähm gestorben.
    emm, we used to have three cats too. A mummy cat, a little boy cat and a d- a tomcat. And em the mummy cat was somehow, she suddenly, she suddenly wasn't there any more, she didn't ever come back. Em, Paul got run over and Pauline, she emm, she just died in her emm basket one day.
13. FAC: mhm.
14. F3: und da hat Oma mir das dann gezeigt als Mama mich aus dem Kindergarten abgeholt ähm hat. Und da bin ich dann nach oben gerannt und Mama hat mich so gefragt, ist alles in Ordnung, da hab ich so getan als ob alles in Ordnung war und dann hab ich mich oben aufs Sofa ge-ähm gesetzt und dann hab ich mich- und dann hab ich alleine ins Kissen geweint.
    and then granny showed it to me when mum picked me up from emm kindergarden. And then I ran upstairs and mum asked me if everything was okay, I pretended that everything was okay and then I s- em sat on the sofa upstairs and then I had- then I cried into the pillow by myself.
15. FAC: **oh nein. Das ist auch traurig ne. Kennt das jeman sowas.**
    oh dear. That's sad too isn't it. Has anyone else experienced something like that.
16. ((many children agree. Some put their hand up to speak))
17. M?: meine Katze ist auch gestorben.
    my cat died too.
18. ((many children tell that their cats also died))

10.3 Facilitation as combinations of different actions in the same turn of talk

For some aspects, this form of facilitation is similar to the first one. However, an important feature here is the complexity of specific turns of talk, which are key points of reference for the development of facilitation. This form of facilitation is based on the use of a great variety of supporting and

enhancing actions. Several actions, in particular formulations, comments, personals stories and appreciations, are frequently combined in the same turn of talk. Comments and appreciations are much more frequent than in the other two forms. This form of facilitation provides enhancement of children's stories above all through complex turns of talk, showing the facilitator's warm involvement, These turns of talk work as connectors among different stories.

Example 58 shows a long and complex turn, which is a point of reference for the ongoing dialogue. In turn 2, the facilitator acknowledges the very long story told by M1, showing her interest. Then, in the same turn of talk, she provides an explication, a question addressed to another child, a development stressing the sharing of memories, a repetition of part of M1's turn, which stresses it positively (although the child storied it as rather upsetting). Finally, she highlights the connection between different stories. In turn 3, M1 provides ad unpredictable development of part of the facilitator's utterance.

Example 58

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

In example 59, turn 2, the facilitator acknowledges M2's story about meeting his cousins at a wedding, thus showing her interest. Then she comments the possible interpretation of his cousin's nasty behaviours. M2 continues to narrate and the facilitator asks a focused question to check a detail (turn 4), then an open question on the child's feelings (turn 6), which is followed by the M2's disclosure of feelings. The facilitator provides an explication; then she ask another question, focusing on M2's feelings (turn 8). In turn 10, the facilitator utters a short personal story followed by the continuation of the child's narrative. The facilitator asks another focused questions on the child's feelings (turn 12), then she provides a comment and invites the other children to add stories about ghosts, which were learned by relatives (turn 14). F2 takes the floor, following this invitation (turn 15) and the facilitator comments on scaring nights and explains that she was scared when she was a child, through a short personal story (turn 16). M3 tells another scary story (turn 17) and the facilitator provides an explication (turn 18), followed by the child's utterance of a further detail. Responding to the invitation of the facilitator (turn 20), M4 and M5 self-select and tell other stories (turns 21 and 22). In turn 23, the facilitator comments on the memories of fears, then she asks a question on the specific fear of finding someone in the wardrobe, telling a personal story about this fear. At the end of this turn of talk, she starts to change topic, but F3 adds another story, thus restarting the narrative

for a while (turn 24). In turn 25, the facilitator comments on scary stories, promises to resume the topic next time, adds a general appreciation for all children's contributions, repeated thanks and a final question about the will of bringing new pictures next time. After a child's confirmation, she greets the children and thanks again.

Example 59

8.	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.
9.	**FAC:**	**Oh wow, some cousins might do that sometimes when they're younger.**
10.	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.
11.	FAC:	**Were you very small?**
12.	M2:	Yeah.
13.	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?**
14.	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.
15.	**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?**
16.	M2:	Yeah.
17.	FAC:	**I used to sleep with my grandma when I was little.**
18.	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.
19.	**FAC:**	**So, you want to sleep with your grandma to be safe?**
20.	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.
21.	**FAC:**	**So, lots of scary stories about ghosts. Did anybody else get told stories about ghosts from their grandparents or siblings or their cousins?**
22.	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.
23.	FAC:	Yeah, it gets quite scary doesn't it when you hear (..) especially at night time, things get a bit scary at nighttime when the lights off, doesn't it. **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.**
24.	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.
25.	FAC:	So, she was really freaked out.
26.	M3:	Yes and she's like 13, so
27.	FAC:	so, some more scary stories.
28.	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 (?).

29. 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.

30. 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.**

31. 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.

32. 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?**

33. M?:   Me.

34. FAC: **Bring them all in then, I'll look forward to seeing them, thank you.**

Example 59 shows an impressive series of six children's interlaced narratives, some of them autonomously provided (M3, M5, F3). This example shows how the facilitator's long turns can work as "connectors" among different stories, both through open invitations and indirectly, as way of showing that the floor is open.

11. Management of problems and conflicts

11.1 Difficulties in producing narratives

The production of narratives can be difficult in some circumstances. Narratives can have problems of **relevance**, as they do not interest the audience, in particular when the tellers are not able to connect the photograph to the story, which they do not know sufficiently well. Moreover, narratives meet problems when they include **delicate issues or taboos**, conveying the teller's transgressive identity. Usually, stories that include delicate issues are not allowed in communication, especially in educational contexts. They can lead to a negative evaluation of the tellers, above all when they tell of their unusual or nasty behaviours. Children can also enact nasty behaviours during the activities. These problems, however, were not frequent during the SHARMED activities.

Example 60 regards the child's story of his nasty behaviour during a wedding. The facilitator supports the telling of the story, avoiding any judgement.

Example 60

1. M3:   I've been to a wedding which basically there was plenty of juices at the far back. So, we got (..) we mixed all of the juices and we put pepper (?) and we were daring them to drink it. And I got another one which the cucumbers and then we got started fighting with the cucumbers.

2. FAC: At the wedding?

3. M3:   ((smiles)) Yeah

4. FAC: And do you think the adults knew that you were doing all of this at the wedding?
5. M3: Yeah.
6. FAC: And was this a children's kind of, young people's lives at the wedding, what do you do, that's interesting, so you were doing potions and dares at the wedding?
7. M3: Yeah and our parents were just dancing.
8. FAC: And do you think the parents knew what you were doing all of the time, all of these potions and
9. M3. Yeah.
10. FAC: They did and they were okay with it?
11. M3: Yeah.
12. FAC: And who were you doing these potions with, were they people that you normally see?
13. M3: ((smiles)). Yeah and some people that I don't normally see.
14. FAC: So, would it be a member of your family or
15. M3: Friends and family.
16. FAC: Both. Yeah, you see them every time there is an event.

An important problem of facilitation is the upgrading of facilitators' **epistemic authority**, i.e., authority in producing knowledge, which limits the promotion of children's agency. Epistemic authority is a very delicate issue in facilitation. Facilitators are active in producing knowledge by coordinating classroom interactions. It is illusory to think that, in this activity of coordination, facilitators' authority in producing knowledge can be cancelled. However, facilitation aims to use this authority to upgrade children's authority in narrating, commenting, showing their feelings, i.e. in displaying their agency. Facilitation fails when facilitators' authority does not enhance children's agency: in these cases, the upgrading of facilitators' authority undermines children's construction of knowledge. Problems of epistemic authority can be shown, for instance, through ways of checking children's knowledge and guiding conversations towards certain outcomes, regarding relations and behaviours.

Problems of facilitation arise when facilitators initiate a so-called IRE sequence (Initiation, Reply, Evaluation) in order to check children's knowledge. The facilitator initiates this type of sequence through a question and concludes it giving an evaluative feedback to the child's reply. In example 61, the facilitator asks what is the synonym for "shisha" (turn 3), M3 answers to this question (turn 4) and the facilitator provides a positive evaluation (turn 5).

Example 61

1. M5: das ist eine Shisha.
   it's a shisha pipe.
2. M6: ja.
   yeah.
3. FAC: **mhm. wisst ihr noch ein anderes Wort für Shisha? Irgendein anderes Wort?**
   mm-hm. Do you know another word for shisha? Any other word?
4. M3: **Wasserpfeife**
   water pipe
5. FAC: **genau**
   exactly

Problems of facilitation also arise when facilitators direct conversations, guiding them towards positive social relations or providing normative directions. In these cases, facilitators' actions reduce children's authority by assimilating it to deviance and obedience. In example 62, the facilitator stresses that too many questions impede the child to answer (turn 1), then he blocks a contribution inviting to listen and inviting M5 to repeat his first question (turn 4). Finally, he invites to wait for an answer before providing other questions (turn 6).

Example 62

1. FAC: **sì però se fate tante domande lui come fa a rispondervi?**
   Yes but if you ask so many questions how can he answer to you?
2. F4: eh lo so
   eh I know
3. ?: posso dire?
   may I say?
4. FAC: **no ascolta ascolta un po' allora la prima domanda gliela ripeti per piacere?**
   No listen listen a little so can you please repeat the first question?
5. M5: no [ho detto
   No [I said
6. FAC: [**e aspetti e aspetti che ti risponda**
   [*and you wait and you wait that he answers*

In example 63, the facilitator invites to respect the turn of speech, based on a circular organisation (turns 4 and 6). However, this organisation prevents any autonomous and timely contribution to the narratives.

Example 63

1. F5: nee, eigentlich ist so gemischt, manchmal is egal, manchmal nicht.
   no, actually it's mixed, sometimes it doesn't matter to me, sometimes it does.
2. FAC: okay, manchmal egal, manchmal nicht.
   okay, sometimes it doesn't matter, sometimes it does.
3. F2: mir ist eigentlich voll egal. Jetzt wollte ich natürlich noch was fragen.
   it doesn't matter to me at all actually. Now I wanted to ask something of course.
4. FAC: **nee, warte, nein,nein nein. Ja. Lässt dein Foto einfach hier. Leg auf dein Stuhl. Wir machen erst die eine Runde zu Ende. Du kannst dir so lange merken, was du wissen möchtest.**
   no, wait, no, no, no. Yes. Just leave your photo here. Put it on the chair. We're finishing the first round first. You can keep in mind what you wanted to know that long.
5. M11: darf ich was dazu sagen?
   can I say something?
6. FAC: **hier gehen wir weiter.**
   we're moving round the circle.

Other two types of problem of facilitation are the lack of focus on children's contributions and narratives, and the missed opportunity to enhance children's agency and narratives. Example 64 follows F7's long story about a gift to her aunt. The facilitator guesses about a gift of her father to her mother, not mentioned by F7 (turn 1). He insists on this topic (turns 3 and 5), although F7 seems to avoid it, until the child reveals that her parents are separated (turn 6). The facilitator shows understanding of this news (turns 7 and 9), then he repairs his lack of attention supporting the child's interest in the gift for her aunt (turns 11 and 13).

Example 64

1. FAC: **e posso essere curioso e indiscreto il papà ha fatto un regalo alla mamma?**
   And may I be curious and tactless did your dad a gift to your mum?
   (..)
2. F7: non lo so no perché
   I don't know no because
3. FAC: **gliel'ha fatto in segre- in segreto**
   He made it secre- secretly
4. F7: perché [io

5. FAC: [**senza raccontarti nie-**
          [*without telling you not-*

6. F7:   e: i miei genitori non stanno più insieme
    e: my parents are no more together

7. FAC: **ah ecco perché hai fotografato lo zio**
    Ah this is because you took the picture of your uncle

8. F7:   ((nods))

9. FAC: ((nods)) **i tuoi non stanno più insieme e quindi tu hai fatto la foto del regalo che lo zio ha fatto alla zia**
    your parents are no more together and so you took the picture of the gift that your uncle mad to your aunt

10. F7:   ((nods))

11. FAC: **e e la zia come com'è rimasta? Molto contenta?**
    And and how was your aunt? Very happy?

12. F7:   sì
    yes

13. FAC: **e: come come: ti sei accorta che era contenta la zia?**
    And how how did you understand that your aunt was happy?

In example 65, the facilitator does not support F6's story, in the attempt of connecting it with his personal story. After some questions about F6's origins, the facilitator develops the child's utterance about her place of birth as a place that is near to his own home (turn 5). The teacher repairs this deviation from the ongoing narrative asking for further details about F6's story (turns 6 and 8). The teacher's unusual intervention enhances the child's story.

Example 65

1. FAC: ma sei nata in Cina?
    But were you born in China?

2. F6:   no sono nata qui in Italia a ((città))
    No I was born here in Italy in ((city))

3. FAC: a ((città))?
    In ((city))

4. F6:   sì
    Yes

5. FAC: [**quindi vicino più vicino a casa mia**
    [*so near nearer to my house*

6. T: [**e poi?**
    [*and then?*

7. F6:   ((smiles))

8. T: **è nata sei nata a ((città)) poi?**
    She was born you were born in ((city)) then?

9. F6:   e: quando tipo avevo tipo: un anno sono andata in Cina,
    and: when I was like: one year old I went to China,

10. FAC: ah

11. F6:   ci sono rimasta tipo due o tre anni, (.) e: quando dovevo ritornare cioè dovevo ritornare in Italia e sono andata in autobus insieme a mia sorella e poi c'era un uomo che non conoscevo e io ho chiesto ma chi sei te? E poi lui mi ha detto sono tuo padre hh
    I stayed there more or less two or three years, (.) and: when I had to come back I mean I had to come back to Italy and I went on a bus with my sister and then there was a man that I dind't know and I asked who are you? And then he told me I am your father hh

11.2 Managemnt of conflict narratives and interactional conflicts

The SHARMED activities show that conflicts can become relevant in two ways: as narratives and as disputes between children. In the first case, facilitators need to understand what the narrative tells about transgression and conflict. In the second case, facilitators need to manage interactional conflicts emerging in the classroom. The two ways can also be combined. The SHARMED activities have also shown that the raising of interactional conflicts can depend on the context: they were more frequent in the Italian settings than in the other settings.

Facilitation of narratives of conflicts and management of interactional conflicts can require very long interactions, including tentative forms of mediation. In the SHARMED activities, conflict mediation was based on three types of action. These are certainly not the only possible actions, but they can be a useful reference for mediation in case of facilitation.

The first type of action is inviting to reflect on children's accuses: these invitations avoid that accuses become judgments and enhance the telling of different views, which are thus intended as different social constructions, as it is shown in example 1, in which a narrative mixes with an interactional conflict. Example 1 shows a sort phase of the very long conversation.

Example 66 regards a narrative of conflict triggered by a video in which M1 has described a photograph regarding a red flower. M1 says that red is his favourite colour and the facilitator asks why M1 prefers this colour. The child answers with the term "blood", repeated two times (turn 1). The facilitator asks if this means that there is life in blood or that M1 likes blood. M1's answer clarifies his violent attitude (turn 3, "I like to hit"). The facilitator repeats this statement, acknowledges it ("okay"); then he asks if someone in the class has been hit by M1. Thus, the facilitator avoids a direct confrontation with M1, asking additional details about his behaviours to his classmates. This question (1) avoids label and judgement on a "deviant" person, (2) avoids M1's self-construction of identity around deviance, (3) promotes a more nuanced narrative on this behaviour; (4) transforms a personal narrative in a collective reflection. This fourth effect of the facilitator's question imports the conflict from the narrative to the classroom interaction. The consequence of the question is a general confirmation of M1's negative behaviour (turns 7-12). The facilitator continues to promote a reflection, by asking to M2 if he has never reacted to M1 and if thinks that M1 likes to hit. Then, the facilitator repeats M2's "I don't know" (turn 17), however insisting in inviting the child to tell about the time he was hit by M1 (turn 19). M2 stresses that he has been hit several times, and the facilitator acknowledges this information (turn 22). M1's following comments ("they were a couple one and two") clearly refers to a specific episode (turn 24). However, the facilitator does not take this reference, continuing to ask M2 about the reason of M1's behavior with a focused question (turn 25). Finally, M2 provides an answer, which stresses M1's casual and humoral behavior. This answer is rejected by M1 (turns 26-29), who in this way contributes to the construction of his own identity.

Extract 66

1. M1: il sangue (.) il sangue
   The blood (.) the blood
2. FAC: ah il sangue c'è la vita nel sangue eh? O perché ti piace il sangue?
   Ah the blood there is life in the blood eh? Or is it because you like blood?
3. M1: no mi piace picchiare
   No I like to beat
4. FAC: **ti piace picchiare ok, qualcuno di voi le ha già prese da lui?**
   You like to beat ok is there some of you who was already beaten by him
5. Some: sì
   yes
6. FAC: eh?
7. M2: ((rises his hand))
8. M?: tutti

          everybody
9. FAC: te le hai prese?
          Were you beaten?
10. M2: ((nods))
11. FAC: **non hai mai reagito**
          Have you never reacted?
12. M2: ((shakes his head))
13. M1: cioè non le han mai prese ((nomi))
          Well (names)) were never beaten
14. M3: (?)
15. FAC: **ma secondo te perché gli piace picchiare?**
          but in your opinion why does he like to beat?
16. M2: non lo so
          I don't know
17. FAC: **non lo sai**
          You don't know
18. M2: no
19. FAC: **non ti sei posto il problema però non hai reag- ce la vuoi raccontare quella volta hai voglia?**
          You never thought of it but you have not react- would you like to tell us that time, would you?
20. M2: ma quelle: [quelle volte
          But those: [those times
21. M?:   [quelle volte
                 [those times
22. FAC: **ah più di una volta**
          Ah more than once
23. M2: sì (?)
          yes
24. M1: erano erano in coppia uno e due ((indicando))
          They were a couple one and two ((indicates))
25. FAC: **ma secondo te lui si diverte così oppu[re**
          But in your opinion does he have fun in this way [or
26. M2:   [sì si sveglia e dice: vengo a scuola e picchio
                                 [yes he awakes and says I come to school and I beat
27. FAC: **ah**
28. M9: °(?)
29. M1: no! non è così
          No! It's not in that way

M1's rejection opens a new phase of interaction, in which M1 and M2 start to discuss, under the facilitator's coordination, through a minimal feedback to M1, i.e. a repetition of his utterance in interrogative form (turn 30). M2 and M1 confirm their diverging points of view, without any substantial explanation. The facilitator supports M1's contribution through a short explication, which however does not develop the child's view (turn 33). The facilitator insists in finding an explanation, this time addressing M1 directly (turn 35). As M1 continues to answer in uncertain way, the facilitator provides a development, suggesting contingent irritability as possible explanation (turn 37). M1 starts to talk in overlapping with M2. They mutually invite each other to talk first, and M1 insists in inviting M2, maybe trying to avoid direct explanation. M2 insists in his interpretation of M1's casual behaviour, which oscillates between aggressiveness and friendship. M1 does not seem very satisfied, but he is interrupted by M8, who invites him to listen M2. The facilitator concludes M2's suspended turn with a formulation about M1's contingent need of unloading physically (turns 51 and 53), which is confirmed by M2 (turns 52 and 54).

30. FAC: **e non è così?**
          And it is not in this way
31. M2: se[condo me è così poi

		In [my opinion it is in this way then
32.	M1:	[no per- boh non so (.) cioè non cioè non mi sveglio a dire: ah oggi picchio per esempio: ((guardandosi intorno))
		[*no, for boh I dont' know (.) I mean I don't I means I don't awake to say ah today I beat for example ((he looks around))*
33.	FAC:	**cioè non lo fai**
		So you don't do it
34.	M1:	e: (.) cioè
		e: (.) well
35.	**FAC:**	**ma c'è qualcosa che ti: spinge a: comportarti così?**
		But is there something that pushes you to behave in this way?
36.	M1:	eh boh cioè
		eh boh well
37.	FAC:	**a[d esempio quando sei più nervoso**
		F[or instance when you are more nervous
38.	M1:	[quando:
		[*when*
39.	FAC:	**oppure quando**
		Or when
40.	M1:	[cioè quando
		[*I mean when*
41.	M2:	[cioè a volte
		[*well sometimes*
42.	M1:	vai vai
		Go go
43.	M2:	vai vai
		Go go
44.	M1:	vai
		go
45.	M2:	a volte cioè ci son dei giorni in cui (.) boh gli vie- viene lì nel tuo banco e ti picchia e altri in cui
		sometimes well there are some days in which (.) boh he com- he comes at your desk and others in which
46.	M1:	beh [tu (che cosa)
		Well [you what
47.	M2:	[ti è molto amico:
		[*he is very friendly with you*
48.	M1:	aspetta tu cosa (?)?
		Wait what do you (?)
49.	M8:	ma gli hai appena detto di parlare lascialo parlare
		But you have said him to talk joust now leave him to talk
50.	M2:	è molto amico: tipo: ti viene lì, ti sta vicino, ti dà un pezzo di merenda, parla, ((allarga le braccia)) e [a volte
		he is very friendly like he comes there he stays close to you, he gives you a piece of snack, he talks ((extends his arms)) and [sometimes
51.	FAC:	**[però ci sono dei momenti in cui invece ha bisogno di:**
		[*however there are moments in which he needs to:*
52.	M2:	sfogarsi
		Let off steam
53.	FAC:	**di sfogarsi fisicamente cioè invece di ascoltare la musica e rilassarsi lui si sfoga menando**
		to let off steam physically I mean instead of listenting music and relax he lets off steam beating
54.	M2:	sì
		yes

The second type of action is presenting personal stories as ways of discouraging unproductive conflicts. This type of action avoids concluding the interaction by accusing someone of bad

behaviour. Example 67 follows a long narrative about a conflict raised during a football game in the school courtyard. During the previous conversation, as in example 1, the facilitator has invited to reflect on accuses, avoiding their transformation in judgments and enhancing the telling of different views, as different social constructions. In example 67, this phase is concluded by the facilitator's personal story, delivered to enhance reflection on the conflict. The facilitator introduces the story by creating expectations of something deviant or irregular, through a series of focused questions (turns 78, 82 and 85). In turns 88 and 90, the facilitator tells his personal story of expeulsion during a football game. After some comments, he increases the expectation of his deviant behavior (turn 97), telling the crucial part of his story (turns 99-107): his protest, the decision of the referee to refer about his negative behaviour and his suspension from the football games for a full year. His conclusion is that he understood that his behavior was wrong (turn 113).

Example 67

1	FAC:	**adesso ve ne dico una però poi (.) ve la dimenticate subito? Se ve la dico?**
		Now I tell you one thing then (.) do you forget it immediately? If I tell you it?
2.	Some:	sì, no
		Yes, no
3.	FAC:	sicuro?
		Are you sure?
4.	F10:	dillo lo stesso
		Tell it anyway
5.	FAC:	**sicuro che ve la dimenticate?**
		Are you sure that you forget it?
6.	F10:	[no
7.	?:	[sì
		[*yes*
8.	FAC:	**e che non la raccontate in giro?**
		And that you don't tell it around?
9.	Some:	sì
		yes
10.	FAC:	**allora io quando avevo (.) quattordici anni (..) giocavo a calcio ed ero un po' nervoso forse un po': ((indicando M2)) anch'io avevo molta energia da (.) da giocare no? E giocavo in difesa (.) allora un attaccante mi scarta, e io allungo la gamba gli faccio fallo no? Allora l'arbitro è venuto da me e mi ha e: dato il cartellino rosso [e io**
		so when I was (.) fourteen years old (.) I played football and I was a bit nervous, maybe a bit ((indicating M2)) I too had much energy to (.) to play, ok? And I played defense (.) so a striker dribbled me, I extended my leg and I made a foul, ok? So the referee came to me and gave me the red card [and I
11.	M14:	[come? Giallo giallo
		[How? Yellow yellow
12.	FAC:	**no rosso diretto**
		No, directly red
13.	M14:	rosso?
		Red?
14.	FAC:	((nods))
15.	?:	(per?)
16.	M3:	sì [si può si può
		Yes [it's possible it's possible
17.	FAC:	[perché era un fallo che secondo lui non dovevo fare
		[*as it was a foul that in his opinion I shouldn't do*
18.	?:	(?)
19.	FAC:	**e indovinate cos'ho fatto io**
		And guess what I did

20. M2:   [hai dato un calcio all'arbitro
           [*you kicked the referee*
21. F3:   [boh eri arrabbiato
           [*boh you were angry*
22. FAC: **((indica M2)) ho fatto un po' come lui mi sono arrabbiato con l'arbitro**
           ((indicates M2)) I did a bit as him I became angry with the referee
23. ?: (?)
24. M3:   come Higuain
           As Higuain
25. FAC: **e sapete cos'ha fatto l'arbitro?**
           And do you know what the referee did?
26. F3:   cos'ha fatto?
           What did he?
27. FAC: **ha scritto nel suo: libretto che: io avevo reagito e mi hanno sospeso per un anno**
           He wrote in his book that I reacted and they suspended me for a year
28. Some: ah:!
29. F10:   cosa significa?
           What does it mean?
30. FAC: **che per un anno non ho più potuto giocare a calcio**
           That for a year I couldn't play football
31. M2:   [quando ti esplodono dalla scuola
           [*when they explode you from school*
32. M3:   [ma cosa ti ha scritto?
           [*but what did he write about you?*
33. FAC: mh?
34. M3:   ma
           but
35. FAC: **dopo ho capito che insomma**
           After that I understood that hence

The third type of action is managing reflection by leaving room to the children but concluding with a personal comment about the advantages of reflecting on conflicts. Example 68 follows a long discussion among the children about a conflict raised while they were preparing the space for the activity. The facilitator has coordinated this discussion rather loosely, leaving room to the children (adopting the second form of facilitation shown in policy brief 5). At the end of the discussion, however, he provides a comment, saying that the discussion was particularly interesting and that it is very important to continue to talk, listen each other, sharing agreements and decisions, in order to solve problems (turn 1). He also starts to add a suggestion about avoiding to accuse who did not the best performance (turn 3).

Example 68

1. FAC: **allora la discussione che avete fatto e: mi e: era particolarmente interessante l'ho trovata almeno io l'ho trovata particolarmente interessante nel senso che credo che se voi e: continuate a parlare in questo modo tra di voi cioè che e: parlate ma anche vi ascoltate, e: ecco che forse è più facile e: risolvere i problemi no? Dovete mettervi dovete mettervi d'accordo magari cioè non lo so io ve la dico così e: è giusto parlarsi e però quando c'è da organizzare un lavoro magari qualcuno può dirigere mentre gli altri stanno ad ascoltare ad esempio no?**
           so your discussion e: was particularly interesting as I believe that if you continue to talk in this way between you and you speak but also listen to each other maybe it is easier to solve problem isn't it? You must you must agree maybe well I don't know I tell you so e: it's right talk and however when you must organise a work maybe someone can direct while the others listen for example, don't you?
2. M1: (?)
3. FAC: come come volete però ecco **io trovo interessante la modalità che avete adottato**

nel senso che e: vi siete: chiariti, avete parlato, eccetera eccetera, un consiglio un suggerimento che io do no? E: e quando: e: non so succedono queste cose qua, e: invece di dire eh ma lui non ha fatto:
how how you prefer but ok I find interesting the way that you adopted as you cleared up, you talked etcetera etcetera, an advice a suggestion that I have, okay? E: when I don't know something like this happens e: instead of saying eh but he didn't do

This comment is interrupted by a new, rather long conversation among the children, In turns 70-74, the facilitator restarts his comment, suggesting that the children should think what they can do to improve the situation, rather than what others did not.

70. FAC: **no provate a pensare a quello che potevate fare voi piuttosto che a quello che doveva fare l'altro**
no try to think what you could do rather than that someone else had to do
71. M1: in che senso?
In what sense?
72. FAC: **cioè invece di dire l'altro non ha fatto, l'altro ha fatto, l'altro: stava seduto, l'altro::, cosa potevo fare per (..) migliorare la situa[zione?**
I mean rather than saying the other did not do, the other did, the other was sitting, the other, what could I do to (..) improve the situation?
73. M1: [chiedere
To ask
74. FAC: **sì tu sì tu cos'avresti potuto fare?**
Yes you yes what could you do?

Later, at the end of this long conversation, the facilitator stresses the importance of understanding each other and having the possibility to contribute to the conversation freely, without being accused by others.

103. FAC: **ok vedete però la cosa ribadisco la cosa importante è che in questo caso ci siamo un po' chiariti no?**
ok look however the thing I repeat the important thing is that in this case we have cleared up didn't we?
104. ?: mh mh
105. FAC: **e che l'importante è che quando si affronta un problema come avete fatto voi ognuno di voi abbia la possibilità di intervenire liberamente no? Senza sentirsi magari accusato (.) ok?**
And that the important thing is that when a problems is dealt with as you did each of you can intervene freely, isn't it? Without feeling maybe accused (.) ok?

Conflicts can also be avoided or ignored, thus privileging the smooth production of narratives. Avoiding and ignoring may be considered a positive way of acting, as it does not emphasize conflicts. However, conflicts that are not managed can become, or remain, unresolved in the classroom. Conflicts are symptoms of relational problems, which in the long run can destroy positive relations in the classroom. Avoiding their management may be a good solution for the contingent continuity of facilitation, but it may also be a negative perspective for the classroom.
Example 69 follows a phase of some turbulence in the classroom and the facilitator's comment that she does not want to hear jokes that can offend other children. F2 takes the floor to announce a series of questions to the facilitator (turn 1). In fact, however, F2 does not ask questions, but she talk about her annoyance when children talk loudly. This is followed by a short exchange with the facilitator, who develops her contribution (turns 5-9), overlapping with F5's exclamation, which is not clearly linked to what is happening. The conflict raises when M11 accuses F2 to lie (turn 11) and F2 reacts with a nasty comment (turn 12). The facilitator ignores this exchange inviting other contributions (turn 13).

Example 69

1.   F2:   ähm, ich habe drei Fragen an Sie.
          emm, I have three questions for you ((FAC))
2.   ((children talk over one another))
3.   FAC: ich merk das.
          I can see that.
4.   F2:   das nervt wenn die so laut sind.
          it's annoying when they get so loud.
5.   FAC: oh, hier war gerad ein Kommentar, das nervt wenn die Gruppe so laut ist, weil jemand was [Fragen möchte].
          oh, there was just a comment here, that it's annoying when the group gets so loud because someone [has a question].
6.   F5:   [halt die Klappe]
          [shut up]
7.   FAC: das heißt, manchmal ist es dir doch wichtig, dass die Leute dir zuhören.
          that means sometimes it is important to you that people listen to you after all.
8.   F2:   nee, das nervt.
          nah, it's annoying.
9.   FAC: ah, gut. Du möchtest doch die ganze Zeit was sagen, und wenn ich nicht sage okay, oder die anderen dir nicht zuhören ist das anscheind nervig für dich.
          aha, I see. You've wanted to say something the whole time and if I don't say okay, or if the others don't listen to you, that's apparently annoying for you.
10. M11: **das ist jetzt unfair und sie lügt. Sie erzählt uns fast jeden Tag irgendwelche Geschichten.**
          that's unfair and she's lying. She tells us some sort of stories almost every day.
11. F2:   **red mal Deutsch, das heißt gelogen und nicht gelügt.**
          speak German, it's called lying and not lyinged.
12.   ((children talk over one another))
13. FAC: **so, okay, hier hat jemand eine Frage in der Runde.**
          well, okay, there's someone else here with a question in the group.

12. Facilitation of narratives about cultures

12.1 Comparisons of cultures

During the SHARMED activities, only some stories regarded cultural differences, based on comparison between different cultures, sometimes stressing the primacy of the cultures of countries of immigration. Interestingly, narratives about cultures have been differently frequent in different settings. These differences depend partly on the form of facilitation, partly on the context, and partly on the interest shown by the children. It is therefore important to reflect about what facilitation means in the so-called multicultural classrooms.

In example 70, turn 1, the facilitator asks an open question to expand the meaning of the feast mentioned by M4 (who said that his origins are in Santo Domingo). This follows a conversation on the affective relations between the child and his grandmother. In particular, the facilitator asks of the meaning of a Latin feast, then he proposes some developments in interrogative tone, associating the feast to fun and music (turns 3 and 5). This association is confirmed by M4. Then, the facilitator asks if this type of feast can be shared by "us" (i.e. Italians), who are explicitly defied as Latins in different way (turn 7). In this way, the facilitator enhances the comparison between Italians and Latin Americans. The child confirms that there is something shared, and the facilitator asks what instead is different (turn 9). Some seconds of silence show that the child is uncertain, but then he answers "more fun". This is developed by the facilitator as more will and interest in having fun (turn 11), and the child confirms. The facilitator addresses the class with another development, highlighting that Italians are less active in having fun (urn 13). Some children confirm. However, M3 takes the floor to stress that his mother is Cuban, but he is not so willing to have fun (turns 18 and 20). The facilitator develops

this turn, suggesting that M3's mother is always happy and willing to have fun (turn 21) and M3 confirms.

Example 70

1. FAC: **e quando prima parlavi di (.) una festa latina no? Questa cosa de- per te che cos'è il: essere latini?**
And before when you told of (.) a Latin feast, wasn't it? This thing what is to be Latin for you?
(..)
2. M4: FESTA:! ((alzando le braccia))
FEAST! ((raising his arms))
3. FAC: **divertimento?**
Having fun?
4. M4: sì
yes
5. FAC: **musica?**
Music?
6. M4: sì
yes
7. FAC: **e secondo te non: non è una cosa che accomuna anche noi che non siamo latini? [o meglio siamo latini anche noi ma (.) in maniera diversa**
And in your opinion isn't this a thing that is ahared by us who are not Latins? Or better we are also Latins but in a different way
8. M4: [((nods)) sì   ((nods))
      yes
9. FAC: **in che cosa trovi che ci sia differenza?**
What is the difference for you?
(2.0)
10. M4: più divertimento
More fun
11. FAC: **cioè voi sentite più: [voglia di divertirvi**
You mean that you feel more will to have fun
12. M4:   [sì   sì
                         [*yes*   *yes*
13. FAC: **ah (..) quindi noi siamo un po' più: (.) seduti eh? Loro invece –**
Ah (..) so we are a bit more inactive eh? Instead they -
14. M?: un po'
A bit
15. FAC: è così?
Is it right?
16. Some: sì
yes
17. FAC: cioè [hanno (?)
You mean they have (?)
18. M3:   [mia madre tipo viene da cuba anche lei
          [*my mother too like comes from Cuba*
19. FAC: sì
yes
20. M3: però io no cioè non ho tanta voglia
However I don't, I mean I haven't so much will
21. FAC: **e la mamma come la: come la: che impressione ti fa? Di una persona che vuol sempre: essere allegra, divertirsi?**
And your mum how how what is your impression about her? Is she a person who always wants to be cheerful, to have fun?
22. M3: sì
yes

After some turns, in which he explores M3's story about his parents, the facilitator re-establishes the topic of being Latins, explicating it as having some meaning (turn 77). M3 recognises that the behaviours are a bit different, but he also adds that Latins are similar to Italians. The facilitator explicates that the Italians are also Latins (turn 81). However, M3 is now less uncertain in asserting that the Latin culture is different from the Italian one, while however siding for the latter ("dalla nostra") and thus distancing from his mother's culture, as he already did previously. The facilitator repeats the last part of the child's utterance showing understanding (turn 85).

77. FAC: **ah ok (.) e: quindi ((gesticola)) essere latini ha un suo significato**
   Ah ok (.) and so ((gesticulates)) to be Latins has a meaning
78. M3: boh mh: non lo so cioè (.) cioè hanno dei comportamenti un po' diversi
   Boh mh: I don't know, well (.) well they have a bit different behaviours
79. FAC: mh
80. M3: però sono uguali in genere [cioè hanno solo un comportamento dive[rso
   But they are the same generally [I mean they only have a different behaviour
81. **FAC:** [perché a te ti   [**anche noi italiani siamo latini dicono**
   [because to you   [we Italians are alsoLatins they say
82. M3: sì ma no: cioè latini che vengon dall'America tutte le persone hanno [(?)
   Yes but no I mean Latins who come from America all people have [(?)
83. FAC: [del sud America te dici
   [from South America you say
84. M3: sì la loro cultura è diversa dalla nostra
   Yes their culture is different from ours
85. FAC: **dalla nostra ok**
   From ours ok

Example 70 shows that the cultural comparison between Latin Americans and Italians is contingently constructed in the interaction, through the active participation of the facilitator, above all through his formulations. This is an ambiguous contribution, as it may seem that the facilitator is enhancing cultural difference, but the children have the last word on these differences and their contributions show their perspectives and uncertainties about cultural identity, always connected to their personal stories.

Example 71 is similar to example 1. In turn 2, answering to the facilitator's question regarding the choice of the photograph, M2 introduces an Islamic feast (Eid), represented in the photograph, and the place where the photograph was taken (Afghanistan). The facilitator provides an explication, which is near to a repetition (turn 3). Then, M2 autonomously expands on the event, focusing on a story regarding his family. The facilitator asks a question to clarify the meaning of the child's hat (turn 5), then she checks if this is linked to Eid and if it means something specific (turns 7 and 9). She explicates the child's answer; then she appreciates the hat and asks if the child has something to add (turn 11). In the following conversation, the cultural issue is abandoned, as the child focuses on his family memories, supported by the facilitator's questions (turns 17, 19 and 23) and short personal story (turn 21).

Example 71

1. FAC: Why did you choose to bring that in?
2. M2: Because it was Eid in Afghanistan.
3. FAC: **So, it's in Afghanistan, so it's celebrating Eid.**
4. M2: Yeah. All of our family was gathered around in this (?) park and my grandfather

unfortunately had to bring his camera because he used to be a photographer, and I think he wanted me to wear this hat and he made me put it on and it made me smile (?) picture.

5. FAC: **Why did he make you wear that hat?**
6. M2: Because it was my dad's old hat.
7. FAC: **Oh, so your dad used to wear that hat as well and how does it link to Eid, how does that link to Eid?**
8. M2: Because he wore it on the same day as Eid.
9. FAC: **And does it represent something, does it mean something?**
10. M2: It doesn't mean anything it's some hats that Afghans wear.
11. FAC: **In the Eid celebration.** Okay, **I really love** all of the (?) on there and **I love** the way it comes out like a little pyramid, a triangle, that's really lovely. I noticed a lot (?). **What else can you remember about the picture?**
12. 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.
13. FAC: Oh wow, some cousins might do that sometimes when they're younger.
14. 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.
15. FAC: Were you very small?
16. M2: Yeah.
17. 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?**
18. 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.
19. 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?**
20. M2: Yeah.
21. FAC: I used to sleep with my grandma when I was little
22. 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 (?) they put their hands (?) in one of the pictures and told me like there's a ghost and a hand appeared.
23. FAC: **So, you want to sleep with your grandma to be safe?**
24. 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.

The interactional production of comparisons does not necessarily lead to introduce cultural differences. Example 72 regards the story of M7's birthday feast in Morocco. The facilitator asks some questions about the photograph and the birthday (turns 1, 3, 5 and 7). Following the child's description, the facilitator provides a development about the fact that birthday parties are similar everywhere (turn 11). After M7's confirmation, he adds a question opening a possible alternative interpretation (turn 13), but the child confirms that there are no differences.

Example 72

1. FAC: **e: e questa foto l'hai scelta per quale motivo?**
   e: and you chose this picture for what reason?
2. M7: eh perché appunto: stava iniziando il mio secondo compleanno che era bellissimo
   Eh because well my second birthday was becoming and it was wonderful
3. FAC: **sì? Ti ricordi: qualcosa?**
   Was it? Do you remember something?
   (.)

4. M7: pochissimo [è un po' difficile
        Very little [it's a bit difficult
5. FAC: [**ti hanno chi è? la mamma che ti ha raccontato di quella festa?**
        [*they told it who? Was your mum who told you of this photo?*
6. M7: sì cioè mia madre
        Yes, well my mother
7. FAC: cosa ti ha raccontato?
        What did she tell you?
8. M7: eh che: che avevano preparato: c'era un casino di gente e avevano preparato
        Eh that we prepared there were many people and we had prepared
9. ?:   il pony
        The pony
10. M7: la torta e: i palloncini [il clown
        The cake and the balloons [the clown
11. FAC: [**quindi le feste di compleanno sono un po' uguali dappertutto**
        [*so birthday parties are the a bit the same everywhere*
12. M7: sì
        yes
13. FAC: **o in Marocco si fa qualcosa di diverso che tu sappia**
        Or in Morocco you know that something different is done
14. M7: no è uguale
        No it's the same
15. FAC: **son tutte uguali**
        They are all the same
16. M7: sì
        yes

The introduction of cultural issues can also show the impact of the Eurocentric narrative on children whose origins are from non-European countries, though this has been very rare during the SHARMED activities. In example 73, F1 tells that her cousin is not seen as Indian, while she is. The facilitator asks for confirmation (turn 2), then she develops the child' utterance through a formulation of the cousin's multiple cultural identity (turn 4). After the child's confirmation, the facilitator adds a comment on the labels that lead to miss a part of multiple identity (turn 6). The facilitator asks a question about the explanation of this lack of recognition of full identity (turn 8). After reflecting, the child mentions the different skin colour, which leads people to ignore the Indian identity. The facilitator provides a positive assessment of "all of the bits" of personal identity (turn 12), siding with the child in assessing stereotypes and prejudices negatively.

Example 73

1. F1: um (..) people (..) because my cousin's dad is Scottish um and her mum is half-Indian, people say that she's not Indian, she's Scottish and English but she is
2. FAC: **She is?**
3. F1: Yeah
4. FAC: **So, she's Scottish, English and Indian**
5. F1: Yeah
6. FAC: **because she couldn't be just half and half and then miss a bit out**
7. F1: Yeah ((nods))
8. FAC: **so why do you think that happens? Why do you think we all miss out a bit of somebody?**
9. F1: because
10. FAC: It's tricky, isn't it?
11. F1: because she's got a different skin colour and we're cousins and people don't really think we're cousins and think we are not Indians
12. FAC: **yeah (..) and I think all of the bits that we have that make us, us are all lovely and wonderful and it's good to know about them (..) yeah**
13. F1: ((nods))

12.2 Constructions of (cultural) identity

Example 73 has introduced the problem of identity. Migration processes enhance the necessity to take in account both children's origins and their new contexts of life. The outcome of this double consideration is unpredictable, as it can lead to different outcomes. Facilitation can highlight these different outcomes, providing important elements of knowledge about children's orientations. In facilitated classroom interactions, children's identities can be presented as cultural identities, uncertain identities and personal identities rejecting belonging.

Example 74 shows the child's desire to visit his country of origin (Chile). M8 tells that his parents do not talk with him about this country (turns 6-10). However he would like to see what he calls "il mio popolo" (my people), thus stressing his sense of belonging (turns 12 and 14). The use of the term people is not recognised by the facilitator, who reformulates it as country of origin (turn 15). The child explains his desire saying that he imagines his people as very cheerful (turn 18).

Example 74

1.	FAC:	**e ti piacerebbe tornare?**
		And would you like to go back
2.	M8:	sì
		yes
3.	FAC:	**e cos'è che c'è che ti attira? (..) che ti piacerebbe (.) vedere**
		And what does attract you? (..) that you would like to see
4.	M8:	[m:
5.	FAC:	**[cioè s- ti ha parlato nessuno del Cile? Forse i tuoi genitori?**
		[*I mean did anybody talk to you of Chile? Maybe your parents?*
6.	M8:	m: no
7.	FAC:	no?
8.	M8:	no
9.	FAC:	**non te ne parlano del Cile**
		They don't talk to you of Chile
10.	M8:	((shakes his head))
11.	FAC:	**e quindi come mai ti è venuta questa voglia?**
		And so why did this will arise?
12.	M8:	perché voglio vedere il mio:
		because I want to see my
13.	FAC:	sei curioso
		You are curious
14.	M8:	sì e voglio vedere il mio popolo
		Yes and I want to see my people
15.	FAC:	**cioè il tuo paese di origine**
		You mean your country of origin
16.	M8:	((nods))
17.	FAC:	**e come te lo aspetti? Nella tua fantasia come: com'è?**
		And how do you expect it? How how is it in your imagination?
18.	M8:	m: (.) molto allegro
		m: (.) very cheerful

In example 75, the facilitator asks M9's opinion about his life in Italy (turn 1). Initially, the child answers that he is well. However, the facilitator, capturing some hesitation, suggests with a question that his life might be better in Ukraine (turn 3). The child shows a positive feeling for both countries (Italy and Ukraine), avoiding to express a clear preference for one of them (turns 4 and 6). The facilitator asks for confirmation of this double preference (turns 7), receiving it.

Example 75

1. FAC: ho capito (.) **ma come ti trovi qui? Ti trovi bene?**
        I understand (.) but how are you here? Are you well?
2. M9:   sì
        yes
3. FAC: **era un po' meglio là?**
        Was it a bit better there?
   (..)
4. M9:   un po' qua
        A bit here
5. FAC: eh [beh
        Eh [well
6. M9:   [un po' là hh
            [*a bit there hh*
7. FAC: per certe cose eh?
        For some things eh?
8. M9:   sì
        yes

In example 76, responding to the facilitator's question about his possible return, M11 says that he does not know if he would like to live in his country (turn 2), then he tells that he is not thinking of it, but that his parents would like to return, as they have a house there (turns 6-10). The facilitator develops this statement by suggesting that M11 has to move (turn 11). M11 smiles, than he states that he will not move (turn 15).

Example 76

1. FAC: **ah (.) e tu ci andresti a vivere là?**
        Ah (.) and you would go to live there?
2. M11: m: boh non [so
        m: boh I don't [know
3. FAC: [ci stai pensando?
                    [*are you thinking of it?*
4. M11: ((shakes his head)) per ora n[o
                            Not for n[ow
5. FAC: [i i tuoi genitori tornerebbero là oppure prefe[riscono stare qua?
                                    [*your parents would come back there or would they prefer to stay here?*
6. M11:   [no i miei tornano là
                                                                [*no my parents come back there*
7. FAC: ah [sì?
        Re[ally?
8. M11: [c'hanno una casa quindi:
        [*they have a house, so:*
9. FAC: han deciso di tornare
        They have decide to go back
10. M11: sì hanno fatto una casa quindi
        Yes they buyed a house so
11. FAC: **quindi ti tocca: smuoverti a te**
        So you must move
12. M11: ((nods))
13. M?: ma quando?
        But when?
14. FAC: eh?

15. M11: oh loro vanno là io rimango qui
          Oh they go there I stay here

Example 77 shows an interesting conversation on identity. The facilitator asks questions on cultural identity to a child who was born in Germany (turns 1-5). Her answer (turn 6) highlights a multiple identity ("I'm German, British and African"), while she clarifies that she only speaks English. The last sentence enhances the facilitator's question, aiming to clarify the relation between language and culture (turn 7). F1 denies any relation between language and identity (turns 8 and 10). This denial is recognised by the facilitator through an explication (turn 11), which is developed by the child through a reference to "blood". The facilitator agrees with the child and adds her personal story, which explains that her agreement is based on direct experience (turn 13). Despite the fact that the facilitator invites to ask questions (turn 15), the child adds further reflection on this point, rejecting any classification and concluding that she is "from all places".

Example 77

1. FAC: Ok (..) and it's interesting (..) because you've got your birth certificate and you were born in Germany?
2. F1: Yeah
3. **FAC: ah (..) so would you say that you're German (..) what's your culture, who are you (..) what's your first name, M.?**
4. F1: M. (..) My first name's S.
5. FAC: Your first name's S. (..) so S., **how would you describe yourself? You're living in England but you've got a German birth certificate and maybe your family are from other places in the world so how would you describe yourself? Who are you?** (..) What's your (..) yeah, who are you?
6. F1: Um, I'm German, British, and African (..) um so I'd say I do not speak the languages but I speak English
7. **FAC: so do you think speak thing the language makes you from that country, or?**
8. F1: No
9. FAC: So what is it then, what do you think?
10. F1: I think it's the way (..) I think it's if you know that you're from there either you can't speak it or not
11. **FAC: yeah, so it's not the language that you speak, it's that you know that you were born here or that you've lived there or that your family were like this because of where they're from**
12. F1: Yeah (..) It's from your blood that's where you come from
13. **FAC: from your blood? Yeah (..) I er (..) I think I agree with you actually because I was born here I was born in England but my family are Irish so someone said to me but you're English and I said well I was born in England but my family are all Irish so I think like you said my blood is Irish but I was born in England so it's a bit of a tricky ((does hand movement)) kind of thing to explain, isn't it?**
14. F1: Yeah ((nods))
15. FAC: Yeah (..) does anyone ever ask you these things or is it just your own thinking?
16. F1: yeah because some people say that you're born in Germany but your name's English, you talk in English and you sound like an English person but I'm not and then they say you're not from Germany because um, my name is pretty English as well, so I am from all places

In example 78, answering to the facilitator's question if it is possible to say that a country is sad or cheerful (turn 1), F7 states that people can feel differently about the same country (turn 4). The facilitator develops this utterance as different moods (turn 6) and F7 confirms, thus showing her thinking of personal view and feelings as more important than cultural belonging.

Example 78

1. FAC: **ma si può dire di un paese che è triste o allegro?**
   But is it possible to say that a country is sad or cheerful?
2. Some: sì, no
   Yes, no
3. M1: no perché comunque: (?) perché comunque [in un paese
   No because anyway (?) because anyway [in a country
4. F7: [no perché qualcuno di quel paese si può sentire
   in un modo diverso da come ti senti te
   [*no because someone of that country can feel in a
   different way than you feel*
5. M1: eh
6. FAC: **quindi è una questione di stato d'animo non è una questione di paese?**
   So it's a question of mood is it not a question of country?
7. F7: sì
   yes

12.3 The problem of delicate issues

The way of dealing with delicate issues regarding migrant children, in particular refugees, is an important problem in facilitation. The German facilitators dealt with these situations avoiding support of stories that could highlight the delicate conditions of young refugees. However, the outcome was that migrant's narratives were rather marginal. In example 79, F6 describes the photograph, while saying that she "lives" in Aleppo (turn 1). The facilitator acknowledges this contribution, thanks the child and asks her a technical question about the photograph (turn 2). The facilitator receives confirmation and repeats this confirmation (turn 4). This short exchange blocks the conversation, which is restarted by the facilitator's following invitation to the other children to ask questions, immediately substituted by two direct questions to F6, again on a technical aspect, her way of searching the photographs on internet (turn 6). Then, the facilitator provides an utterance (turn 9) in which she acknowledges F6's explanation, comments the photograph as not inviting to go to Syria and thanks again F6. This example shows the facilitator's difficulty in dealing with F6's story: she does not ask anything about Aleppo, the war and above all the child's statement that she "lives" in Aleppo.

Example 79

1. F6: also, ich komme aus Syrien und ich wohne in Aleppo und diesen Foto habe ich in Internet gesucht und da habe ich ähm, ein Krieg gesehen und da hab ich den Bomb- Bomben wie sie unten fallen und da hab ich natürlich Angst und mh das ist echt nicht gut, dass wir müssen aus dem Syrien flüchten und ich wünsche gegen den Krieg, also weg und äh Syrien wieder gut ist.
   well, I come from Syria and I live in Aleppo and I searched for this photo on internet and I saw em, a war there and and the bo- bomb how they fall down and of course I am scared and that's really not good, that we must to flee Syria and I wish against the war, well, away, and err Syria is good again.
2. FAC: **mhm. Herzliches Dankeschön. Stimmt es, dass das ein Vorher und ein Nachher Bild ist?**
   mm-hm. Thank you very much. Is it true that it's a before and after picture?
3. F6: ähm, ja.
   emm, yes.
4. FAC: **ja.**
   yes.
5. F6: das ist.
   that is.
6. FAC: **habt ihr also gut erkannt, ja, mhm. Möchtet ihr vielleicht noch Fragen stellen? Habt ihr noch Fragen zum Bild? Hast du da lange gesucht im Internet oder hast du den Begriff eingegeben schon? Oder was hast du da eingegeben im Internet damit du das Bild**

bekommst?

so well spotted by all of you, yeah, mm-hm. Would you ((plural)) like to ask any more questions? Do you have any questions about the picture? Did you spend a long team searching the internet or had you found that picture before? Or what did you type into the search engine to find that picture?

7. F6: ähm, ich hab geschrieben, ähm Fotos von Aleppo. In den Krieg und nach- und äh vor dem Krieg und da hab ich gefunden.

em, I wrote, em, photos of Aleppo. In those war and after- und er, before the war and then I found.

8. FAC: **ah ja, das war dir wichtig ne, dass du das mal ne. mhm. Klasse, merk das auch grade in der Stimmung ja. Ich kann beobachten, dass wir jetzt alle Recht angespannt sind hier ja. Ist so ein bisschen Gefühl von, ah, wie schon gesagt, ja da möchte man kein Urlaub machen, das ist kein schönes Gefühl, wenn man auf das Bild guckt, herzliches Dankeschön auch an dich, dass du uns das rausgesucht hast und die Erinnerung mit uns teilst danke. Okay.**

ah I see, that it was important to you wasn't it, that you that erm yeah. Mm-hm. Great, do you all notice the atmosphere now. I can see that we're all a bit uptight here now. It's that kind of feeling of, er, just like you already said, yeah you wouldn't like to go there on holiday, that's not a nice feeling, when you look at the picture, thanks very much to you for looking out that picture for us and sharing the memory with us. Okay.

13. Summary and reflections

This chapter has provided an overview of the classroom activities during the SHARMED project. These resulst can suggest some interesting ways of facilitating narrative and dialogue through the use of images. This final summary can also work as a way of reflecting on facilitation.

1. Children's preference for narratives involving personal experiences and family, above all involving important personal feelings, is clear. It seems that more general or abstract contents can only be enhanced by teachers and facilitators. Transitions, from photograph to stories as well as between tellers and stories, can be very different, and facilitators may guide them to enrich narratives and dialogue. This analysis can show to teacher and facilitators what they can expect for what concerns types of narratives and ways of narrating during SHARMED-type activities.

2. Invitations to tell and questions to support narratives cooperate in the active enhancement of narratives. Invitations are frequently questions, used to start narratives, to add to and expand on narratives, to ask questions to the teller. While open questions can be useful to invite a child to start to tell a story, focused questions can be used to support the development of the story. The frequent use of focused questions is based on the necessity to clarify and check children's narratives, which can be rather fragmented. However, focused questions alone rarely enhance complex narratives: therefore, they cannot be used alone or for a long time. Combinations of different ways of inviting and combinations of focused and open questions are important strategies of enhancing narratives effectively. In this Policy Brief we have introduced the first important feature of facilitation: the choice among types of invitations and questions, and the ways of combining these types. While questions can be used both to facilitate the production of a narrative, and to support clarification of narratives, only or prevalently using questions for a long time is risky as it can show insistence, rather than desire to explore and expand children's narratives.

3. Use of minimal feedback allows effective support and recognition of children's stories. These types of feedback work well in two conditions: (1) when children's stories are fluid and do not need relevant support; (2) when facilitators prefers to avoid interrupting children's narratives through questions or comments. However, while minimal feedbacks are effective and useful in some circumstances, they cannot be the generalised way of supporting narratives. When the complexity of the interaction is higher, formulations are more effective.

4. Formulations are powerful actions, with three important functions: (1) showing the facilitator's attention (above all explications); (2) enhancing the children's narratives and comments (more frequently developments); (3) offering the children the opportunity to assert their perspectives, rejecting the formulation (developments). Developments are more risky than explications and sometimes are rejected. However, the difference between these two types of formulations in showing attention and enhancing expansions is not relevant, as both can enhance narrative expansions. Rejections are interesting as they show children's agency as lack of acquiescence for facilitator and interest in claiming their rights of telling the story. Facilitators can decide if and when using formulations as explications or developments, according to the way in which the narrative is told by the child: explications can clarify aspects of the narrative and sometime summarise them, while developments are useful to carry the narrative on. Facilitators can also decide if and when it is useful to provide series of formulations, thus checking when children's interest in expanding comes to end.

5. While questions can enhance and support the narrative production, types of minimal feedback and formulations show that narratives are listened to, enhance their continuation and, in the case of formulations, enhance co-construction, thus showing the facilitators' active participation and involvement in the narrative.

6. Facilitators' personal comments can be provided in different ways and with different degrees of success. In general, stories and displacements are less ambiguous than comments and appreciations, though they are not free from risks. While their length and pervasive nature can disturb children's interest and participation, stories and displacements can be adapted to the specific situation and linked to children's narratives. Moreover, they can be respectful of children's rights as primary participants in interactions. In these cases, facilitator's personal expressions are effective in increasing closeness, surprise, fun, stories and contributions, and, last but not least, sense of unpredictability. Personal comments are the most risky actions as they display the facilitator's authority in the clearest way. Appreciations are beautiful actions, but they risk to be rather intrusive in the conversation. Personal stories and above all displacements require a strong commitment and are not easy actions; above all it is not easy to decide when and how provide them in the conversation.

7. Children's initiatives are important, as they show children's agency, but challenging for facilitators' coordination. When facilitators can easily coordinate them, many autonomous contributions arise in the interaction, although some fragmentation can be the outcome of this situation. When children interrupt ongoing conversations or narratives, the facilitator's decision of the way of reacting depends on two aspects: (1) the perception of the degree of fluidness of the conversation and (2) the assessment of the contextual relevance of interruptions. These perceptions and assessments do not necessarily lead to the best possible reactions. In particular, the decision if supporting or ignoring interruptions can have relevant consequences on the interaction: both actions may limit participation. It is important to recognize that managing unpredictable contributions is the most difficult task of facilitation.

8. Facilitation can take different forms. Forms of facilitation can be based on an intense activity and several different types of action. The first and third forms of facilitation are based on the facilitators' intense and creative activity of co- construction of narratives. They are differentiated by two factors: (1) contingency (first form) vs. sense of order (third form); (2) displacement (first form) vs. empathy (third form). The more "classical" second form of facilitation is based on active listening and minimal interventions and aims to enhance the autonomous voice of children.
The first form of facilitation is the most effective in enhancing expansions of personal stories, thus promoting a great number of narratives, often linked to the same photograph and developing without a precise order. The second form of facilitation is the most effective in leaving the floor to the children for autonomous contributions, without the facilitator's direct coordination, and separating the stories

through an ordered presentation of the photos. The third form of facilitation is the most effective in enhancing interlacements, based on children's long stories in single or few turns, and in enhancing ordered sequences of children's contributions.

These three forms of facilitation are not exhaustive of the complex activity of facilitation. Rather, the examples aims to show that different forms of facilitation may depend on two factors. On the one hand, the type of setting, which includes the school system, the class composition and the prevailing ways of communicating in the classroom context. On the other hand, the facilitator's training and style. Therefore, cultural and personal factors are intertwined and it is impossible to separate them. This may mean that forms of facilitation can be different in different situations and that it can be expected that facilitators adapt the form of facilitation to their styles and contexts.

9. Difficulties in producing narratives depend on interest in them, above all as they are not sufficiently developed, and degree of accepted transgression. These difficulties can be overcome through involvement of families in sharing narratives with children (ensuring children's knowledge about the pictures) and accepting transgressions without judgements.

Facilitators' upgrading of their epistemic authority lead to assess children's contributions, guide conversations, underestimate children's contributions. These effects increase the difficulty of facilitating children's display of agency and dialogue between children. The best way of avoiding this type of problems is keeping the children's interest alive, paying systematic attention to their contributions and on promotion of narratives and dialogue in the classroom.

Conflicts are a very delicate issue for facilitation, and their management requires both important and complex skills and time. It seems very hard to transform facilitation of narratives and dialogue in conflict management, in particular in conflict mediation. However, facilitators can employ some form of mediation when conflicts arise, avoiding accuses, inviting to reflect, narrating personal stories and providing personal comments. The alternative of avoiding or ignoring conflicts seems more risky for classroom relations.

10. Narratives of cultural aspects, such as cultural comparisons and identity, are contingent constructions in specific classroom interactions. They are productions of **small cultures**, which means that they cannot be considered as essential components of children's personalities, but rather as linked to the specific situation. Against this background, the way in which facilitators act as co-tellers is particularly important in this production of narratives.

It is important to note that very frequently these narratives highlight the importance of children's personal experiences and preferences, rather than the abstraction of cultural values or principles. This shows the distance between children's personal experiences, on the one hand, and stereotype and prejudices on the other. Personal experiences and preferences can however lead to different outcomes, including sense of belonging, uncertainties, hybrid identities, rejection of any cultural identity.

It seems clear that facilitation should not look for cultures and cultural identities at any cost. Rather, facilitators can decide if, when and how to expand on this type of narratives, being aware that they are produced as small cultures and that children can be very sensitive to their personal experiences. Ignoring these experiences can be a way of showing sensitivity for the delicacy of children's conditions. However, in these cases, facilitation may fail in creating dialogue around different life-stories, in particular linked to those children that are not natives of the local community and thus missing an important opportunity to give voice to these children.

11. Finally, the analysis provided in this chapter should not be considered as a prescription of the way of doing facilitation, but rather as the report of a set of experiences that can help to understand what facilitation is. In other words, a (non-exuastive) facilitation of the way of facilitating.

Chapter 5. Analysis of post-test and effects of activities

1. General data about the post-test

In this chapter, we provide the analysis of the post-test and the effects of the SHARMED activities. As we have seen in Chapter 3, the number of participants in the AG is much higher than the number of participants in the CG. This difference is mainly due to the difficulties in finding classes to include in the CG, in particular in UK. The number of children who participated in the post-test, in both the Activity Group (AG) and the Control Group (CG), is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Total number of respondents

	Post-Test AG	Post-test CG	Total
Italy (Modena, Monfalcone, Udine)	341	324	665
Germany (Turingia, Saxony-Unhalt)	306	241	547
United Kingdom (London Barnett)	334	44	378
Total	981	609	1590

The highest percentage of questionnaires was collected in primary schools, as Table 2 shows. In tables 2.1 shows the different distribution regarding Italy and Germany.

Table 2. Primary and Secondary Schools (general data)

	Total	Primary schools	Secondary schools
Post-test AG	981	667	314
Post-test CG	609	262	347
Total	1590	929	661

Table 2.1. Italy

	Total Italy	Total Germany	Primary schools Italy	Primary schools Germany	Secondary schools Italy	Secondary School Germany
Post-test AG	341	306	189	144	152	162
Post-test CG	324	241	142	76	182	165
Total	665	547	331	220	334	327

The children who participated in the post-test in the AG are almost equally divided between females and males. It is easy to see that the changes between the pre-test and the post-test are minimal.

Table 3. Sex and school grade (%) (in parenthesis the data of the pre-test)

	Females	Males	Primary	Secondary
Italy	50,3 (50,1)	49,7 (49,9)	55,4 (56,6)	44,6 (43,4)
Germany	48,8 (49,3)	50,2 (50,7)	47,2 (46,7)	52,8 (53,3)
United Kingdom	49,4 (49,4)	50,6 (50,6)	100,0	-

In Italy a very large minority (44,3%) speak e second language in combination or not with Italian (children speaking foreign languages and bilinguals, CSFLB). In Germany, 22,4% speak a second language in combination or not with German. In UK, a vast majority of children use languages other than English at home (SOL 65,1%); as we have seen in Chapter 3, this does not imply that children who use other languages at home are not competent users of the English medium. The majority of CSFLB is included in primary schools both in Italy (68,2%) and Germany (55,3%). Even in this case, the changes between pre-test and post-test are minimal.

Table 4. National Speaking Children (NSC) and Children Speaking Foreign Language + Bilinguals (Speaking language other than English in UK) (in parenthesis the data of the pre-test)

	NSC	CSFLB/SOL	NSC Primary	NSC Secondary	CSFLB/SOL Primary	CSFLB Secondary
Italy	55,7 (58,0)	44,3 (42,0)	45,3 (48,3)	54,7 (51,7)	68,2 (68,0)	31,8 (32,0)
Germany	77,6 (76,1)	22,4 (23,9)	44,7 (43,3)	55,3 (56,7)	55,9 (57,6)	44,1 (42,4)
UK	34,9 (31,5)	65,1 (68,5)	34,9 (31,5)	-	65,1 (68,5)	-

This chapter, the data regarding differences between native speakers and speakers of foreign languages, children attending the primary and the secondary schools, females and males will be only dealt with in Section 3, on the effects of the activities.

2. Post-test in the Activity Group (AG)

Table 5 shows a positive assessment of the relationship in the classroom. This confirms the results of the pre-test. In particular, the pleasure of talking together and the positive assessment of getting along are still frequently observed. As in the pre-test, in UK positive relationships are more frequently observed, while in Germany are less frequently observed. Differently from the pre-test, however, in Germany children say less frequently that they learn from each other and tell each other stories, while in UK "sharing of personal matters" and above all "telling each other stories" increase.

Table 5. My classmates and I (%, always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Like to talk	90,1	81,4	95,0
Learn from each other	61,9	57,5	77,7
Get along well	91,1	88,1	98,0
Have different opinions	69,4	64,5	84,2
Tell each other stories	52,5	25,5	81,0
Share personal matters	42,8	40,3	54,4
Have some troubles	31,2	19,0	27,7

Table 6 shows that, as in the pre-test, the perception of classmates' participation in the classroom is very positive. Children's positive perception of classmates is still more generalised in UK. In particular, the difference between UK on the one hand, and Italy and Germany on the other, is very relevant for what concerns the sharing of feelings (64,1% in UK, 39,9% in Italy and 37,9% in Germany), even if in UK this frequency decreases in the post-test. Differently form the pre-test, in Italy and UK expressing different points of view is much more widespread.

Table 6. Classmates (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Have the same chance to express ourselves	75,7	71,2	82,9
Express different points of view	85,7	76,2	97,1
Share opinions and experiences	70,1	68,7	82,8
Share feelings	39,9	37,9	64,1

Table 7 shows that, as in the pre-test, interest in classmates is also relatively widespread, even if it changes in the different settings. Interest in classmates still increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy to UK (higher level). As seen in the pre-test, this data can be influenced by the fact that in UK all children come from primary school. In Italy and Germany, the most frequent interest still regards respectively classmates' feelings and experiences, while in UK's post-test the most frequent interest is for what classmates think, which is higher than in the pre-test, while it remains rather underestimated in Germany. Compared to the pre-test, in Italy interest for experience is more widespread, while in Germany interest for feelings is lower.

Table 7. I am interested in what my classmates (%, very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Feel	63,8	37,5	67,0
Think	61,1	35,0	69,3
Experience	53,6	49,9	62,9
Know	48,1	43,1	54,0

Table 8 shows that, as in the pre-test, respondents' perception of classmates' interest is much lower than their perception of their own interest in classmates. This confirms children's clear tendency to perceive themselves as more concerned with classmates than classmates with them. The differences among the settings are the same as in the pre-test: interest increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy, to UK (higher level). In the post-test, in Italy the most frequent classmates' interest changes from knowledge to thinking, and in UK it passes from thinking to feeling and experiencing, while in German experience remains the most frequent interest. In Italy, interest in experiences and in thinking becomes the most frequently chosen answer, while in UK interest for feeling, experiences and knowledge increase.

Table 8. My classmates are interested in what I (% very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Think	39,8	20,5	53,9
Know	39,0	27,4	52,8
Feel	38,8	23,4	55,8
Experience	31,8	32,9	55,8

Table 9 shows that, when in the company of classmates, the highest percentage of children still tell stories about themselves in all settings. The telling of stories still increases from Germany to Italy to UK. In Italy, talking and making of photographs and videos are the other most frequently chosen answer, as in the pre-test, while in Germany talking and making of photographs and videos takes the place of birth and family. In UK the most chosen answer remains the place of birth, followed by family and cultural background. Compared to the pre-test, in Germany children talk less frequently about photos and videos, the place where they were born, their families, and their cultural background. In UK, children more frequently take photos and make videos and tell stories about family.

Table 9. with my classmates I (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Tell stories about me	52,0	45,0	70,7
Show may favourite photos/videos	30,3	23,9	37,1
Take photos/make videos	26,1	23,0	33,6
Talk about my cultural background	22,8	19,0	37,6
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	27,4	18,9	47,6
Talk about places linked to the story of my family	19,8	18,9	45,9
Tell stories about my family	23,0	20,5	42,2

Table 10 concerns the children's perception of their classmates' reactions, when they say something deemed as important. Positive reactions are chosen by a large majority of children, as in the pre-test. Positive reactions increase from Germany to Italy and to UK. In Germany, "trying to convince of the importance of what I said" is still much less frequently chosen than in the other settings. Compared to pre-test, in UK aggressive and judging reactions are signalled by a lower percentage of children, while pointing out the positives is signalled by a much larger percentage. In Italy classmates less frequently point out the positive, but they look more frequently for shared stories and less frequently have mocking reactions.

Table 10. If I tell something that is important for me, my classmates (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Try to understand	74,7	67,6	84,4
Try to convince me	64,2	48,9	71,4
Respect what I am saying	74,0	63,1	92,1
Try to point out the positives	56,7	64,0	77,9
Look for shared stories	55,5	50,3	68,6
Judge me negatively	20,4	14,1	17,4
Mock what I am saying	19,0	17,7	18,7
Get aggressive	11,4	12,2	12,1

Table 11 regards children's reaction to the stories told by classmates. A very high percentage of children still addresses classmates' stories positively. In Germany telling their story too and joining in the storytelling is chosen by a lower percentage of children than in the pre-test, this last item becoming similar to that in Italy, while this activity remains very common in UK. In Germany children also get bored more frequently, but they also find stories more frequently reliable. In UK, mocking remains more frequent than in the other settings, but children are less bored by stories and are more frequently amused by them. Moreover, children tell more frequently their story too and much more frequently ask questions.

Table 11. when my classmates tell me stories (% always + often)

	Italy	Germany	UK
I find that nice	88,9	80,9	95,2
I am amused	87,7	66,6	76,6

I find their stories interesting	82,2	71,8	86,8
I believe them	76,0	76,2	88,0
I join them in the storytelling	51,8	56,6	65,9
I ask questions about their stories	63,3	69,4	81,5
I tell my story too	56,7	43,6	68,4
I feel annoyed	9,1	12,5	13,9
I get bored	17,8	29,3	18,0
I mock their stories	10,4	11,2	17,7

Table 12 captures how much talking about memories to different categories of people is a common experience for children. As in the pre-test, children talk of their memories prevalently in their families, followed by friends, classmates and teachers. As in the pre-test, in Italy children talk less frequently of memories both in families and with friends. The difference among the settings is even higher than in the pre-test for what concerns classmates (51,6% in UK, 29% in Italy and only 22,2% in Germany) and teachers (29,3% in UK, 15,5% in Germany and only 10,9% in Italy). In general, talk about memories is still much more frequent in UK, while it remains particularly infrequent in Italy. Compared to pre-test, in Italy children more frequently specify a member of other categories using the "other" response, in Germany they talk about memories more frequently with classmates, in UK with friends, classmates, teachers and specific members of other categories.

Table 12. I talk about my memories (% very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Other	63,5	50,5	52,9
With my family	62,1	70,5	73,5
With my friends	44,8	48,3	68,2
With my classmates	29,0	22,2	51,6
With my teachers	10,9	15,5	29,3

Table 13 regards children's assessment whether expressing different perspective is positive or negative. As in the pre-test, the tendency is similar in the different settings. In particular, a large majority of respondents say that expressing different perspectives is neither positive nor negative, and only a marginal minority say that expressing differences is always negative. Compared to the pre-test, the difference concerning children who say that expressing different perspective is always positive between Italy on the one hand and Germany and UK on the other, is lower (I: 24,6%, UK: 30%, G: 35,8%) since the frequency of this answer increases in Italy. For this question, the percentage of German invalid answers is higher than 10%.

Table 13. Expressing different perspectives is (%)

	Always positive	Neither positive nor negative	Always negative
Italy	24,6	73,0	2,4
Germany	35,8	62,3	1,9
United Kingdom	30,2	69,1	0,7

Table 14 shows children's use of photography. The most important difference between settings is still between Italy and UK, on the one hand, where the use of photography very frequently regards remembering and telling/sharing memories, and Germany on the other, where it very frequently regards capturing interesting moments of life (less frequent than in the pre-test), and recording what is seen. In UK, it is still particularly relevant to be creative (69,1%), while using photography to relate to other people is more frequent than in the pre-test (46,8%) and it is still much more frequent than in Germany (24,5%), and Italy (35,3%) where however the percentage increases. Showing emotions still increases from Germany (only 26,8%) to UK (52,2%) to Italy (57,3%), with a further lowering

of the German frequency and a rising of the UK's one. Finally, in Italy and Germany, the use of photography to tell stories about personal experiences (I: 46,3%, G: 40,4) is less frequent than in UK (56%), with an increase of the Italian and the UK's frequency and a lowering of the German one. Compared to the pre-test, in Italy and UK children use photographs more frequently to record what they see around them, in UK they use it more frequently to tell stories about their personal experience, and in Germany they use much less frequently photographs to be creative.

Table 14. Use of photography (% very much)

	Italy	Germany	UK
Remember and tell my memories	81,4	54,0	78,4
Capture interesting moments of my life	78,3	62,5	75,8
Show my emotions	57,3	26,8	52,2
Record what I see around me	55,1	59,0	64,9
Be creative	54,5	37,9	69,1
Tell stories about my personal experiences	46,3	40,4	56,0
Relate to other people	35,3	24,5	46,8

Conclusions

The most important results of the analysis of the post-test in the AG are summarised as follows (the meaningful changes in the post-test are in bold).

9. Relationships among classmates are seen as largely positive, confirming the results of the pre-test. The pleasure of talking together and the positive assessment of getting along are still frequently observed. As in the pre-test, in UK positive relationships are more frequently observed, while in Germany are less frequently observed. **In the post-test, in Germany children say less frequently that they learn from each other and tell each other stories, while in UK sharing of personal matters and above all telling each other stories increase.**

10. The general view of classmates' participation in the classroom is very positive, even if the children's positive perception of classmates is still more generalised in UK, as in the pre-test. In particular, the difference between UK on the one hand and Italy and Germany on the other, is very relevant for what concerns the sharing of feelings, even if **in UK the frequency of sharing feelings decreases in the post-test**. **In the post-test in Italy and UK, expressing different points of view is much more widespread.**

11. Interest in classmates is relatively widespread, changing in the different settings as in the pre-test. In general, interest in classmates still increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy to UK (higher level). In Italy and Germany, the most frequent interest still regards respectively classmates' feelings and experiences, while **in UK's post-test the most frequent interest is for what classmates think, which is higher than in the pre-test**, remaining rather underestimated in Germany. **In the post test in Italy, interest for experience is more frequent, while in Germany interest for feelings is less frequent.**

12. Children perception of classmates' interest is much less frequent than their perception of their own interest in classmates, as in the pre-test. The differences among the settings are the same as for point 3 and in the pre-test: interest increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy, to UK (higher level). **In the post-test, in Italy the most frequent classmates' interest changes from knowledge to thinking, and in UK it changes from thinking to feeling and experiencing**, while in German experience remains the most frequent interest. **In the post-test, in Italy interest in experiences and in thinking, which becomes the most frequently chosen answer, increases; in UK interest for feeling, experiences and knowledge increases.**

13. The highest percentage of children tell stories about themselves in all settings, as in the pre-test. The percentage still increases from Germany to Italy to UK. In Italy, talking and making

of photographs and videos are the other most frequently chosen answer, as in the pre-test, while in Germany talking and making of photographs and videos overcome place of birth and family. In UK the most chosen answer remains the place of birth, followed by family and cultural background. **In the post-test, in Germany children talk less frequently about photos and videos, the place where they were born, their families, and their cultural background. In UK, children more frequently take photos and make videos and tell stories about family.**

14. Children frequently perceive positively their classmates' reactions to their important points. However, as in the pre-test, positive reactions increase from Germany to Italy and to UK. In Germany, trying to convince is still much less frequently chosen than in the other settings. **In the post-test, in UK aggressive and judging reactions are signalled by a lower number of respondents, while pointing out the positives is signalled by a much larger number of respondents. In Italy classmates less frequently point out the positive but look more frequently for shared stories and less frequently have a mocking reaction.**

15. A very high percentage of children address classmates' stories positively. As in the pre-test, differences among settings are lower than for the previous variables. **In the post-test, in Germany telling their story too and joining in the storytelling is chosen by a lower percentage of children,** this last item becoming similar to that in Italy. Therefore, only in UK this activity remains very common. **In Germany, moreover, children get bored more frequently but they also find stories more frequently reliable. In UK, mocking remains more frequent than in other contexts, but children are less bored by stories and are more frequently amused by them. Moreover, children tell more frequently their story too and much more frequently ask questions.**

16. Children still talk of their memories prevalently in their families, followed by friends, classmates and teachers. As in the pre-test, in Italy children talk less frequently of memories both in families and with friends. **The difference among the contexts is even higher than in the pre-test for what concerns classmates and also teachers since in UK these two percentages increase in the post-test.** Talk about memories is still much more frequent in UK, while it remains particularly infrequent in Italy. **In the post-test, in Italy children more frequently specify a member of other categories using the "other" response, in Germany they talk about memories more frequently with classmates, in UK with friends, classmates and teachers and above all with specific members of other categories.**

17. The large majority of respondents say that expressing different perspectives is neither positive nor negative, and only a marginal minority say that expressing differences is always negative, as in the pre-test. **In the post-test, the difference concerning positive expression of different perspective between Italy on the one hand and Germany and UK on the other, is lower because the frequency of this answer increase in Italy.**

18. In Italy and UK, use of photography still very frequently concerns remembering and telling/sharing memories, and **in Germany it still very frequently concerns capturing interesting moments of life, even if this answer is less frequent than in the pre-test,** and recording what is seen. In UK, it is still particularly relevant to be creative. Moreover, **in UK using photography to relate to other people is more frequent than in the pre-test** and is still much more frequent than in Germany and Italy. However, **the percentage of using photography to relate to other people increases also in Italy.** Showing emotions through photographs still increases from Germany to UK to Italy. However, **in the pot-test showing emotions through photographs is less frequent in Germany and more frequent in UK.** Finally, in Italy and Germany, use of photography to tell stories about personal experiences is less frequent than in UK. **In the post-test, use of photography to tell stories about personal experiences increases in Italy and UK and decreases in Germany. Moreover, in Italy and UK children use photographs more frequently to record what they see around them, in UK they use it more frequently to tell stories about their personal**

experience, and in Germany children use much less frequently photographs to be creative.

These data show that, as in the pre-test, in London Barnett the positive outcomes regarding classroom communication are more frequent than in the Italian regions and, above all, in the German regions. Moreover, in the post-test, in Italy and UK there is an increase of positive outcomes and a decrease of negative behaviours, while in Germany outcomes are more ambivalent.

3. Effects of the activities

As we have seen in Section 1, we are very far from a perfect comparison between the AG and the CG. Each class has its own features and it was impossible to find strong similarities among different classes. Moreover, it was very difficult to find students for the CG, in UK in particular, where the CG is very small. In Italy, too, where the conditions were much better, some differences between AG and CG are anyway relevant. In Italy there are more females in the CG than in the AG, and in UK the differences are very high. In Italy and Germany, the secondary schools are overrepresented (and the primary schools underrepresented) if compared to the AG, even if to a lesser extent than in the pre-test. In Italy, the percentage of NSC decreases in the CG, and also the distribution in primary and secondary schools is different. In UK the percentage of ELF decreases. In Germany, the distribution is different with more NSC in secondary schools in the CG.

We do not explore in details the results of the post-test in the CG (see the specific report for this). Rather, we show the comparison between the AG and the CG. It is important to note that the most relevant differences between the AG and the CG regards UK; a number of explanations for this have been explored in Section 1. To measure the effect of the activities: (1) the ordinal variables (e.g. not at all, not so much, very much) have been transformed into intervals (e.g. 0,1,2,3); (2) for every type of questionnaire (AG: pre and post-test; CG: pre and post-test) the average values have been calculated for each question; (3) the following formula has been applied:

	Activity Group (AG)	Control Group (CG)
PRE_TEST	A	C
POST_TEST	B	D
Difference between average value	Y=(B-A)= changing due to chance* + activities	X=(D-C) = changing due to chance*
Effect	E=(B-A)-(D-C) E=(Y-X)	

*chance stands for a series of different factors: tool, school period, contingent factors, etc.

The data originated from this elaboration represent the differences between the change occurred in the AG and the change occurred in the CG. Comparing the differences to zero (lack of effects), we have either positive (+) or negative effects (-). The positive and negative effects have been considered relevant, and thus reported, if they are at least **0,10**. In case the effects are at least the double of their minimal level of relevance (0,20), they are additionally highlighted in the comment. The positive effects for the AG can be associated with either positive effects or negative effects in the CG. This methodology can limit the effect of movements between adjacent interval, e.g. a movement from 'not at all' to 'not so much' will have a lesser effect than a movement between 'not at all' and 'very much'. As positive effects in the UK and German settings are mainly related to movement between adjacent intervals, it is possible that the overall measurement of the positive effect was somehow influenced by the methods of choice.

As we have seen, the comparison between the AG and the CG presents many limitations. However, the fact that the AG and CG belong to the same schools gives some meaning to it. It is also important to triangulate the quantitative data with the qualitative data produced though focus groups (FG) with the children conducted at the end of the activities. We make reference to these qualitative data when

they help to understand the phenomena signalled (but not explained) by quantitative data. For the German and UK settings, in particular, qualitative data support an interpretation of some apparent negative effects as cues for a more reflective children's approach to the meanings of relationships and communication. In general, the positive (or less negative) results in the AG may be linked to the intense dialogic activity shown in Chapter 4. In some cases, the dialogic activity may also explain some differences among the settings. These cases will be highlighted below. It is also important to stress that the children can be unaware of the effects of interactions, which are visible in the video-recording: they can perceive only part of the complexity on these interactions and of their importance for participation and dialogue. Finally, the video-recorded interactions did not regard all the meetings, therefore some effects could depend on the larger set of quantitative data.

Table 1 shows the positive effects for relationships with classmates in all settings, but with different meanings. Firstly, there is a deterioration of many aspects in the CG in Italy and Germany, resulting in a positive effect regarding the AG, about perceiving troubles (Italy) and sharing personal matters, having different opinions and interest in talking with classmates (Germany). In Germany, the positive effects regard sharing personal matters (+0,20), having different opinions and interest in talking with classmates. On the contrary, some negative effects in Germany regard getting along well and learning from each other. In UK, there is a relevant positive effect on the activities of sharing stories (+0,20). Some negative effects regard learning from each other and getting along well in UK and Germany. In UK, an additional negative effect regards sharing personal matters.

In Germany an UK, these data suggest a mixed picture. In the FG in Germany, the children stated that, during the regular school day there is not much time to reflect upon and talk about relationships with classmates. SHARMED opened up the opportunity to talk about some conflicts which were already present in the class, so that the perception of the relationship with classmates might appear worse, though a process of positive engagement with classmates might have started. The analysis of conflict narratives and management (Chapter 4) shows that the facilitators did not mediate these conflicts, and this can explain the negative effect. For what concerns 'learning from each other', whilst before the activity the meaning of 'learning' was linked to notions and skills, the participation in SHARMED has promoted a reflection on the difference between learning from and about the 'persons' rather than receiving and transmitting knowledge to the fellow pupil. In the FG in Germany and UK, what was considered 'personal communication' before the activities, was often observed as more superficial communication, after the experience of the sharing memories and feelings. Moreover, the participation in SHARMED promoted a reflection on the difference between learning from and about the 'persons' rather than receiving and transmitting knowledge to the fellow pupil.

Table 1. My classmates and I (effect AG-CG)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Get along well		-0.14	-0,16
Like to talk			+0,10
Learn from each other		-0.16	-0,11
Tell each other stories		0.20	
Share personal matters		-0.14	+0,20
Have different opinions			+0,17
Have some troubles	-0,12		

In Italy, positive effects are that males perceive less frequently troubles (-0,20) and more frequently interest in talking, telling each other stories and learning from each other. Moreover, both NSC and CSFLB perceive less frequently problems. NSC also perceive more frequently that they get along well. Finally, NSC and CSFLB more frequently tell stories each other. Secondary school students perceive more frequently to get along well and less frequently to have troubles, while primary school students perceive more frequently interest in talking and telling stories, but less frequently different opinions.

Table 1.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	males	NSC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
Get along well		+0,13			+0,16
Have some troubles	-0,20	-0,11	-0,14		-0,15
Like to talk	+0,16		+0,15	+0,16	
Tell each other stories	+0,12	+0,10		+0,15	
Have different opinions				-0,11	
Learn from each other	+0,14				

In Germany, there is a strong positive effect regarding the very significant decrease in CSFLB's perception of having troubles with their classmates (-0,42). However, there is also a smaller increase among NSC. CSFLB also show a high increase in the perception of learning from their classmates (+0,35) whereas, once again, NSC show a decrease (-0,21). Females (+0,23) and primary school students (+0,33) show a higher increasing interest in talking with their classmates. The increase in sharing personal matters is highest among females (+0,33), the NSC (+0,26) and secondary school students (+0,30). There is however a decrease in telling each other stories among CSFLB (-0,22) and secondary school students. There is an overall increase in having different opinions in all groups.

Table 1.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	GSC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
Get along well	-0,16	-0,14	-0,16	-0,16	-0,16	-0,16
Have some troubles		+0,10	+0,14	-0,42		+0,14
Like to talk	+0,23				+0,33	
Share personal matters	+0,33	+0,12	+0,26		+0,10	+0,30
Tell each other stories				-0,22		-0,16
Have different opinions	+0,17	+0,14	+0,15	+0,26	+0,25	+0,14
Learn from each other		-0,15	-0,21	+0,35		-0,20

In UK, males there are controversial effects, first of all regarding males. On the one hand, they perceive more frequently troubles, on the other they show much more interest in telling stories (0,49), talking and learning from each other. Females largely contribute to the apparent negative effect of the activities, observing a lesser measure of positive relationships (-0,53), pleasure in talking (-0,24), telling stories (-0,20) and sharing of personal matters (-0,24). SOL less frequently share stories, while among EFL there is a strong increase regarding having trouble (0,44), but also telling stories (0,48).

Table 1.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	Males	Females	EFL	SOL
Get along well	-0.16	-0.53		-0.19
Have some troubles	+0.12		+0.44	
Like to talk	+0.15	-0.24		
Share personal matters	-0.13	-0.24		-0.17
Tell each other stories	+0.49	-0.20	+0.48	+0.13
Have different opinions		-0.19	-0.17	
Learn from each other		-0.46	+0.14	-0.27

Table 2 shows that the effect of the activities on classroom communication vary among the settings, due to a little positive effect in the AG, a deterioration in the CG, or a more critical way to look at

communication. In Italy, there is a more frequent perception that classmates express different points of view. In general, all the effects are positive for the AG, but not significantly. In Germany, a significant positive effect regards sharing feelings, stemming from a significant decrease in the CG. The FG and the analysis of interactions demonstrate that during the activities it seldom came up to discussions in which children could have had different opinions as most of the memories they talked with their classmates about where personal experiences. In UK, a positive effect regards the expression of different points of views, whilst significant negative effects concern sharing of opinion and experiences (-0,42), as well as sharing of feelings (-0,29). With regard to the first variable, the effect is influenced by the high increase of the value in the CG. The FG support interpretation of the negative effect on sharing feelings, linking to a more reflective approach regarding relationships and their meaning. The analysis of interactions supports this interpretation, confirming the reflective approach (Chapter 4).

Table 2. Classmates (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
express different points of view	+0,07	0.10	-0,04
Share opinions and experiences	+0,07	-0.42	+0,05
Have the same chance to express ourselves	+0,05	-0.03	+0,06
Share feelings	+0,02	-0.29	+0,18

In Italy, positive effects regard males, who share more frequently feelings (0,26). Moreover, NSC express more frequently different points of view and primary school students share more frequently opinions and experiences and above all feelings (0,24). However, females share less frequently feelings (-0,21). Secondary school students express more frequently different points of view, but share less frequently feelings.

Table 2.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	ISC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
express different points of view	+0,19		+0,12			+0,10
Share opinions and experiences	-0,11	+0,19			+0,10	
Share feelings	-0,21	+0,26			+0,24	-0,18

In Germany, a positive effect regards CSFLB, i.e. the possibility and opportunity to express themselves and to share feelings with their classmates. However, there is also a relevant negative trend among CSFLB, regarding sharing opinions and experiences with classmates (-0,29). Male and primary school students (+0,27) show a positive effect concerning equal possibilities to express themselves. The positive effect also regards sharing opinions and experiences with classmates (+0,26).

Table 2.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary	Secondary
have the same chance to express ourselves	-0,09	+0,14		+0,12	+0,27	
express different points of view	+0,16	-0,21				
share opinions and experiences		+0,10	+0,14	-0,29	+0,26	
share feelings	+0,17	+0,21	+0,20	+0,19	+0,28	+0,16

In UK, a strong positive effect regards EFL, i.e. their expression of different points of views (+0,31) and possibility and opportunity to express themselves (+0,34), while negative effects regard SOL, i.e. sharing opinions (-0,54) and feelings (-0,35). The negative effects are also noticeable among females, in particular with regard to sharing opinions (-0,50) and sharing feelings (-0,45). However, qualitative

data confirm that, rather than a negative effect, these pieces of data point to a more reflective and critical approach to the meaning of personal communication.

Table 2.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	Males	Females	EFL	SOL
Have the same chance to express ourselves			+0.34	
express different points of view		+0.18	+0.31	
Share opinions and experiences	-0.38	-0.50		-0.54
Share feelings	-0.15	-0.45		-0.35

Table 3 shows the lack of significant effects regarding children's interest in classmates' knowledge, thoughts, feelings and experiences. In general, in Italy, there are slightly more positive effects for all the variables, but the only relevant positive effect regards interest in knowledge, due to a deterioration of this variable in the CG. In Germany and UK, no significant effects can be traced regarding children's interest on classmates' knowledge, thoughts, feelings and experiences.

Table 3. I am interested in what my classmates (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Know	+0,10	-0.09	+0,02
Experience	+0,07	-0.05	-0,01
Think	+0,05	-0.02	-0,07
Feel	+0,01	-0.01	+0,06

In Italy, several selected positive effects regard more frequent interest, of males in what classmates think and experience, of CSFLB in what classmates know, of primary school students in what classmates know and experience, of secondary school students in what classmates think and know.

Table 3.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	males	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
Think	+0,15			+0,12
Know		+0,11	+0,10	+0,11
Experience	+0,13		+0,12	

In Germany, there is a negative decrease of interest regarding classmate's experience among CSFLB (-0,15), and a positive increase regarding classmates' feeling among secondary school students (0,10). In UK, an extremely high positive effect regards EFL's interest in classmates' thinking (0,60), knowledge (0,38) and feelings (0,50), coupled with a negative effect regarding SOL's interest in classmates' thinking (-0,23). The positive effect is also observed for females' interest in classmates' thinking and experiences (+0,38), but coupled with negative variations among males, above all regarding knowledge (-0,27).

Table 3.2 Effects by independent variables in UK

	Males	females	EFL	SOL
Think	-0.18	+0.13	+0.60	-0.23
Know	-0.27		+0.38	-0.19
Experience		+0.38	-0.17	
Feel	-0.09		+0.50	-0.15

Table 4 shows that no significant effect can be observed for the perception of classmates' interest in children's thoughts, knowledge, feelings and emotions. The only exceptions regard Italy, where there is a positive effect on classmates' interest in what the children think (the effects are also generally

positive for thinking, knowing and feeling, but not for experience) and Germany, where there is a negative effect for the perception of classmates' interest in experience. In UK, no significant effect can be observed.

Table 4. My classmates are interested in what I (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Think	+0,10	-0.05	-0,01
Know	+0,09	-0.03	-0,07
Feel	+0,03	0.07	-0,04
Experience	-0,01	-0.01	-0,10

In Italy, positive effects are that males perceive much more frequently that their classmates' interest in what they think (0,20), CSFLB perceive more frequently classmates' interest in what they think, 'know and experience, and primary school students perceive more frequently classmates' interest in what they think and know (0,21). However, NSC perceive their classmates as less interested in what they experience.

Table 4.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary
Think	+0,20	+0,09	+0,12	+0,18
Know			+0,17	+0,21
Experience		-0,13	+0,17	

In Germany, the selected negative effects are rather generalised. In particular, females perceive less classmates' interest in their experiences, primary school students and above all CSFLB less classmates' interest in their feeling (-0,21) and experience (-0,23).

Table 4.2 Effects by independent variables on Germany

	females	males	CSFLB	Primary
Feel		-0,10	-0,21	-0,12
Know	-0,10		-0,10	
experience	-0,17		-0,23	-0,19

In UK, there are relevant positive effects among the EFL for all variables, and among females for knowledge. Negative effects are rather widespread among SOL and males.

Table 4.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	males	Females	EFL	SOL
Think	-0.13		+0.31	-0.15
Know	-0.18	+0.12	+0.27	-0.10
Experience			+0.52	-0.13
Feel	-0.13		+0.31	-0.15

Table 5 shows the effect regarding what children do with classmates in relation to some of the projects' aims are quite different depending on the settings, including the different styles of facilitation. In Italy, some positive increase regards talking about places linked to the family's story, telling stories about families, and taking photos/making video is balanced by an increase in the CG.

In Germany, all effects, regarding talking about places linked to the family and cultural background, telling stories about the family, talking about the places of birth or life (-0,27), are negative and this opens some questions about the cultural and social background. If this on one side can be referred to the increased critical reflection on the presence of telling about private matters in the everyday life at school, the comparison with the effects in UK (see below) opens some questions on the context of the German classrooms, which seems to create some problems of effectiveness of the activities. During the activities, these problems were evident: in particular, facilitation did not take care much of cultural background and stories about families and places linked to family stories.

In UK there are relevant positive effects of the activities for almost all variables, with stronger effect on telling stories about places linked to the family (0,47), talking about the places where the respondents were born/used to live (0,30) as well as taking photos/making videos of classmates (0,29). The AG are characterised by a relevant positive effect, except talking about the place I was born/I used to live, but the overall effect is not always positive due to increases in the CG as well. The interpretation of some negative effects being due to a more reflective approach to relationships and communication is reinforced by the generalised positive effect concerning what children do with classmates in relation to some of the projects' aims. Differently from assessment of behaviours or feelings, the description of behaviour is less influenced by possible changes in respondents' subjective meanings of the dependent variables. This is also clear in the analysis of interactions.

Table 5. With my classmates I

	Italy	UK	Germany
talk about places linked to the story of my family	+0,08	0.47	-0,27
Talk about my cultural background	+0,08	-0.03	-0,17
tell stories about my family	+0,06	0.11	-0,11
Tell stories about me	+0,00	0.06	-0,02
Show photos/videos	-0,01	-0.03	+0,08
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	-0,04	0.30	-0,16
take photos/make videos	-0,08	0.29	+0,04

In Italy, positive effects are that males talk more frequently about places linked to the family's story, NSC tell more frequently stories about their family, primary school students tell more frequently stories, talk more frequently about the place where they were born, the place linked to their family's story (0,22) and above all their cultural background (0,29). Negative effects regard females, who less frequently take photos/make videos, show them and talk about the place where they were born, and secondary school students, who talk less frequently about their cultural background, the place where they were born and take less frequently photos/make videos. CSFLB talk more frequently about their cultural background but they take photos and make videos less frequently.

Table 5.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary	Secondary
Tell stories about my family			+0,11		+0,12	
Talk about my cultural background				+0,16	+0,29	-0,13
Show them my favourite photos/video	-0,10					
Take photos/make videos	-0,12			-0,16		-0,12
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	-0,16				+0,10	-0,16
Talk about places linked to the story of my family		+0,10			+0,22	

In Germany, a very significant negative effect is the decrease among CSFLB of talk on their cultural background (-0,53), the place where they were born or used to live (-0,26) and the places linked to the story of their families (-0,35). However, among CSFLB telling personal stories and showing photos/videos (0,22) increase. This effect is clarified by the analysis of interactions (Chapter 4). Relevant negative effects also regard the secondary schools and for several aspects NSC, males and females. A positive effect is the strong increase in showing photos/videos among males (0,20).

Table 5.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
tell stories about me	-0,18	-0,20		+0,11		
tell stories about my family	-0,10	-0,13	-0,12			
talk about my cultural background	-0,17	-0,12		-0,53	-0,11	-0,25
show them my favourite photos/video		+0,20		+0,22	+0,34	
take photos/make videos	+0,17					
talk about the place where I was born/used to live		-0,27	-0,16	-0,26	-0,13	-0,20
talk about places linked to the story of my family	-0,24	-0,35	-0,28	-0,35	-0,19	-0,35

In UK, a positive effect regards the generalised strong increase among males, while negative effects regard females, with the exception of talking about places of birth/living. The effect of language is mixed, since relevant positive effects for EFL is noticeable only regarding the variable 'talk about the place where I was born/used to live' (0,47) and places linked to family (0,41), while relevant negative effects regard telling stories about family (-0,38) and talking about cultural background (-0,31). Important positive effects regard the SOL, for telling stories about the family (0,22), taking photos/videos (0,27), talking about places of birth/living (0,29) and talking of places linked to the family (0,29).

Table 5.3 E by independent variables in UK

	males	females	EFL	SOL
Tell stories about me	+0.39	-0.33	-0.29	+0.11
Tell stories about my family	+0.27	-0.11	-0.38	+0.22
Talk about my cultural background			-0.31	
Show them my favourite photos/video	+0.15	-0.33	+0.20	-0.10
Take photos/make videos	+0.38		+0.13	+0.27
Talk about the place where I was born/used to live	+0.37	+0.14	+0.47	+0.29
Talk about places linked to the story of my family	+0.57	+0.35	+0.41	+0.47

Table 6 shows that after the activities the perception of classmates' attitudes about the children is controversial in all settings. In Italy, all variables have a significant or a limited positive effect, because of a deterioration of the CG or an improvement of the AG; in particular, there is an increase in perception of understanding and looking for shared stories, and above all a decrease in perception of mocking (-0,26), aggressiveness (-0,14) and judging negatively (-0,18). This is probably the most important positive effect of the activities: the perception of more positive classmates' attitudes about the responders. Some negative effects regard Germany, in particular trying to convince and mocking. These data may be explained through an increase of critical consciousness about the way children feel treated by their classmates and that the FG show are also related to a lack of the trust in certain classes. In UK, there are positive effects for judging negatively (-0,23) and trying to convince (-0,14), but there are negative effects in trying to understand (-0,17) and, above all, respecting (-0,32) that are attributable to the high increase of most intervals in the small CG, dwarfing the limited, although still positive in the AG.

Table 6. If I tell something that is important for me, my classmates (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Try to understand	+0,18	-0.17	-0,03
Look for shared stories	+0,17	-0.09	-0.02
Respect what I am saying	+0,13	-0.32	-0,14
Try to point out the positives	+0,01	-0.03	+0,03
Try to convince me	-0,09	-0.14	+0,11
Get aggressive	-0,14	0.05	-0,00
Judge me negatively	-0,18	-0.23	+0,02
Mock what I am saying	-0,26	0.05	+0,15

In Italy, the positive effects are relevant among males, who perceive more frequently that classmates respect, try to understand (0,31), try to point out the positives, look for shared stories (0,25) and less frequently that they judge (-0,29), mock (-0,29) and get aggressive (-0,23). More controversial effects regard the females, who perceive less frequently that classmates try to point out the positives, but also that they mock their stories and classmates more frequently look for shared stories. NSC perceive more frequently that classmates respect, try to understand and look for shared stories, and less frequently that they try to convince, judge (-0,24) and mock. CSFLB perceive more frequently that classmates respect, try to understand (0,25), point out the positives, and look for shared stories and less frequently that they judge and mock (-0,37). Primary school students perceive more frequently that classmates respect (0,31), try to understand (0,42), point out the positives, look for shared stories (0,23) and less frequently that they judge, mock or get aggressive. Secondary school students perceive more frequently that classmates look for shared stories try to convince, judge (-0,27), mock (-0,31) and get aggressive. However, NSC and secondary school students perceive less frequently pointing out the positives.

Table 6.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	ISC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
Respect what I am saying		+0,19	+0,12	+0,14	+0,31	
Try to understand		+0,31	+0,13	+0,25	+0,42	
Try to point out the positives	-0,12	+0,14	-0,10	+0,17	+0,19	-0,16
Try to convince me			-0,18			-0,14
Look for shared stories	+0,10	+0,25	+0,16	+0,18	+0,23	+0,12
Judge me negatively		-0,29	-0,24	-0,11	-0,11	-0,27
Mock what I am saying	-0,23	-0,29	-0,17	-0,37	-0,18	-0,31
Get aggressive		-0,23			-0,13	-0,11

In Germany, among CSFLB, negative effects regard the decrease of respect (-0,30) and the increase of mocking (+0,40). This may be consistent with the hypothesis of an increase of critical consciousness about the way they feel treated by their classmates. However, the analysis of interactions shows that CSFLB were not strongly involved in telling their stories during facilitation. Furthermore, the FG show that, in some classes, the level of trust to share personal issues was not sufficient. The style of facilitation could not always make up for it.

Table 6.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary	Secondary
respect what I am saying	-0,15	-0,11	-0,10	-0,30	0,00	-0,16
try to understand	+0,21	-0,19				
try to point out the positives					+0,19	-0,03

try to convince me about the importance of what they have to say	+0,07	+0,12	+0,12	-0,03	+0,28	+0,02
look for shared stories	-0,15	+0,08	-0,01	-0,12		
judge me negatively	-0,04	+0,11				
mock what I am saying	+0,05	+0,21	+0,09	+0,40	+0,05	+0,23
get aggressive					-0,15	-0,10

In UK, Males (-0,23) and SOL (-0,24) show a positive effect regarding 'try to convince me'. However, a negative effect for males (-0,24) and SOL (-0,22) regard 'trying to understand'. Again SOL and females stand out for a positive effect linked to negative judgments (-0,30 for SOL) and aggressive behaviours (-0,36 for SOL and – 0,50 for females). However, the effects are rather negative for what concerns respect for EFL (-0,32), males (-0,31) and females (-0,36), while for EFL, also the effect on classmates' mocking is negative (+0,31).

Table 6.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	males	females	EFL	SOL
Respect what I am saying	-0.31	-0.36	-0.32	-0.35
Try to understand	-0.24			-0.22
Try to convince me about the importance of what they have to say	-0.23		+0.28	-0.24
Look for shared stories	-0.15		-0.21	
Judge me negatively	-0.14	-0.34	-0.17	-0.30
Mock what I am saying			+0.31	
Get aggressive		-0.50		-0.36

Table 7 shows that the children's self-assessment of the reaction to classmates' stories changes in different settings, in a rather relevant way. In Italy, there are positive effects for asking classmates questions, joining in storytelling, telling their story too, and above all in believing classmates stories (0,20), due to a deterioration of the CG. In general, almost all the effects are positive.
In Germany there are several negative effects, concerning getting bored, asking questions (-0,24), telling my story too, feeling annoyed and joining in the storytelling (-0,20). In general, almost all the effects are negative. This is linked to the social and cultural context, including the style of facilitation (Chapter 4). Even if during the activities all children could tell their own stories (as well as i.e. asking questions), their perception of the frequency with which they do so, decreases, while getting bored increases. Once again, these results pose some questions about the German setting, including the style of facilitation.
In UK, positive effects concern getting bored and above all joining classmates in their storytelling (+0,44), this last one due not only to a positive difference in the AG, but mainly to a sharp decrease in the small CG. Conversely, most negative effects are generated by high positive differences in the small CG that overcome the lower positive differences in the AG, with the exception of mocking classmate stories.

Table 7. When my classmates tell me stories (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
I believe them	+0,20	-0.00	-0,05
I ask questions about their stories	+0,17	-0.10	-0,24
I join them in the storytelling	+0,14	0.44	-0,20
I tell my story too	+0,11	-0.12	-0,10
I am amused	+0,08	-0.18	+0,02
I find that nice	+0,05	-0.26	-0,01
I feel annoyed	+0,02	-0.01	+0,18

I find their stories interesting	+0,05	-0.22	-0,05
I get bored	-0,04	-0.10	+0,16
I mock their stories	-0,08	0.10	+0,07

In Italy, positive effects are widespread. Females perceive more frequently nice stories, amusement, asking questions, telling their stories too and believing them. Males perceive more frequently asking questions and believing classmates (0,20), and less frequently mocking them. NSC perceive more frequently asking questions, telling their story too and believing classmates (0,23), and less frequently getting bored and mocking (-0,22). The CSFLB perceive more frequently asking questions (0,22), telling their stories too, finding stories interesting, believing classmates and joining in the storytelling (0,24), but also mocking classmates. Primary school students perceive more frequently finding stories nice, asking questions, believing classmates (0,20) and joining in the storytelling. Secondary school students perceive more frequently asking questions (0,21), telling their stories too, believing classmates (0,21), finding stories interesting, and less frequently mocking their classmates.

Table 7.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary	Secondary
I find that nice	+0,11				+0,18	
I get bored			-0,13			
I am amused	+0,15			+0,17		
I mock their stories		-0,18	-0,22	+0,13		-0,10
I ask questions about their stories	+0,16	+0,18	+0,13	+0,22	+0,13	+0,21
I tell my story too	+0,17		+0,10	+0,12		+0,15
I find their stories interesting				+0,11		+0,10
I believe them	+0,13	+0,20	+0,23	+0,15	+0,20	+0,21
I join them in the storytelling				+0,24	+0,18	

In Germany, the effects are controversial. A positive effect is that CSFLB appreciate storytelling, finding them nice (+0,23) and amusing themselves (0,30). However, primary school students and females perceive less frequently participation to storytelling and asking questions, and more frequently getting bored (+0,43 in primary schools), being annoyed (0,20 and 0,33), a trend that is also shared by males (0,22) and NSC (0,22), and mocking the stories of others (0,25 and 0,24).

Table 7.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	Primary	Secondary
I find that nice				+0,23		
I get bored	+0,20	+0,21	+0,24	-0,18	+0,43	
I am amused				+0,30		
I mock their stories	+0,25				+0,24	
I ask questions about their stories	-0,33	-0,22	-0,28	-0,24	-0,32	-0,16
I tell my story too		-0,17	-0,14		-0,12	
I feel annoyed	+0,20	+0,22	+0,22		+0,33	
I find their stories interesting			-0,11		-0,12	
I believe them				-0,12		
I join them in the storytelling	-0,44	-0,19	-0,17		-0,21	-0,12

In UK, a relevant and generalised positive effect above all for EFL (0,72) and males (0,57) regards joining in storytelling. Males show a relevant negative effect for getting amused (-0,37). Females show negative effects for several aspects, in particular finding stories nice (-0,41) and interesting (-0,54). EFL and SOL are characterised by both positive and negative effects; in particular, EFL find stories less interesting (-0,55).

Table 7.3 Effects by independent variable in UK

	Males	females	EFL	SOL
I find that nice	-0.13	-0.41	-0.18	-0.28
I get bored	-0.18		-0.12	-0.09
I am amused	-0.37		+0.24	-0.29
I mock their stories		+0.13		+0.13
I ask questions about their stories		-0.23		-0.14
I tell my story too		-0.31	-0.21	-0.15
I feel annoyed			-0.16	
I find their stories interesting	+0.09	-0.54	-0.55	-0.10
I believe them	+0.14	-0.23	+0.19	
I join them in the storytelling	+0.57	+0.26	+0.72	+0.36

Table 8 shows that effects are not particularly relevant for the people with which memories are shared, with the exception of the category "other", in particular in Italy. In Germany, there is also a decrease in talking with family, due to a deterioration of the CG. In UK, there is a slight increase in talking with all proposed categories of people, except for family.

Table 8 I talk about my memories (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Other	+0,19	+0,11	+0,10
Classmates	+0,04	+0,04	-0,04
Family	+0,01	-0.00	-0,16
Friends	-0,00	+0.08	-0,05
Teachers	-0,07	+0.09	-0,04

In Italy, the specific effects are rather nuanced. Females perceive more frequently to talk with other people and less frequently with teachers, while males perceive more frequently to talk with classmates and other people (0,20) and less frequently with families and teachers. NSC perceive more frequently to talk with other people (0,23) and less frequently with teachers. Primary school students perceive more frequently to talk with classmates and less frequently with families, while secondary school students perceive more frequently to talk with family and above all other people (0,41) and less frequently with teachers.

Table 8.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	ISC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
With my family		-0,11			-0,11	+0,12
With my classmates		+0,10			+0,12	
With my teachers	-0,10	-0,11	-0,14			-0,12
Other	+0,16	+0,20	+0,23	+0,13		+0,41

In Germany, positive and negative effects are distributed among females and males, NSC and CSFLB, primary and secondary schools. The most relevant effects regard the category "others" for males and CSFLB.

Table 8.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	GSC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
with my family	-0,11	-0,19	-0,17		-0,21	-0,12
with my friends	-0,14			-0,13	-0,12	
with my classmates			-0,09	+0,12		-0,11
Other		+0,25	+0,13	+0,27		+0,17

In UK, positive effects characterise males for three variables, while only sporadic and limited variation are generated by the independent variable language.

Table 8.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	male	Female	EFL	SOL
With my family		-0.11		
With my friends	+0.12			
With my classmates	+0.12	-0.10		+0.09
With my teachers	+0.15		+0.11	+0.09
Other				+0.11

For what concerns the expression of different perspectives, there are positive effects in Italy (0,11) and UK (0,15), in the last one due to a deterioration of the CG, while in Germany there are not relevant changes. In Italy, this positive effect is relevant among the females (0,14), CSFLB (0,16) and the primary school students (0,17). In Germany, there is no general change in perceiving the expression of different perspectives as positive. However, there is a decrease among CSFLB in perceiving the expression of different points of view as positive (-0,32). In UK, a positive effect regards the expression of positive differences (0,15), though this is generated by a relatively high negative difference in the small CG. There is also a relevant positive effect for EFL (+0,37), while SOL are also marked by a positive effect (0,14).

Table 9 shows that effects regarding the use of photography are limited, which is coherent with a higher interest in narratives than in photography. In Italy, these effects are generally positive, in particular for recording what is seen around and telling stories about personal experiences. In Germany, there are no significant effects. In UK, positive effects regard showing emotions and recording what is around. However, negative effects regard relating to other people (-0,21) and being creative, but, characteristically of the UK set of data, these negative effects are generated by the particularly high positive difference in the CG countering the still positive effects for the AG.

Table 9 Photography (effects)

	Italy	UK	Germany
Record what I see around me	+0,13	+0,13	+0,03
Tell stories about my personal experiences	+0,10	-0,03	-0,08
Relate to other people	+0,09	-0,21	+0,06
Capture interesting moments of my life	+0,05	-0,03	-0,02
Be creative	+0,04	-0,19	-0,00
Remember and tell my memories	+0,01	+0,03	-0,06
Show my emotions	-0,02	+0,12	-0,07

In Italy, females use less frequently photography to show their emotions, and more frequently to record what they see around them, while males use it more frequently to show emotions, relate to other people and be creative. NSC use more frequently photography to record what they see and tell stories about their personal experiences, while CSFLB use it more frequently to record what they see,

to relate to other people and to be creative. Primary school students use more frequently photography to show their emotions, record what they see, capture interesting moments of their life and tell stories about their personal experience (0,21), while secondary school students use it less frequently to show emotions and more frequently to record what they see and relate to other people.

Table 9.1 Effects by independent variables in Italy

	females	males	NSC	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
Show my emotions	-0,16	+0,13			+0,12	-0,13
Record what I see around me	+0,13		+0,12	+0,13	+0,12	+0,15
Capture interesting moments of my life					+0,12	
Tell stories about my personal experiences			+0,12		+0,21	
Relate to other people		+0,11		+0,10		+0,11
Be creative		+0,14		+0,17		

In Germany, it is interesting to see the effect among CSFLB, i.e. more frequent perception of photography as a way of relating to others and a relevant decrease of all other uses. This decrease is also relevant among females for several uses of photography. In primary schools and among males, there is a relevant positive effect regarding the use to relate with other people (0,28 and 0,26)

Table 9.2 Effects by independent variables in Germany

	females	males	CSFLB	primary	Secondary
remember and tell my memories			-0,32		
show my emotions			-0,23		-0,10
record what I see around me	-0,20		-0,15	-0,17	
capture interesting moments of my life	-0,13		-0,39		
tell stories about my personal experiences	-0,18		-0,42	-0,22	
relate to other people	-0,12	+0,26	+0,12	+0,28	
be creative	-0,10		-0,27		

In UK, males are characterised effects are controversial for both male and females. However, positive effects are higher for males, regarding showing emotions (0,28) and recording what is seen (0,21). On the contrary, males show a rather relevant decrease for capturing interesting moments (-0,24) and relating to people (-0,26). Positive effects among females regard capturing interesting moments of life, however females also show negative effects on creativity (-0,22). Positive effects regard EFL, above all for showing emotions (0,32) and recording what is around (0,45). The only negative effect for EFL is observed whilst relating to other people, while the negative effect is stronger for SOL (-0,23), who also show a negative effect for creativity (-0,32).

Table 9.3 Effects by independent variables in UK

	Males	females	EFL	SOL
Remember and tell my memories			+0.22	
Show my emotions	+0.28		+0.32	
Record what I see around me	+0.21		+0.45	
Capture interesting moments of my life	-0.24	+0.17	+0.15	
Tell stories about my personal experiences		-0.19		
Relate to other people	-0.26	-0.15	-0.18	-0.23
Be creative	-0.19	-0.22	+0.19	-0.32

4. Summary and conclusions

As we have seen, the effects of the activities are frequently different in different settings. In general, the effects are much more frequently positive than negative, but there are some exceptions. In UK and Germany, some negative effects in perceiving relationships with classmates can be explained by a more reflective attitude developed during the activities and shown through the FG. However, the analysis of interactions (Chapter 4) also shows a relevant influence of the style of facilitation in enhancing participation effectively. Moreover, in the UK setting, several negative effects are generated by the particularly high positive difference in the small CG countering the still positive effect for the AG. The comparative analysis in UK is rather problematic, as we have seen. Given this and the more general warning about the comparison between the AG and the CG, it is interesting to note that the deterioration in the CG for several aspects may show that the activities have prevented problems in the classroom, since these may increase during the school year. The following summary highlights the most important effects shown in this chapter.

1   **Relationships with classmates.** In Italy and Germany, positive effects regard in particular the perception of troubles (Italy), and the sharing of personal matters, expressing different opinions and interest in talking with classmates (Germany). In UK, the positive effect regards the sharing of stories. In Germany and UK, some negative effects regard learning from each other, sharing personal matters and getting along well. The FG help to understand that these effects can be attributed to a more reflective attitude on relationships, attitude developed during the activities.

2   **Communication in the classroom.** In Italy, all the effects are slightly positive, even if not significantly. In Germany, the positive effect concerns the sharing of feelings. In UK, the positive effect concerns the expression of different points of views, whilst significant negative effects concern sharing of opinion, experiences and feelings; the negative effect on expression of opinions is influenced by the high increase of the value in the CG. The FG support interpretation of the negative effect on sharing feelings as linked to a more reflective approach regarding relationships and their meaning.

3   **Interest in knowledge, thoughts, feelings and experience.** Few significant effects can be traced for this aspect. The only exception is a positive effect in Italy for what concerns interest in classmates' knowledge. For what concerns the perception of classmates' interest in the respondents, the only exceptions are in Italy, where the children perceive slight more frequently classmates' interest in respondents' thought, and the negative effect concerning classmates' interest in experience in Germany.

4   **Activities with classmates in relation to the projects' aims.** In Italy, some increase in talking about places linked to the family's story, telling stories about families, and taking photos/making video is balanced by an increase in the CG, resulting in non-relevant effect. In UK, relevant positive effects concern almost all variables, with stronger effect on telling stories about places linked to the family, talking about the places of birth or living, taking photos/making videos. All variables in the AG are characterised by a relevant positive effect, except talking about the place of birth or living, but the overall effect is not always positive due to increases in the small CG as well. In Germany, by contrast, all relevant effects are negative and this raises a question about the cultural and social context of the activities, including the style of facilitation, which was not effective for all the dialogic aspects dealt with in the project.

5   **Perception of classmates' attitudes.** In Italy, all effects are positive. Particularly relevant is the positive effect about interest in shared stories and reduction of mocking. In UK, the positive effects concern the reduction of negative judgement and attempts to convince, while negative effects concern attempts to understand and respect, which depends on the high increase of most intervals in the CG, dwarfing the more limited, although still positive effect in the AG. In Germany, the negative effects concern respect, mocking and attempts to convince. The effects may be partly with an increase of critical consciousness about the way

children feel treated by their classmates, partly with lack of the trust, which as not effectively contrasted by facilitation.

6 **Self-assessment of reactions to classmates' stories.** In Italy, the positive effects concern asking questions, joining in storytelling, telling their story, and (above all) believing classmates stories. In UK, the positive effects concern reduced boredom and above all joining classmates in their storytelling. Conversely, most negative effects are generated by high positive differences in the CG that overcome the lower positive differences in the AG, with the exception of reduction of mocking. In Germany, negative effects concern increased boredom, interest in asking questions, telling stories, annoyance and joining in storytelling. These effects may be associated both with the results of the FG and with the analysis of interactions.

7 **People with which memories are shared.** Few effects are evident, with the exception of the category "other", for which there is a generalised positive effect, probably referring to the facilitators. In Germany, there is a slight negative effect concerning talk with family. In UK the effect of increase of the AG in talking with all proposed categories of people, except for family, is balanced by the increase in the CG.

8 **Expression of different perspectives.** There is a positive effect in Italy and UK. In Germany, there is no relevant effect.

9 **Use of photography.** Positive effects are limited, coherently with the higher interest in narratives than in photography. In Italy, positive effects concern the use of photography for recording external aspects and telling stories of personal experiences. In UK, positive effects concern the use of photography to show emotions and record external aspects; a negative effect is measured for relating to other people and being creative. In Germany, there are no significant effects, even if there is a slight positive effect in the critical consciousness of using photography as a way to capture interesting things, as well as a way to be creative.

Summing up, the most positive effects prevail, or at least the negative effects are limited, above all in Italy and for several aspects in UK. In UK, the specific effects in the AG should probably be considered more relevant, as the comparison between the AG and the CG may be misleading. This may be partially true also for Germany, as the CG is less balanced than in Italy. Moreover, both in UK and in Germany some controversial results can be associated with the reflective attitude created by the activities. The children could reflect on their relationships and their ways of acting, thus becoming more critical. Not all the effects can be associated with this result of the activities, and above all in Germany the context seems to create some obstacles to the achievement of positive effects. This seems to be confirmed by the analysis of the children's assessment of the activities (Chapter 5). In Germany, the influence of the context is also visible through the activity of facilitation, which was not always effective in enhancing agency and dialogue.

Gender differences

Gender differences are associated with some relevant effects of the activities, both positive and negative. The positive effects prevail but it is not possible to find regularities. Probably, the most important result is that males are positively affected more frequently than females. Males could observe a dialogic way of communicating which is less frequent in their traditional socialisation. It is possible that this improvement among males had some counter-effects in females' participation. Positive effects among **males** concern:

(1) Less troubles and more interest in talking, telling each other stories and learning from each other (Italy)
(2) Equal possibilities of expression (Germany)
(3) Sharing opinions, experiences and feelings (Italy, Germany)

(4) Classmates' respect, interest in sharing stories, attempt to understand, to point out the positives and avoid judging, mocking and being aggressive (Italy)
(5) Interest in classmates' thought, experience (Italy), and knowledge (Germany)
(6) Interest in telling stories of themselves, family, places of birth (UK) taking (UK) and showing (UK, Germany) photos/videos
(7) Interest in asking questions to and believe classmates, not mocking them (Italy)
(8) Joining classmates in storytelling (UK)
(9) Talk about memories with classmates, friends and teachers (UK)
(10) Consideration of different perspectives as positive (UK)
(11) Use of photography to show emotions (Italy, UK), to record what is seen around (UK), to relate to other people (Italy, Germany), to be creative (Italy).

Positive effects among **females** are slightly less relevant and concern:

(1) Interest in classmates' stories and in telling stories, amusement, interest in questions, and believe of classmates (Italy), interest in talking with classmates (Germany)
(2) Interest in classmates' thinking and experience (UK)
(3) Share of personal matters with classmates (Germany)
(4) Positive different perspectives (Italy, UK)
(5) Talk about family story (UK)
(6) Perception of classmates' understanding (Germany) and classmates' negative judgment and aggressiveness (UK).

On the other hand, negative effects on males are more frequent in Germany and UK, and concern:

(1) Less interest in classmates' knowledge (UK), in expression of different points of view (Germany)
(2) Talk about stories of themselves, family places of birth (Germany)
(3) Perception of classmates' respect, attempt to convince (UK), mocks (Germany), attempts to understand (Germany and UK)
(4) Amusement with classmates (UK)
(5) Getting bored, asking questions about their stories, annoying (Germany)
(6) Talk about memories with teachers (Italy);
(7) Use of photography to capture interesting moments of life and to relate to other people (UK).

Negative effects on females are more balanced among the contexts, and concern:

(1) Getting along well, interest in talking, in sharing personal matters, in telling stories (UK)
(2) Sharing of opinion, experiences and feelings (Italy, UK)
(3) Talk about family story (UK) and places of birth (Italy)
(4) Display (Italy, UK) and production (Italy) of photos/video
(5) Perception of classmates' respect (UK)
(6) Perception of boring classmates, mocking their stories, asking questions about their stories and feelings, annoying, joining them in the storytelling (Germany)
(7) Talk about memories with family and teachers (Italy)
(8) Use of photography to be creative (UK), to record what is seen around (Germany), to show emotions (Italy).

It is interesting to note that a number of negative effects may be correlated, with a reflective attitude developed with the activities. In other cases, they may be the other side of positive effects, e.g. talking of memories with teachers in Italy, where the facilitator became the most important interlocutor, specific uses of photography. In general, it is not possible to observe these differences during the

facilitation activities, where females and males were free to self-select and it is not possible to observe a clear difference in their self-selection and attitude to narrate.

Indeed, these results show that a particular attention to the dynamics of gender relations in the classroom is important, and differently distributed in different contexts, therefore unpredictable. Paying attention to gender differences is an important aspect of facilitation. In particular, it is important to note that the possibility of talking of their stories, mixing personal experiences and cultural background is very important.

Differences concerning language

The effects on those who speak other languages are differentiated in the three contexts. In Italy, the effects on CSFLB are positive in terms of both relationships and use of photography. CSFLB perceive less frequently problems with the classmates and more frequently exchange stories with them. They are more frequently interested in what their classmates know, perceive more frequently that classmates are interested in what they think, know and experience, talk more frequently of their cultural background and the places in which they were born, perceive more frequently that classmates respect, try to understand, point out the positives, and look for shared stories and less frequently that they judge and mock. CSFLB more frequently ask questions, tell their stories, find classmates' stories interesting, believe classmates and join them in the storytelling. CSFLB consider different perspectives as more frequently positive. CSFLB use more frequently photography to record what they see, to relate to other people and to be creative. The negative effects are very few: CSFLB take photos and make videos less frequently, and mock classmates more frequently. The analysis of interactions confirms the strong involvement of CSFLB during the activities. However, they also experience more frequently mocking and aggressive behaviours.

NSC share more frequently memories with teachers, use more frequently photographs to remember and tell their memories, but also observe more frequently problems with classmates. To sum up, NSC:

(1) Say more frequently that they have problems with classmates
(2) Talk about memories with teachers more frequently
(3) Use more frequently photography to remember and tell their stories.

In Germany, the effects on CSFLB are more controversial, as negative effects are not infrequent. Positive effects concern troubles with classmates, learning from classmates, showing favourite photos/video, finding classmates' talk nice and amusing. More frequently, negative effects concern:

(1) Telling each other stories
(2) Sharing opinions and experiences with classmates
(3) Perception of classmates' interest in feeling and experience
(4) Talk of cultural background, place ow birth, family story
(5) Asking questions about stories
(6) Perception of different perspectives as positive
(7) Perception of classmates' respect and mocking
(8) Use of photography to remember and tell memories, to show emotions, to capture interesting moments of life, to tell stories about personal experiences, to be creative.

These effects are confirmed by the analysis of interactions, which shows scarce involvement of CSFLB in narratives and dialogue. The difference between CSFLB and NSC are less frequent and relevant than in Italy. NSC are more interested in what their classmates experience, observe that their classmates look for shared stories more frequently, talk with their family or other people about memories more frequently and perceive more frequently photography as a way to capture interesting moments of their life, to record what they see and to tell stories about their personal experiences. CSFLB more frequently talk about their memories with their classmates and teachers.

In UK, the most important positive effects concern EFL. The positive effects on the SOL are much more limited and this category also shows some controversial effect. Positive effects on SOL include however, some important aspects, such as talking about themselves, family, place of birth, family story, taking photos/video, considering different perspectives as positive, perception of classmates' negative judgement, attempt to convince, aggressiveness, joining classmates in the storytelling. Negative effects concerning SOL are however not infrequent and concern sharing opinion, experiences and feelings with classmates, interest in classmates' thinking, perception of classmates' respect and attempt to understand, perception of classmates' talk as nice and amusing, use of photography related to other people and creative. This is not so evident as it is in Germany. However, it is clear from the analysis of interactions that the setting in which migrant children were more involved is the Italian one.

Chapter 6. Assessment of the activities

1. Introduction

This chapter combines the results of the final questionnaires of evaluation of both training (with teachers) and activities (with children), the results of the focus groups (FG) with children, which immediately followed the administration of the questionnaires, and the results of the analysis of teachers and facilitators' interviews.

The children who participated in this evaluation process were **341** in Italy, **334** in UK and **306** in Germany. We shall mix the results of questionnaires and FG where the results of FG are relevant. Moreover, we shall refer to the analysis of the activities (see Chapter 4). Some results can be slightly different in questionnaires, FG and video-recorded activities. This depends on methodological differences. The methodology of FG was based on questions that promoted children's answers. The direct responsibility in public answers may have blocked some critical assessments; therefore, the outcomes of the FG are more positive than those of the questionnaires. We do not know if the (small) minorities who were critical in the questionnaires reflected upon the variety of aspects of the activities, as it happened in the FG. It is therefore important to balance both types of results to give account of the children's assessment. Moreover, the participants are never completely aware of the details of interactions, while they may get general impressions.

Semi-structured interviews were administered 40 teachers, who followed the activities as they taught in the involved classes, and 8 facilitators, all those involved in the project. This set included:

- 15 teachers, in both Italy and UK, and 10 teachers in Germany, with a prevalence of teachers working in secondary schools, while there were some difficulties in interviewing some teachers in primary schools.
- 4 facilitators in Germany, 2 in Italy and 2 in UK.

2. Children

Several of the following tables include two types of evaluative data for each topic and each setting (IT, GE and UK), that is Very Much (VM) and Not at All (NA). The most important data are in bold.

2.1 General level of enjoyment

Table 1 shows that all activities were enjoyed by the majority of children in Italy and especially in UK, where the assessment is even more positive. In Germany, three activities were enjoyed by the majority of children, while the others were enjoyed by a large minority. For all the activities, in Germany the percentages are much lower than in UK and Italy. This may be influenced by a style of facilitation that did not enhance agency and dialogue as it happened in Italy and UK.

The highest percentage of children enjoyed aspects not entailing a visible role, in particular being the audience for classmates' stories and pictures, while aspects implying a public participation, such as presenting pictures, telling stories and exchanging ideas, were the less appreciated.

In Italy, in particular, the highest favour regards looking at classmates' pictures, listening to their stories, and producing and choosing a picture. The lowest favour regarded exchanging ideas and information with the classmates; this may have been influenced by the style of facilitation. Few children did not enjoy at all the activities; however, a higher percentage did not like the activities implying a public participation, such as presenting pictures, telling stories and exchanging ideas.

In UK and Germany, the highest favour regarded being the audience for classmates' stories and pictures, and (in Germany only) choosing a picture. However, in UK the need to take a more active role did not prevent children to appreciate in large majorities to tell their stories (66,7%), to present pictures (59.1%), or to exchange ideas with their classmates (60,8%). Choosing a picture was enjoyed by the 68% of children, whilst producing a picture was enjoyed by a smaller percentage of respondents (58,3%). Instead, in Germany, the more active role (telling stories, exchanging ideas, presenting pictures and producing pictures) was appreciated by less than half of the children. Producing a picture was much less appreciated in Germany and UK than in Italy. The dislike for activities implying a public participation was much higher in UK and above in Germany. The most frequent dislike regarded producing a picture (17,3% in UK and 12,6% in Germany), presenting a picture (17% in UK and 15,1% in Germany), telling stories (14,1% in Germany), and exchanging ideas and information (12,5% in Germany). For what concerns looking at pictures and listening stories, the lowest percentages are in UK. One again, the less disliked activities were also the less active (looking, listening, choosing).

In UK, the high percentage of children who enjoyed telling stories finds some support from the FG, where children expressed their high appreciation for the opportunity to join the stories told by classmates when presenting their pictures. Producing a picture was presented though the FG as difficult more than not enjoyable, particularity for the strict no-mobile and no-tablet policies enforced in all settings. Such policies prevented children from bringing photographs taken with their mobile phones, which represent their preferred device to use for taking pictures. This was reinforced by the sometimes rare availability, of children having access to printing devices or resources at school or at home.

Table 1. How much did you enjoy (%)

	IT VM	IT NA	UK VM	UK NA	GE VM	GE NA
looking at the pictures of your classmates	83,0	3,3	86,1	2,0	**60,7**	**8,3**
Listening to the stories of your classmates	77,7	4,8	**85,8**	1,7	**61,4**	**9,3**
Producing a picture	**71,0**	**6,0**	58,3	**17,3**	48,6	12,6
Choosing a picture	69,2	**3,6**	68,0	7,0	**60,6**	6,5
Presenting your picture	60,7	**8,1**	59,1	17,0	**41,5**	15,1
Telling your stories	59,3	**7,8**	**66,7**	12,2	**47,5**	14,1
exchanging ideas and information with your classmates	56,4	9,5	60,8	8,0	**47,0**	**12,5**

Table 2 shows that the great majority of children had fun, discovered new things about others, did something new and learned new things. However, the differences among the settings are the same as in Table 1: the positive assessment increases from Germany (lower level) to Italy and to UK (higher level). Once again, the style of facilitation may explain these results. Almost all children had fun (with a slight lower percentage in Germany). In Italy and UK, moreover, almost all children discovered new things about others, while the percentage was much lower in Germany. A very large majority did something new (with the highest percentage in Italy and the lowest in Germany) and learned new things. The percentage regarding learning new things was very high in UK, high in Italy and lower in Germany.

In UK, moreover, very high percentages of positive assessment concerned feelings and emotions during the activities: 84,3% felt respected, 84,1% felt appreciated and 68,9% felt not only valued but also important. In Italy, the large majority felt respected, and felt appreciated, although the percentages were lower than in UK. In Germany, while a very high percentage of children felt

respected (77,5%), only 49,5% felt appreciated and 48,6% felt important. This rather negative might depend on the specific wording of the questionnaire: especially younger children were not familiar with the word "appreciation", while the statement of "feeling important" is not very common among children. Another reason may be that the social cohesion in some classes, especially in the higher grades, was rather small. Finally, a reason may be in the style of facilitation, which was not always effective in enhancing children's agency.

For a large majority of children, it was easy to get involved in the project, however more frequently in UK (81,2%) and less in Germany (65%). The majority had much to share with their classmates, with a higher percentage in Italy and UK (69,4%).

In UK, the most arduous objective of the project, that is, supporting young children in discovering something about themselves, became a lived experience for the majority of respondents (57,7%). In Germany and above all in Italy, fewer children felt important during the activities and discovered new things about themselves.

Table 2. During the activities (%)

	IT	UK	GE
I had fun	92,9	94,3	88,9
I discovered new things about others	91,1	93,5	**79,9**
I did something new	**87,6**	82,5	80,5
I learned new things	82,4	**89,3**	**75,3**
It was easy to get involved	70,4	**81,2**	**65,0**
I felt respected	**69,5**	**84,3**	77,5
I felt that I have much to share with others	69,4	69,4	**58,1**
Other	66,0	67,1	**47,4**
I felt appreciated	62,9	**84,1**	**49,5**
I felt important	**41,0**	**68,9**	48,6
I discovered new things about myself	**38,0**	**57,7**	50,9

Table 3 shows that the majority of children had fun and had the chance to express their opinions. Expression of feelings, which is much rarer in ordinary classroom environments, was the less frequently chosen among the items, but still increasing from Germany, to Italy, to UK. In UK, the opportunity to express feelings is the highest one (64,6%); in Italy, still the majority of children could express their feelings (54,5%), while in Germany only one third could express their feelings. This outcome might reflect the observed lack of trust and social cohesion within some classes and the fact that the children did not perceive the topics and themes they were talking about during the activities as an expression of feelings. In this sense, facilitation was not sufficiently effective to enhance personal expressions. In Germany, the assessment is less positive for all variables, even if a majority stated that they were able to express their opinions and a large majority had fun (73,4%).

A very small percentage of children did not have fun and did not have the chance to express their opinions. The lowest percentages of dislike can be observed in Italy, with the exception of feeling expression (14,7%), which is lower in UK (7%), while Germany has the highest percentage of children that perceive they could not express feelings (19,5%).

Table 3. During the activities (%)

	IT VM	IT NA	UK VM	UK NA	GE VM	GE NA
I had fun	84,8	3,9	89,0	4,0	**73,4**	5,9
I had the chance to express my opinions	70,4	**3,6**	70,3	6,2	**54,2**	8,3
I could express my feelings	54,5	14,7	**64,6**	**7,0**	**29,3**	**19,5**

The FG show that children assess positively the activities in all settings, appreciating the freedom to narrate and to express their opinion safe from judgements and assessments, and the opportunity to link many different stories together. The activities helped children to improve reciprocal knowledge, relationships with classmates and knowledge about themselves, strengthening their cohesion. Moreover, they helped them to reflect behind the appearance, in particular on their stories and feelings, and discussing on these issues.

In Italy, in particular, children liked making and watching videos about the produced photo and expressing their opinion about them, above all in primary schools. They assessed the activities as very involving. In UK, the children highlighted their positive feelings in listening to classmates' stories about themselves and their families and, on the other hand, they acknowledged that their knowledge of their classmates was only apparent and somehow superficial before SHARMED. This helped children to re-assess what was previously unproblematically observed as personal communication or getting along with classmates, resulting in the need for exploring the person and its stories behind the role of classmate. In Germany, most children indicated that they enjoyed the activities, while they often criticized their class for being too noisy or not listening to other.

Some critical, although rare, observations concerned:

(a) In UK, the difficulty to produce a picture particularly because of the strict no-mobile and no-tablet policies enforced in all settings and the sometimes rare availability of printing devices or other resources

(b) In Germany, the fear to be judged or mocked by classmates when talking about feelings and experiences, and the feeling of being not appreciated because classmates did not concentrate very much or talked while other children presented their pictures

(c) In Italy, the lack of time to talk, reticence or difficulties in sharing private issues, embarrassment for the video-making on the produced photo, boredom in listening to classmates or difficulties in being involved or paying attention, disappointment because the facilitator did not give the same time to all children to tell their stories.

2.2 Relationships with classmates

Table 4 shows that children observed supportive behaviour from classmates, in Italy and above all in UK. In UK, a large majority of children observed supportive behaviour when presenting their pictures or telling their stories. In all settings, believing and respecting were the most chosen answers. In UK, more than three quarters affirmed that classmates respected their opinions (72%), that classmates believed them (70,2%), that classmates were interested and tried to understand them. In Italy, the large majority of children perceived that their classmates believed them, respected their opinions, were interested in what they were saying and tried to understand them. In Germany, the activities that required more active involvement, i.e. trying to understand and being interested, were not chosen by the majority of children.

In Germany, the assessment is less positive: still a majority of children stated that classmates believed and respected respondents' opinions (63,5% and 50%). However, only a minority perceived their classmates as trying to understand what respondents' had to say or being interested in what respondents' were telling (48,6% and 42,9%). In all settings, only a limited share of the population (from 12,2% to 14%) affirmed that classmates judged them. The rather negative perception of the relationship with classmates reflects the lack of social cohesion within some of the classes and the partial ineffectiveness of facilitation in changing this situation.

In Italy, very few children perceived negative outcomes, especially about interest and trying to understand. In UK and Germany percentages are little higher, especially believing in UK (7,3%) and respecting in Germany (10,7%).

Table 4. During the activities (%)

	IT VM	IT NA	UK VM	UK NA	GE VM	GE NA
My classmates believed me	75,5	**5,7**	72,0	**7,3**	**63,4**	6,2
my classmates respected my opinions	61,2	6,4	**76,4**	7,6	**50,0**	**10,7**
my classmates were interested in what I was telling	59,5	**5,1**	**70,2**	9,1	**42.9**	9,9
my classmates tried to understand me	58,7	**7,2**	**70,2**	9,5	**48,6**	9,2
my classmates judged me	14,2	54,8	14,0	57,2	12,2	57,2

Table 5 shows that in all settings relationships with classmates were assessed positively, increasing from Italy, to Germany, to UK which has the highest frequency of positive assessment (83,9%). Only minimal percentage observed negative relationships, but it is interesting to note that Italy has the highest frequency of the "neither positive nor negative" response (21,1%), which may reflect some conflicts which were documented in Chapter 4.

Table 5. Relationship with classmates during the activities (%)

	IT	GE	UK
Positive	73,5	79,8	**83.9**
Neither positive nor negative	**21,1**	16,0	13.7
Negative	5,4	4,2	2.5

In Germany, this positive result seems to be partially in contradiction with the previous one, which shows that some classes presented problems of social cohesion.

The FG, in Italy and UK, show that the conditions of classroom communication resulted in a more supportive environment for children's contribution and active participation during processes of mutual, as well as child-led and child-initiated, learning. They had the chance to work in collaboration, helping each other and avoiding judgments. Therefore, the relationships among children were positive, and they had fun together watching photos and videos, narrating and listening. Children observed that the relationships with their classmates were improved during the activities, and that they could talk much more than during the usual class activities. They perceived affective relationships and support in narrating common experiences, reciprocal listening, encouragements. Extended participation led to know the classmates better, to change idea about them, to understand their points of view better, feeling understood and not alone.

In Italy, children stressed that everyone had the same opportunity to talk, as everyone had a photo and a story to tell, and they had the possibility to express themselves, to listen each other, and to show/feel interest, respect, understanding, believe, support, attention and acceptance, in particular trough questions and narration of new stories, starting from a specific story.

In UK, children insistently mentioned the strong and positive impact of SHARMED regarding to the 'discovery of the classmates'. During the FG, on the one hand, children highlighted their excitement and positive feelings in listening to classmates' stories about themselves and their families and, on the other, they acknowledged that their knowledge of classmates was only apparent and somehow superficial before SHARMED. This helped the children to re-assess what was previously unproblematically observed as interpersonal communication or getting along with classmates, resulting in the need for exploring the person and its stories behind the role of classmate.

As for critical points, in Italy, few children stressed their embarrassment in sharing personal issues, few others stressed lack of listening, in particular when their classmates made too much noise, talked all together or made jokes to draw attention, few other children pointed out that sometimes the relationships were a bit negative because of the discussion resulting from different opinions. In UK, some critical aspects regarded the perceived lack of time to secure that all children had the opportunity to present their photographs. Many children suggested to replace the time dedicated to filling out

questionnaires with more SHARMED activities, which was already evident based on their casual comments and reflections at the end of the last workshops.

In Germany, the FG show a very mixed picture concerning the social cohesion in the classes. In some classes, trust and comfort were high. In other classes, the facilitator first had to make a session on how children wanted to talk with each other because the children were insulting each other all the time. In these classes, the children also said that they did not like to come to school at all. The social cohesion in primary schools was higher than in secondary schools. Primary school students appreciated the activities in which they had to take on an active role more than secondary school students.

As a consequence, several children did not really feel confident in talking with their classmates about feelings and experiences, as they feared to be judged or mocked by them. The presence of the facilitator and the way in which the activities were conducted gave the children the chance to open up and interrelate in a positive way, strengthening their cohesion. However, this was not always sufficient. In a few cases, the conflicts were more profound to be solved in context of the project, in particular as facilitation did not use any type of mediation. Furthermore, many children stated that their classmates did not concentrate very much or talked while other children presented their pictures, so that within the class they might not have felt appreciated.

2.3 Relationships with the facilitator

Table 6 shows that the majority of children felt comfortable or very comfortable with the facilitators, with an increase from Germany (77,1%), to UK (81,5%), to Italy (89,1%), where there is also the highest percentage of feeling *very* comfortable (68,7%). In all settings, only a marginal minority felt uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with the facilitators. In Italy, there was also the lowest percentage of children feeling neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (8,6%), while in Germany there was the highest one (21,3%). In all settings only a marginal minority felt uncomfortable or very uncomfortable, even if a bit more in UK.

Table 6. how did you feel with the facilitator (%)

	IT	UK	GE
Very comfortable	**68,7**	46,0	48,0
Comfortable	20,4	**35,5**	29,1
Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	**8,6**	14,3	**1,3**
Uncomfortable	1,2	**2,1**	1,2
Very uncomfortable	0,9	**2,1**	0,4

Table 7 shows that the largest percentage of children chose to describe the facilitator as a person open to children's interests and feelings, increasing from Germany (41%), to UK (42%), to Italy (50,8%). The other two more chosen definitions (between 11,8% and 29,7%) are "friend" and "teacher", friend being more chosen in UK (29,7%), probably due to the age of the participants, and teacher in Germany (16,4%). In Italy and Germany, moderator is a definition chosen by a small but relevant percentage of respondents (9%). All other definitions chosen are marginal and sometimes nearly null, with Italy having the lowest percentage who define the facilitator as an authoritative person (0,9%). These definitions lead to observe a more frequent misunderstanding of facilitation in Germany (22,1% teacher + authoritative person), which is also shown by the difficulty to find a definition (6,1%). This result may be associated with a style of facilitation that was not always effective in enhancing children's agency. In UK, too, however, 19,6% of the children observed the facilitator as a teacher or an authoritative person, while in Italy these definitions were only chosen by 12,7%.

Table 7. how would you define the facilitator (%)

	IT	UK	GE
A person who is open to children's interests and feelings	**50,8**	42,0	41,0
A friend	20,1	**29,7**	18,0
A teacher	11,8	14,5	**16,4**
A moderator	9,0	**0,7**	9,0
I cannot find a definition	3,7	2,9	**6,1**
I would define her/him in another way	3,7	4,3	3,7
An authoritative person	**0,9**	5,1	5,7

Table 8 shows that, when it comes to the facilitator's stance during the activities, children's outlook is largely positive for all variables, once again increasing from Germany, to UK, to Italy, with the exception of helping to get along with classmates for which UK prevails (this is confirmed by the analysis in Chapter 4, as in UK facilitation was more focused on interlacements of narratives). Also the lowest percentages of negative assessments can be observed in Italy for all variables with the exception of helping to get along with classmates (13,1%), which is lower in Germany (6,7%).

In all settings, children assessed more positively interest, trust, respect, and understanding. Helping to get along with classmates is less chosen, but still chosen by the majority, while judging is chosen only by a minority, but increasing from Italy, to Germany, to UK. In Italy, almost all children said that the facilitator was interested in what they were telling (90,4%), believed them (89,9%), respected their opinions (89,8%), and tried to understand them (87,5%). Around 80% said that the facilitator helped them to talk about what they were interested in and about their memories. Italy has also the highest percentage of absence of judging (69,1%).

In UK, children above all said that the facilitator's respected their opinions (81,5%) and was interested in their narratives (78,2%). UK has the highest percentages of negative assessment regards being interested in what children were telling, believing, trying to understand and helping to talk about memories.

In Germany, children assessed positively in particular facilitators' attempt to understand them (74,2%), their respect of their opinions (72,5%), and that they believed them (71,5%). In Italy, only 12% felt judged by the facilitator, against 19,6% in Germany and 23,7% in UK. Once again, this may reflect the different styles. Probably, the frequent use of positive assessments, more articulated in UK than in Germany, led some children to see "judgements", term that, as in some Italian FG was clarified, has not necessarily a negative meaning from the children's point of view.

Table 8. During the activities the facilitator (%)

	IT VM	IT NA	UK VM	UK NA	GE VM	GE NA
was interested in what I was telling	**90,4**	**2,7**	78,2	**6,9**	**68,8**	4,6
Believed me	**89,9**	**2,1**	70,9	**12,6**	71,5	4,4
Respected my opinions	**89,8**	**3,4**	81,5	8,3	**72,5**	7,1
Tried to understand me	**87,5**	**2,4**	78,0	**7,5**	**74,2**	5,3
Helped me to talk about what I am interested in	**80,6**	**4,9**	68,4	9,6	**62,9**	8,0
helped me to talk about my memories	**80,3**	**4,2**	67,6	**10,4**	64,7	6,7
Helped me to get along with my classmates	59,9	**13,1**	**64,7**	10,7	56,6	9,5
Judged me	**12,0**	**69,1**	**23,7**	59,3	19,6	58,3

In Italy, the differences between Modena and FVG are rather relevant. In Modena, the facilitator was much more frequently seen as an open person (54,3% vs. 37,3%) ad as a moderator (10,9% vs. 1,5%), while in FVG there was a polarisation between friend (34,3% vs. 16,4%) and teacher (23,9% vs. 8,6%). In Modena the children felt more frequently understood, and above all helped to talk about memories (84,2% vs. 66,2%), while in FVG, the children felt more frequently helped to get along

with the classmates (74,3% vs. 56%) and judged (26,1% vs. 8,2%). This difference may be explained by the rather different styles of facilitation in the two settings. In FVG, facilitation worked better in the most comfortable situations, while in Modena it worked in a more transversal way.

The FG, in Italy and UK, highlight very positive opinions for both children's relationships with the facilitators and facilitators' behaviours and approach. The facilitators were described as friends with an apparently genuine interest in children's narratives, promoting trust and self-confidence. What was particularly appreciated was the facilitator's sharing of their personal memories, something the children were not used to, not just in the classroom, but in their relationships with adults. By sharing their narratives, the facilitators supported the children in doing the same, particularly when combined with the expression of interest during children's narrations. Differently from teachers, the facilitators did not deliver any assessment of children's narratives, and this was very appreciated, though some children in UK affirmed that were initially challenged by the lack of judgement even when the stories produced by classmates appeared somehow boring, made up or inconsistent.

A frequent facilitator's action was the appreciation directed primarily to participation as story-teller, co-tellers or active listeners rather than to the 'quality' of the contribution. The interest in children's narrative was not expressed only via appreciative turns but through questions asking for more details or probing about the feeling of the narrator. Questions directed to the audience were noted as a powerful facilitation strategy to include more children in the developing narratives or to support the narrator to make links with peers. The children expressed very positive comments on the facilitator's support offered when memories and related narrative generated some stronger emotional reactions in the narrator or other children. This included leaving time for children to present stories at their own pace and to manage their relationships with classmates in an unusually autonomous way. The children, therefore, confirmed that the smaller percentage observing the facilitator as judging is not necessarily negative.

In Italy, in particular, children highlighted that the facilitator helped them to improve their reciprocal knowledge and their relationships, stepping into their shoes in several ways: showing interest in the children's stories and points of view, understanding children's feelings, putting together different experiences, finding similarities by linking the stories and moving from a story to another one, putting children at their ease and overcoming their shyness, keeping alive their attention, helping them to correct themselves, encouraging them to narrate difficult things, helping them in moments of sadness, helping them to handle conflicts. Children also specified the facilitative actions, thus showing a remarkable awareness of the interactional dynamics:

(1) Using simple, specific and follow-up questions and addressing them to everybody
(2) Adapting the way of talking to the children
(3) Not giving a time-limit and a specific subject to the narrations
(4) Supporting children emotionally, for example changing the questions if they created some problems and being sensitive when someone was embarrassed or got emotional
(5) Switching among subjects and stories, for example asking if the children had similar stories to tell
(6) Narrating about personal experiences, expressing personal opinions and using facial expressions
(7) Avoiding overlapping, normative expressions, judgements and exclusion
(8) Summarising what children said and interpreting it.
(9) Narrating personal experiences and linking children's stories to them made children feel close to the facilitator.

In UK, in particular, children repeatedly observed the lack of directive style in facilitation. The facilitator's behaviour and approach during the activities were presented in an even more positive way. Children who were not used to participate actively during ordinary classroom communication expressed the most positive, almost enthusiastic, overlook on their relationship with the facilitator. The facilitator's interest in supporting all children as authors of their personal narratives, whilst

sometimes challenging the otherwise established hegemony of some children, was noted and mentioned by many participants.

In Germany, nearly all classes stated that the facilitator supported them and listened to what children said, so that in general the relationship was perceived as rather close. Children stressed that the facilitator supported them and listened to what they were saying, so that in general the relationship was perceived as rather close.

As for critical points, in a secondary school in Italy, someone stressed that the facilitator spent too much time over a single activity and that classmates made a lot of noise. Moreover, in a primary school, someone pointed out that he did not give to everybody the same opportunity to speak. In UK and Germany, it was not possible to observe any negative judgement towards the facilitators.

2.4 Differences

Table 9 shows that different opinions were appreciated, increasing from Germany, to Italy, to UK. Only a minority of respondents did not observe the expression of different points of view, decreasing from Italy (19,7%), to Germany (25,8%), to UK (39,8%). In UK, however, a great majority of children affirmed that different opinions were not just appreciated (84%) but also helped them to appreciate different things (78,6%). In Italy too, the large majority of children said that different opinions were appreciated (71,2%) and helped them to see other things (69,6%). In both UK and Italy, moreover, the majority sad that different opinions lead them to find shared solution (70,1% and 55,1%). In Germany, different opinions were less appreciated, but still a majority of children affirmed that different opinions were not appreciated (54,8%) and helped them to see other things (50,2%).

Different opinions were a reason for conflicts for a small percentage of children in Italy (9%), while conflicts were much more frequently perceived in Germany (2m2% and UK (39%), although they were much more frequent in Italy (Chapter 4). This is evidently linked to the context.

Negative assessment on different perspectives was marginal in UK and Italy. In Germany, helping to see other things, leading to find other solutions and above all the "other" response are higher than in the other two settings. In UK different opinions did not lead to find shared solutions for only 7,5% of respondents (vs. 14,1% in Germany). In Germany, moreover, children perceived less frequently the expression of different perspectives, while in Italy children perceived less frequently the presence of conflicts (57%).

As a general result, it is possible to affirm that children observed the expression of different points of view as a positive and fruitful occurrence during SHARMED activities, even when they caused some forms of conflict.

Table 9. During the activities, different opinions (% very much)

	IT VM	IT NA	UK VM	UK NA	GE VM	GE NA
were appreciated	71,2	2,1	**84,0**	2,5	**54,8**	**5,0**
helped me to see other things	69,6	7,4	**78,6**	6,0	**50,4**	**10,9**
lead us to find shared solutions	55,1	9,9	**70,1**	**7,5**	**44,9**	**14,1**
Other	53,3	22,2	57,4	23,5	**17,0**	**61,7**
no different opinions were expressed	**19,7**	33,2	**39,8**	32,8	25,8	**21,4**
were a reason for conflicts	**9,0**	**57,0**	**39,0**	27,8	23,2	31,6

The FG, in Italy and UK, show that different points of view emerged quite frequently and they were always listened to, respected and appreciated. Trying to understand different perspectives allowed children to narrate, to learn new things and to understand each other better.

In UK, in particular, children made clear that 'seeing new things' meant first and foremost seeing something new about the classmates, recognising them as other 'I', with memories, hopes, likes, dreams, loved and sometimes missed relatives, pets or friends. One of the most important effects was the 'discovery of the other', combined with a reflective approach to the nature and actual depth of

what was previously, and maybe unproblematically, seen as interpersonal communication and friendship in the classroom. As a general result, children observed the expression of different points of view as a positive and fruitful occurrence, even when different opinions cased some forms of conflict, however not evident in the video-recorded activities (Chapter 4). The impact of conflict on children's overlook on the activities can be possibly justified in light of the support offered by the facilitator in the management of (light) disagreements, which was the object of positive appreciation. Not taking side and making sure that everyone had the opportunity to express a point of view were important characteristics of the facilitator's style as observed by children. Nevertheless, children were not particularly keen on discussing about their experience of conflict.

In Italy, in particular, children stressed the importance of the photos to allow the different perspectives to emerge, as they favoured the confrontation between with the classmates. They also stressed the difference between conflicts and discussions: according to them different opinions did not frequently lead to conflicts but sometimes they brought to discussions when there were different points of view, the children expressed their opinions, listened to others' ideas and tried to understand them. Moreover, they shoed awareness that they reflected together in a constructive way, trying to find positive elements in different points of view, nobody prevailed and all were respected. Negative feelings, such as anger, were not expressed, children did not quarrel, and the reasons of disagreement were not considered very important. Children sometimes found an agreement as a compromise, sometimes changed their ideas, sometimes maintained their opinions, but accepting other opinions. They highlighted that sometimes they handled these discussions without the facilitator's support, as in the workshops, when they could reach shared solutions together, but more frequently the facilitator was an important mediator, listening to different perspectives, trying to understand them, respecting every point of view and avoiding distribution of reasons and wrongs. According to some children, the facilitator helped to put together different perspectives, sometimes proposing a point of view that suited everyone, sometimes helping them to find it. When different perspectives were considered in a negative way, the importance of the facilitator as conflict mediator increased. Children stressed that the conflicts never degenerated because they were handled better than usual. The facilitator found positive elements in all points of view, did not judge them and helped them to reach a compromise, as a point of view that could satisfy everyone. Children's view was clearly confirmed by the analysis of interactions and in particular of the facilitator's work on conflicts (Chapter 4).

2.5. General evaluation of the activities

Table 10 shows that most children found their participation in SHARMED to be a positive experience. On the contrary, just a marginal minority, found their experience negative.

Table 10. General evaluation of the activities (%)

	IT	UK	GE
Positive	83,7	82,4	82,1
Neither positive nor negative	11,4	15,1	13,1
Negative	4,8	2,5	4,8

In Italy, the evaluation is slightly more positive in Modena, but above all in FVG the negative evaluation is much higher (11,3% vs. 3,1%). This shows that facilitation was more effective in Modena than in FVG.

The FG show that, in Italy and UK, the most appreciated aspects of the activities were the discovery of new things about classmates, families and themselves, the feeling of appreciation and respect, the chance to share stories, points of view and feelings with classmates, the possibility to decide what they wanted to talk about, the lack of judgements and assessment, the talk on memories and personal matters. Reciprocal knowledge led to an improvement of relationships with classmates, strengthening

their cohesion. They also helped to reflect behind the appearance, in particular on their stories and feelings, and discussing on these issues. Learning about classmates walked hand in hand with fun while watching classmates' pictures and listening to their stories, in a context where the adult never advanced criticisms or doubts about children's narratives. The FG also highlighted that the SHARMED activities were perceived as different from the usual activities in the classroom, as they allowed children's learning of new things in a different way, regarding classmates, places, connections, cultural habits, and, especially in Italy, sharing opinions without judging and remembering families through photographs. Absence of evaluation and normative appeals was considered important, as children felt more confident to talk about themselves, safe from judgements and assessments.

In Italy, in particular, the SHARMED activities were considered less boring and more funny than the usual activities. Children observed that even the shyest children could narrate their stories and that the medium of photography and the type of activities promoted their expressions, as well as different interpretations and points of view on others' photos. Narratives and the themes of narration were particularly involving. The themes were much more personalised than the usual school subjects. The transition between different stories and different subjects allowed children's discovery of different aspects, among which new places and cultures. Children stressed more openness towards other's expressions because the stories allowed their identification into other's experiences and favoured the desire to tell other stories. According to some children, this explained the lack of conflicts and the possibility to find an agreement. Talking about personal issues let the children to be the "teacher", i.e. the one who chooses the subject and holds the knowledge about the subject. Children appreciated the lack of normativity, such as the lack of necessity to raise their hands. Children also underlined the importance of the use of technology, in particular the video making about the second photo and the video-recording of the activities, the absence of homework and of the necessity to write or to cut out and glue. Moreover, the questionnaire made possible to express opinions, particularly on their relationships with the classmates, anonymously so without offending anyone.

According to some children, however, the SHARMED activities were not completely different from the usual school activities, but they could share their points of view and opinions, so that everyone could discover new things. Moreover, some children did not perceive the SHARMED activities as very different from the usual activities, except for the photos, for being video-recorded, and for the easy questions in the questionnaires. As for critical points, some children:

(1) Highlighted reticence in sharing private issues with classmates and in the questionnaire, and embarrassment for the video of the photo that was taken
(2) Were bored in listening to classmates, in talking too much about a specific photo
(3) Met some difficulties in being involved, in particular in paying attention to classmates' narratives
(4) Were disappointed for classmates' overlapping
(5) Were disappointed because the facilitator did not give the same time to all children to tell their stories and there was not enough time to talk.

In UK, in particular, children strongly advocated the importance of lack of 'objectives' and 'outcomes' associated to the activities. They repeatedly mentioned the great difference between communication during the activities and ordinary communication in the classroom. They got the impression that talking about themselves and the classmates was not instrumental to any learning outcome selected by the adult. Facilitation made children feel more confident to talk about themselves and safe from judgements and assessments. Communication was felt as a safe environment to risk personal contributions and share life experiences, without being prompted by the adult. This was greatly, and consistently, praised as it allowed room to discover the persons behind the classmates and their possible connections, at a relaxed pace, with the possibility of express humor, wit and creativity. Relaxed atmosphere, space to share and lack of judgements or assessment did not prevent the activities to have a positive impact on learning, both regarding classmates and regarding knowledge on places, connections and cultural habits. Finally, children observed a difference between

ordinary experiences in the classroom and SHARMED activities in relation to conflict management approaches. Whilst in the normal classroom routine the intervention of the teachers aims to 'calm down' and to close any conflict as quickly as possible, as disruptive for the achievement of learning, the facilitator used disagreements to promote further communication and the inclusion of other children in the discussion.

In some instances, the excitement of children generated a certain level of confusion, and the facilitator exercised some control to bring the conditions of mutual understanding back. A relatively common development in these situations was the generation of small groups conversation overlapping. However, when asked about their assessment of such situations, many children said that those where the moments they appreciated the most. What was a descent into chaos for adult's ears, for the children was the juxtaposition of different streams of communication. The children stated their ability to manage intertwined interactions in the same physical space, a piece of data that is confirmed by the observation of the activities (Chapter 4).

In Germany, the results of FG were rather mixed which is mostly due to the variety of classes that participated in the activities. The cohesion of the class, that is the level of trust among the classmates, had an important impact on the way children could enjoy the activities. In some classes, the children enjoyed the activities, as they were allowed to decide what they wanted to talk about. They liked to talk about memories, as the positive feelings linked to these moments came back. They appreciated having time with their classmates to talk about personal matters. They also stated that they learned a lot about and from their classmates and that they liked the atmosphere as everybody could talk openly and nobody got laughed at. In other classes, however, the FG confirmed that the low cohesion decreased the level of enjoyment of the activities. Children stated that they did not want to present their pictures, because they were afraid that their classmates would laugh at them. In some cases, they stated that during the breaks or after the activities other children were mocking them and laughing about their stories. Moreover, for all classes, it was difficult to concentrate on other children presenting their pictures for a long time. Methods which activated all children at the same time, making them performing tasks together, were appreciated, i.e. the re-enactment of the pictures described by some children. This kind of methods was received very positively by all classes. Some children did say that they did not like the questionnaire very much, as it was long and difficult to understand. However, other children appreciated the questionnaire as a medium to ask for their opinion.

The voice of children emerging from the FG invites to reflect whether assessments of children's skills and engagement are justified or, rather, the outcome of adult's deficit in understanding and appreciating their way of communicating. It is believed, with the support of quantitative and qualitative data, the SHARMED successfully created the conditions for children to express themselves in their own ways, by creating conditions of mutual trust between adult and children and among children through facilitation.

2.6 Summary

We can sum up the most important results of the analysis of the assessment of the activities among the children.

1. The activities were enjoyed by the majority of children in Italy and especially in UK, while they were less frequently enjoyed in Germany, though they were considered positively. In all settings, the children enjoyed more frequently aspects entailing a less visible role, for instance being the audience for classmates' stories and pictures, while aspects implying a public participation, such as presenting pictures, telling stories and exchanging ideas, were the less appreciated. Producing a picture was among the less appreciated features in UK and Germany.

2. The outlook on the activities was very positive in all setting even if the positive assessment increased from Germany (lower level) to Italy and to UK (higher level). In all settings the great

majority of children had fun, had the chance to express their opinions, discovered new things about others, did something new and learned new things, felt respected, felt appreciated and involved. In all settings, expression of feelings, which is rare in ordinary classroom environments, was less frequent, increasing from Germany, to Italy, to UK.

3. Children observed classmates' supportive behaviour, in particular in Italy and, above all, in UK. In all settings, believing and respecting were frequently perceived, while judging was the less frequent behaviour perceived. In Germany, the activities that required more active involvement, as trying to understand and being interest, were less frequently chosen. In all setting, the relationships with classmates were assessed positively, increasing from Italy, to Germany, to UK.

4. The large majority of children felt comfortable or very comfortable with the facilitators in all settings, with an increase from Germany, to UK, to Italy, where the percentage of children who felt very comfortable was much higher than in the other settings. In all settings, only a marginal minority (very marginal in Italy) felt uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with the facilitators.

5. The largest percentage of children described the facilitator as a person open to children's interests and feelings, increasing from Germany, to UK, to Italy, where this definition was chosen by the majority of children. The other two more frequently chosen definitions were "friend" in UK and teacher in Germany. In Italy and Germany, moderator was a definition chosen by a small but relevant percentage of children.

6. Children's outlook on the facilitator's stance during the activities was largely positive for all variables in all settings, increasing from Germany, to UK, to Italy. In all settings, the most positive assessment concerned interest, trust, respect, and understanding. Helping to get along with classmates was the less chosen, but still chosen by the majority, while judging was chosen only by a minority of children, increasing from Italy, to Germany, to UK.

7. Different opinions were appreciated, increasing from Germany, to Italy, to UK. A minority of respondents did not observe the expression of different points of view, decreasing from Italy, to Germany, to UK. Different opinions triggered conflicts according to very few children in Italy, and more frequently according to children in Germany and above all in UK, though these differences are not confirmed by the analysis of interactions (Chapter 4).

8. Most children found their participation in SHARMED to be a positive experience. Only a marginal minority found their experience negative. In UK the assessment was more polarized than in Italy and Germany, with the greater percentage of negative evaluations.

While the general assessment is very positive, some differences may be explained by the different ways of facilitating classroom interactions ate least in some cases (see Chapter 4). In Germany, facilitation included some normative orientations and some difficulties in managing conflicts. In UK, facilitation worked very well for many aspects, in particular in enhancing new narratives and interlacements between narratives, but sometimes the facilitators provided appreciations and comments, which might be interpreted as judgments. In Italy, there was a difference between facilitation in Modena and in FVG, the latter being more similar to the German one, which was visible in the internal comparison, but not in the whole corpus, as the data collected in Modena were overwhelming. Facilitation in Modena was more effective in avoiding a normative and judgemental appearance, in providing mediation of conflicts and in enhancing agency and dialogue.

Finally, we can give a look to some, limited differences regarding type of school, gender and spoken language.

For several aspects and in different settings, **children in primary schools** appreciated the activities more frequently than secondary school children. They more frequently:

(1) Enjoyed producing a picture (G: 62% vs. 37,6%), presenting a picture (I: 69,6% vs. 49,7%; G: 57,5% vs. 28,7%), telling their stories (I: 66,8% vs. 50%; G: 57,7% vs. 39%)
(2) Learned new things (I: 88,8% vs. 74,5%), felt they had much to share with others (I: 74% vs. 63,8%), discovered new thing about themselves (I: 45,1% vs. 29,3%), felt appreciated (G: 55,4% vs, 44,3%) and important (G: 56,8% vs. 41,6%);
(3) Had fun (I: 89,8% vs. 78,4%).

Moreover, they more frequently perceived facilitators as friends or teachers in Germany and as a person who did not judge them in Italy (74,7% vs 62,6%). However, **secondary school children** perceived facilitators as persons open to children's interests and feelings (Germany) and that the facilitator helped them to talk about memories (Italy: 86,4% vs. 75,4%).
For several aspects and in different settings, **females** were more involved in the activities than males. Females more frequently enjoyed exchanging ideas and information with classmates (I: 63,8% vs. 48,7%), producing a picture (UK: 62,8% vs. 53,5%) and presenting a picture (UK: 63,1% v. 54,8%). They felt more frequently very comfortable with classmates (UK: 52,1% vs. 40%). On the contrary, **males** more frequently felt important (G: 52,8% vs. 45%). Moreover, **females** more frequently defined the facilitator as an open person (I: 55,5% vs. 45,9%) while **males** defined him more frequently as a friend (I: 23,6% vs. 16,8%) or a teacher (I: 14,9% vs. 8,4%). In Germany, **females** also perceived the facilitators' support as more positive than males, stating that the facilitator was trying to understand the respondent (G: 81,9% vs. 67,6%), that the facilitators respected their opinions (77% vs. 69%) and that they believed what they were saying (79,4% vs. 63,3%). About 23,9% of male perceived the facilitator as judging them, compared to 14% of females. Also in UK, **females** observed the facilitator as someone who helped them to get along with classmates (75% vs. 54,7%). **Males** more frequently appreciated different opinions in Italy (76,2% vs. 65,8%), while **females** more frequently perceived different opinions as a way to find shared solutions in Germany (53,4% vs. 37,7%).
The results regarding spoken language are more nuanced in Germany and Italy, while in UK no variations were observable regarding the language, probably due to the generalised high competence of all children in the use of the English medium. **CSFLB** more frequently discovered new things about themselves (I: 49,7% vs. 28,9%; G: 66,1%, vs. 46,8%), more frequently learned new things (I: 87,2% vs. 78,7%), but they also felt less frequently they had much to share with others (I: 62,1% vs. 75,1%). However, personal expression was more difficult for CSFLB (I: 62,3% vs. 76,6%; G: 45,2% vs. 57%), though in Italy many CSFLB participated actively in interactions and observed positive effects from the activities (Chapter 4), as shown by the 20 points of difference between the Italian group and the German group. In Germany, **NSC** also perceived different opinions as a way to find shared solutions more frequently than CSFLB (47,2% vs. 37,6%). Moreover, in Italy, CSFLB felt respected less frequently than the NSC (53,5% vs. 67,2%). Maybe for these reasons, in Italy 53,2% of **CSFLB** perceived the facilitator as a person who is open to children's interests and feelings compared to 28,4% of the NSC.

3. Teachers

3.1 Perception and assessment of the activities

Teachers' general perception of the activities was positive. All the respondents in Italy and most in UK and Germany said that the activities were successful for a series of reasons.

1. Children had the opportunity to know each other better, to share stories and to know different aspects of classmates' personality, thus increasing their empathic relations and harmony in the classroom.
2. The activities gave the chance to leave the usual teacher-student relations thus enhancing a new perspective on their students, and allowing them to work on the emotional and relational issues observed during the activities.
3. The facilitators were able motivate children.
4. There was a great number of intimate, delicate and emotional stories and moments during the activities, and children who usually did not display their emotions were able to share their feelings in classroom interactions.
5. The activities were innovative, promoting narratives about children and their experiences and promoting participation of the shyest children, who usually did not participate in school activities (Italy).
6. The use of photographs and visual materials had a positive impact in the classroom, engaging, motivating, involving and including children in a joint project (UK).
7. Many children liked to share their stories, photographs and experiences with their classmates and enthusiastically engaged in conversations, listening to each other (UK).

Some teachers also expressed critical assessments, for several reasons.

1. The necessity to cope with the possible emergence of traumatic experiences (Italy).
2. The need to spend more time in dealing with conflicts (Italy).
3. The necessity to give continuity to the core activities and to reduce or re-organize some other activities, such as the administration of questionnaires and the written descriptions of the photos (Italy).
4. The absence of real innovation, lack of clarity about the project, difficulty of the questionnaires related to children's age and language (Italy).
5. Children's difficulties in doing the activities, despite the facilitators' competence (Germany).
6. Children's difficulties in remembering certain periods of their life, in reflecting and talking about them in front of the classmates, in focusing for long time on other students presenting and talking about their pictures (Germany).
7. The low value of interactions between children (Germany).
8. The scarce success of the activities in primary schools (though the analysis of the recorded activities show that the facilitators adapted their way of working to the different age) (Germany).
9. The worry to receive insufficient support from the SHARMED team, in terms of clarity about the links between the project and the teaching of curricular subjects (UK).
10. The difficulty in articulating teaching with facilitation, particularly when working with Year 6 (final year of primary school) children (UK).
11. The need to advance a compelling case to justify what their managers could see as "taking time out" of planned subject areas for the project (UK).
12. The need to address literacy, math and science first (UK).
13. The necessity of documentation justifying the benefits of facilitative methodology and non-standard activities around three themes: (1) meeting curricula demands; (2) flexibility of the methodology that does not demand finding huge amount of time for project activities during heavily planned days/weeks/terms (where core subjects demanded more time to be spent on them); (3) benefits for the individual child partaking in the project in terms of confidence building, self-esteem, communication skills, articulation of expression/emotions and well-being.

In Germany, while critical views stressed some problems in facilitation (see Chapter 4), they reflected a traditional perspective about children and education. Several teachers did not fully recognise the possibility of displaying children's agency and the value of dialogue in the classroom. In UK, the obstacle was the school system, or at least the way in which teachers and managers understand it. Due to the selectivity of the final examination, from which school funding greatly depends, time and classroom activities are carefully planned around core subjects via traditional teaching directed to produce measurable learning and outcomes. Clear links with curricular subjects are demanded if something different is suggested.

Critical assessments show the ambiguity between the need for a longer and more intense engagement with the activities, and the difficulty to find time for this type of activity in the school schedule. It seems necessary to increase the hours of activities and to avoid too sporadic activities in order to obtain a long-term impact, but also to use shorter periods of time to enhance the children's overview, and to include meetings to check the impact in a longer time perspective.

3.2 Methods and techniques of facilitation

The methods and techniques of facilitation were very appreciated in Italy and UK. According to the Italian teachers, the facilitators:

1. Allowed the promotion of children's participation.
2. Promoted generalised participation, especially involving those children who did not participate frequently.
3. Was able to enhance and show interest for all stories and to make everyone feel at ease.
4. Coordinated classroom interactions in a non-authoritative and non-directive way.
5. Used photographs to stimulate interest and group work, thus promoting collaboration and putting children at ease.
6. Allowed consideration of children no longer as silent recipients of information, were the same that they themselves try to use.
7. Made them more aware of their actions and let them reflect on their teaching methods and correct those actions that inhibited children's participation, limiting their autonomy.

According to the UK teachers:

1. Facilitation allowed their learning of information about children (for example, they did not realise that children had lived in another country, that some had a bereavement in the family they were struggling to recover from, that a child had his dad in prison or that children were experiencing transition challenges between different family homes).
2. Facilitation was a way to work "with'", rather than "on" children.
3. Facilitation had an impact on adult-children relationships and affectivity, as they did not fully comprehend that the children were holding emotional stress, with possible consequences on behaviours, wrongly linked to lack of successful development of individual personalities and a lack of concentration.
4. The naturalness and depth of children's narratives around their memories of grandparents made them wonder if they had overlooked investing time in interacting with the child as a person. The history of the child as an individual outside of classroom and learner role was noted to have much more depth than expected.
5. They felt able to listen to children, without having to lead, manage or drive towards outcomes.
6. They had relished the time during project activities to reflect on other characteristics of children "seeing them differently".

7. Children who followed only moderately successful behavioural management plans, were highly motivated and engaged during the activities. Two teachers noticed how, after the initial excitement, the class knew how to self-manage participation in the activities.

In Germany, the assessment was more differentiated. Teachers' reactions ranged from "rich in variety" to "lack in variety", nevertheless the facilitators used basically the same methods in all classrooms, only adapting it to the different situations. This different assessment can partly be attributed to the different preconditions of classrooms, conditioning the possibility to employ facilitative methods. Thus, different teachers took different positions, which can be summarised as follows:

1. Judging the methods as well chosen as they matched very well with teacher's pedagogical style.
2. Asserting that the facilitative method was less decisive for the success of the activities than the personality of the facilitator, who was able to react and respond to each student individually and promoted an environment in which the students felt comfortable telling even very personal stories.
3. Lamenting lack of variety, in a context of co-teaching and with an additional language teacher for children whose first language is not German, thus enhancing more capacities to respond to each child individually.
4. Advocating that, in a class of thirty children, it would have been better for favouring the attention of the students, to separate them in two groups to present their pictures, and giving closer attention to those with lower ability to understand, as still developing the skill of presenting the photographs in front of the class.

3.3 The educational aspects of the activities

Most teachers found the activities educational, in particular asserting what follows:

1. Children were able to know each other better and to see them from a different perspective, therefore overcoming problems, prejudices and divergences, developing empathy, collaboration and self-awareness (all settings).
2. Usually shy and not fully linguistically competent children could share their life stories and experiences (Italy and UK).
3. Children learnt a great deal from and about each other regarding personal life stories, cultural experiences and family differences (Italy and UK).
4. Children talked mainly about their personal experiences and all the participants were equally stimulated, thus they could express their point of view, while during the usual lessons, apart from moments of cooperative learning, the contents was simply transmitted to children.
5. Children were able to make connections not previously made or discussed, such as shared holiday destinations, shared friends, hobbies, playgrounds or venues (Italy and UK).
6. Children were able to recognise and discuss without much adult input similar experiences via very different religious, cultural and family units (Italy and UK).
7. Children learnt to dialogue and to respect speaking time and listening to others (Italy), to listen and use questioning (UK).
8. Children volunteered to share personal stories about intimate topics or uneasy personal stories, whilst talking to the whole class; the attention was thus directed to the intensity of children's participation, rather than on the adherence of their narrative to factual truths.
9. Class dynamics changed after the project, with children bonding seeming much stronger and with children showing slightly different forms of respect or understanding (UK).

In UK, the majority of teachers found that classrooms were nosier, with much more chatter occurring during project activities where children talked as a whole group and also in silos. However, apart from a single teacher, the interviewees did not associate more noise and chatter to problems. On the contrary, the they stated that facilitation gave children much breadth of topic and less rules, which allowed the emersion of aspect of children's experiences and personality that were completely unknown. This was a relevant consequence of the implementation of SHARMED for most teacher, which made them amply tolerant towards some children who, in the midst of excitement, were "acting" up a bit.

A more critical perspective, from few teachers, included the following aspects:

1. The activities should have been more educational, i.e. producing change, if the facilitator would have payed more attention to some problems (Italy).
2. The facilitator missed the opportunity to link the flourishing discussions to curricular knowledge, for instance embedding teaching geography, history or religion in discussions that were clearly lending themselves to that (UK).
3. Focusing on the veracity of the stories, rather than on their (co)construction, children were believed to be lying or not telling accurate stories (UK).
4. There was not enough time, due to a tight time schedule, to reflect on the activities (Germany).

Some teachers did not hide feeling sometimes uneasy to allow some subjects to be opened up: for instance, knife crimes, guns and shooting; clear mental health related topics, potentially safeguarding issues, argumentative differences. Nevertheless, the same teachers also shared their relief when children were talking about delicate and emotional stories with some grace.

3.4 Children's approach to facilitation

In all settings, the relationship between facilitators and children was assessed as good or very good and the facilitators were seen as very much engaged into building a close and positive relationship with the children. Most teachers observed that the children appreciated very much the activities and accepted the proposals made by the facilitators with enthusiasm and interest, becoming involved and trusting them. Several teachers claimed that children were always looking forward to the next workshop.

In Italy, in particular, children's participation was assessed very positively.

1. All children were involved in the activities, even those whose parents did not give the consent to use pictures.
2. Children related positively to the facilitator and understood aspects that they normally did not have the chance to observe.
3. Relationships between the facilitator and the children were interpersonal, based on equality and trust, respect and dialogue, without authority and judgment.
4. Even those children who were usually shy and with difficult social and familiar conditions participated, and this led sometimes to change their level of self-confidence.
5. Facilitators, as external persons, allowed more free children's self-expression, while children find difficult to talk with teachers because of their role of evaluators and their connection with parents.

However, the teachers also expressed different views about participation:

1. Most children listened with interest and curiosity
2. Children introduced their ideas and points of views only in some moments

3. Children mainly introduced ideas and perspectives.

Some teachers observed that participation was more difficult during the written activities and that, in the long run, the children lost the overview of the activities. Moreover, for some teachers, the level of active participation reflected the general situation of the class, especially children's character and cultural origins. However, these teachers also stressed the positive developments, as those who did not participate actively, in any case participated with attentive and interested listening. The teachers also expressed different views about children's autonomy:

1. Children were autonomous during the activities, in taking the initiative to narrate about themselves, in choosing actions and in handling on their own group works, as they perceived that they were not judged and felt free of expressing themselves.
2. Children were mainly or partly dependent on the facilitator, because the activity was new, their age was low, they were unsecure or they needed an activation.
3. There was a difference in the level of autonomy between different moments and different children.

In Germany, opinions were very different. Most teachers agreed that the level of participation was high or very high, but the teachers provided several, different assessments.

1. The relationship with the facilitator was friendly and respectful.
2. The facilitator was very responsive to the children needs.
3. The children appreciated the facilitator and facilitation was very well suited for them.
4. The pictures and the stories around the pictures touched the children and they continued talking about different aspects during the lessons.
5. The class was given the chance to talk about numerous, very personal experiences: the students as well as the teacher herself could reflect on these experiences.
6. The children seemed as if they were not listening to each other because of turmoil, but later they showed that they still remembered the details of what other students had said while presenting their pictures.
7. The structure of the activities was very clear to the children and they were able to act autonomously.
8. The children were not forced to present their pictures and could decide to participate in the activities.
9. The excitement, in a context in which children were more free than usual, brought them to misuse their autonomy: for example, when children were asked to communicate with each other, they stopped sitting quietly and talked of something else than the picture.

Thus, according to the German teachers, the children's degree of participation differed very much. Although in general participation was very high, the teachers highlighted that the children who can talk in public easier and more creatively took over. The following observations emerged among the teachers:

1. With external persons, students become very excited and curious, and this leads to the emergence of "creative turmoil"; children are particularly loud and need to stand up and in some case move around. However, the facilitator was able to handle very well this situation.
2. The facilitator's rule of replacing raising of hand with paying attention to gestures and facial expressions of classmates, is a very good idea but difficult to introduce in school, as it would lead to privilege children that perceive what they are saying as very important.
3. At the beginning, children were rather dependent on the facilitator and only after some activities they were able to become more autonomous, as they became more familiar with the procedures.

4. The class was rather hesitant, as the activities were exhausting and unfamiliar; therefore, only some children were active, while others did not participate very much.
5. Participation was a little lower when the activities were recorded and a teacher observed that children were uncertain when speaking about their emotions in front of a camera.
6. The level of participation in filling the questionnaires was rather low, especially for lower grades, as it was difficult or very difficult for many children to respond.

In UK:

1. The teachers observed that participation levels were much higher with children-led questions, discussion and topics then during planned curricula activities.
2. A majority of teachers noted that children looked very confident when sharing personal narratives and asking questions to probe further into personal histories.
3. Most teachers observed that children were autonomous during the activities.
4. Four teachers commented that whilst they saw the positive impact of SHARMED activities within the classroom, they felt it was a bit less than realistic using facilitation as an alternative to more teacher-centred communication, due to workloads and targets needed to prepare children for assessment and progression.
5. A teacher stated that classroom management would be difficult to sustain, if only facilitation is used to teach and control children.
6. A much larger group of teachers were impressed by children's stories, lives and adaptation to the activity and its style.
7. A teacher was touched by the honesty and depth of some of the stories shared by the children.
8. Five teachers noted how humour and gender identity were used as forms of manipulation and discussion tool by children during some of the activities.

3.5 Children's participation

The teachers noted differences for what concerns the class dynamics during the activities. In Italy, some teachers observed that there were not differences between children, as even those who generally had problems in expressing themselves in the classroom, participated actively and were listened to without judgment by the classmates, because the project allowed everyone to feel involved, even those who usually did not participate much. The teachers stressed some episodes:

1. Some girls participated actively while normally did not tell anything of themselves and their opinions or had problems, and this led to more cohesion and self-confidence in the class, also helping classmates to understand them, their problems and vulnerabilities.
2. A boy who usually did not tell anything about himself, explained his perception of diversity.
3. A Chinese girl, usually very reserved, narrated some intimate episodes.
4. A boy, with personal problems, talked about his mother, thus disclosing himself.
5. Other children told of journeys with parents and travels to country of origin.
6. Two children, coming from other classes, expressed their point of view and narrated their personal experiences.

However, other teachers observed that some differences were reproduced or increased, regarding shy children and self-centred children; groups of friends, which excluded or mocked at other children, were more interested in listening to friends and less interested to the others; cultural and socio-economic background led some children to express themselves more personally than others, who were scared of being judged. A teacher highlighted that the self-centred phase was not yet overcome by some children and it was emphasised by the video-camera. Some teachers noted that boys participated more actively than girls.

In Germany, some teachers noticed slight differences in the way children reacted or related to each other in comparison to their usual behaviours. Different teachers:

1. Pointed out that the children were able to be more attentive to other children.
2. Observed that children were usually more focused on themselves, while during the activities they were more attentive to each other and reacted accordingly.
3. Observed that some of her students, in particular the ones she did not expected to, talked about very personal memories and were able to show emotions.
4. Noticed that during the activities children had more freedom than normally and were asked to bring in their own ideas. She affirmed that they still needed to learn and practice the self-reliance.
5. Observed that children who came recently to Germany as refugees had difficulties to speak in front of the class, as their knowledge of the German language was not very good, arguing that the difficulties of language increased the general nervousness about presenting in front of the group and decreased active participation.
6. Many teachers referred to the "creative turmoil" (see above).

In UK, the majority of teachers were impressed with how children easily adapted to facilitation with less input and management of communication. They were surprised by the fast development of affective relationships between children and facilitators. For instance, one teacher stated that children remembered the names of all SHARMED team members, months after the end of the activities. Children also kept asking when the 'SHARMED-people' and their activities were next due in school, showing disappointment when they were informed that SHARMED-like activities could not be implemented with the same investment of time. Children were upset if there was not enough time to share photographs or join in during SHARMED-inspired activities, which prompted some teachers to insert these activities into the crowded timetable. A teacher said that the children were really motivated and excited on the day of SHARMED activities and sometimes it was difficult to contain them. However, about half of the teachers made the point that children often enjoyed high levels of autonomy and time to discuss their interests also during ordinary classes, due to their own style of teaching.

In both Italy and Germany, some teachers observed that the activities had some influence on the relationships between children. These teachers:

1. Claimed that children discovered their classmates' private life and emotional experiences they ignored before, allowing their mutual understanding in a new light, improving empathy, opening to new perspectives and helping to accept diversity (Italy).
2. Observed that the discovery of classmates brought to create new relations and to open groups to other children (Italy).
3. Observed that in many cases children were able to know each other better and to a deeper extent, a thing that is not possible during the regular lessons, highlighting the situations in which children without migration background and children with migration background and/or experience could learn about each other, widening their understanding about the reasons why people act in certain way and as a consequence developed their ability to react in a more conscious and adequate way (Germany).
4. Recognized the potential of the project, believing that the activities could have had a positive influence on difficult classes (Germany).

According to some Italian teachers and the majority of German teachers, the activities did not change or improve the relationships between children because this change would have needed more time and continuity. Some Italian teachers added that the school setting and the spatial disposition did not favour opening to the others. A class already worked on team building and on sharing of values so

that the activities were just a continuation of that work. Some other Italian teachers observed that it was difficult to determine if the activity changed the relationships among children.

In Italy, a majority of teachers did not observe problems or conflicts during the activity. They rather noticed empathy and good feelings. Some teachers stressed that different perspectives were treated as enrichment in communication. In only two cases, the teachers observed conflicts, emerging during the activities, but they were not unexpected, and in other two cases, there were problems with a child.

1. A conflict emerged between a boy and the facilitator; the boy had experienced problems in his family and for this reason he had a strong perception of injustice: during the activities, he thought that the facilitator gave him less opportunity to talk than to the other children. The facilitator managed the conflict listening to the children's point of view, using irony, showing understanding and trying to take into consideration his needs, but not agreeing completely with him. The teacher was happy with the way in which the conflict was managed by the facilitator.
2. A conflict emerged between a boy and his classmates. The facilitator handled well the conflict but he did not spend enough time to manage it.
3. In forming a group, a boy was not happy and stayed aside until the facilitator gently suggested him how to overcome the problem;
4. A disabled boy had some verbal and cognitive difficulties that maybe a specific preparation could have enabled him to overcame.

In Germany:

1. Two teachers observed conflicts as not all children were happy with the way their parents decided whether they were allowed to be filmed or not.
2. A teacher observed conflicts about the issue of loudness and the attention the students payed to their classmates while presenting pictures. She decided to talk privately to the children after the activities.
3. A teacher observed that a student got mocked by other students during a short break in the activities, but the facilitator did not notice the episode as she was dealing with other students.

3.6 Teachers' involvement

In Italy, the teachers remained aside to observe the activities without intervening even when there were some problems, which were handled by the facilitator, but observing differently the situation.

1. A teacher observed that the children accepted and respected this choice, avoiding to ask her to intervene.
2. A teacher observed that the facilitator was able to manage the situations in which some children were particularly noisy.
3. Some teachers feared that their presence inhibited children's participation so that they assumed that it would have been better to live the class.
4. Some teachers claimed some degree of normativity, positioning themselves near those who spoke too much or did not pay attention. They also intervened before the activities by recommending silence and attention, and during the activities when they were called to distribute wrongs and rights about conflicts that emerged between children, for example when a third party asked to sanction who was making noise.
5. Some teachers participated more personally, positioning in the circle with the children and narrating personal experiences that children appreciated.

In Germany, all teachers agreed that their relationship with the students was not different, if compared to their daily interaction, and only one teacher highlighted that it was interesting to leave this teacher-student relation and to get an outside perspective on the students.

In UK, five teachers decided that because SHARMED activities were not curricula based and the project was perceived as a form of "time out activities", they would utilise the project and facilitator as a form of classroom cover. This enabled those teachers to leave the classroom during facilitation sessions to catch up with their class planning and paperwork. However, due to the motivation from children to continue talking about the project, the facilitators and their personal narratives, two of the teachers stayed in class for the two final sessions because they felt they were missing something about children's stories. Another teacher reflected that during lunch time in the staffroom other teachers were talking about the project and stories shared by children that he wanted to be more involved with facilitation and knowing more about his group. Interestingly, because children continued SHARMED discussions and connections well after each session, teacher reactions were influenced so that they decided to work in the classroom rather than in the staffroom to listen to what they were saying.

In Italy and Germany, the relationship between the facilitator and the teachers was assessed as very positive. In Italy, a teacher told that the facilitator asked some information about the class to avoid delicate themes, while in Germany, one teacher stressed that the facilitator was very much interested into the family background of the children. In Italy, the teachers also highlighted that they trusted the facilitator and agreed with his methods. In Germany, a teacher stressed that the facilitator was engaged to ensure a good cooperation with the school. Moreover, some teachers highlighted that the different roles were very clear, which was very helpful.

3.7 Summary

The general perception and assessment of the activities were positive in all settings, though in Germany some teachers were more critical. In particular, the teachers appreciated some important aspects of the activities:

1. The facilitators' competence and ability in motivating all children.
2. The use of photographs and visual materials to engage, motivate, involve and include all children.
3. The opportunity for the children to improve mutual knowledge and understanding.
4. The intimate and emotional stories and moments, in which the children who usually did not show their own emotions were able to share their feelings.
5. The chance offered to the teachers to leave aside their usual teacher-student relations and get a new perspective on their students.

Facilitative methodologies were appreciated above all in Italy and UK, while they received some more critical assessments in Germany. In particular, the facilitators were appreciated as they were able to promote children's participation and avoided being directive. They worked "with" rather than "on" children, influencing the nature of adult-children general relationships and in particular affective rapport. Children's participation was high and all children were involved in the activities. The teachers themselves learnt many new details about the children's experiences and views.

The teachers considered the activities as educational. In particular, children learnt to engage in dialogue. Those children, who had some problems in expressing themselves during regular lessons, participated actively and were listened to without judgment by the classmates. In particular, shy and not fully linguistically competent children were supported in sharing their life stories and experiences. Children knew better their classmates, their cultural experiences and family differences. They could recognise and discuss similar experiences via very different religious, cultural and family units. Children appreciated very much the activities and accepted the facilitators' proposals with enthusiasm and interest, becoming involved and trusting them. They were able to focus on each other personally,

and they easily adapted to facilitation, developing affective relationships. More variable affects were observed for what concerns children's expression of ideas.

According to most German and UK teachers, children were autonomous, while for the Italian teachers, some children were very confident when sharing personal narratives and asking questions, while other children were mainly or partly dependent on the facilitator.

The German teachers observed that their relationships with children, during the activities, were not different from their daily interaction. Only one teacher highlighted that it was interesting to leave the teacher-student relation and to get an outside perspective on students. The Italian teachers remained aside to observe the activities, without intervening even when there were problems, which were handled by the facilitator. In UK, some teachers, who initially left the classroom to do other things, were fascinated by the enthusiasm shown by children and decided to stay in class.

The relationships between facilitators and teachers were positive in all settings. The facilitators were very interested in the children and their family background, in ensuring a good cooperation with the school, in ensuring trust and respect. The activities were successful as all children liked them very much and asked to repeat them. The children could understand aspects they had not the chance to observe in other settings. The pictures and the stories touched the children and they still continued to talk of them for long time.

The influence of the activities on children was explored in particular in the Italian and German settings. In both settings, there were two different views. Some teachers observed that new knowledge during the activity could influence children. In particular, classmates' touching and emotional experiences allowed their consideration in a new light, improving empathy, and helping to accept diversity. Other teachers observed that there was no influence because there were not sufficient time and continuity.

Suggested improvements regarded clarification of connections with school curricula (in particular in UK), continuity in time, reduction of space for writing activities, increasing time for the activities, ability to manage conflicts and traumatic and painful experiences which can emerge during the activities.

4. Facilitators

In general, the facilitators assessed the activities very positively. The activities were interesting, well fit for the age-groups, involving and successful for both students and teachers. However, the Italian facilitators, though stressing many positive aspects, were more critical and self-critical, showing a more reflexive approach to their work. Probably, this peculiarity comes from the long experience of these facilitators in working with children and classes.

4.1 Methods and techniques

All facilitators showed a clear understanding of the methodologies and techniques they used in the classroom. Moreover, in UK, there was a special investment towards securing the facilitators' sharing of the project's aims. First they were asked to read the project's methods and aims before being interviewed for the position, so getting in with some understanding of it. Second, and most important, the lead of the team and them got together a few times to share the philosophy of the project, so they got in the classrooms with a clear understanding of the meaning of what they were doing.

All facilitators used methods to stimulate the participation of the students to the process and recognised that learning was a core aspect of SHARMED activities.

The UK and German facilitators highlighted the use of visuals as an excellent way of sharing stories and experiences. Whilst in UK children were not used to facilitation, they were used to visuals that are widely used as tools for learning, therefore their use helped them to tune in with the project methodology. The UK and Italian facilitators stressed that learning did not depend on educational methodologies and that the activities were different from ordinary education with regard to the methodology and the cultural presupposition.

The Italian facilitators did not orient children to any value. An Italian facilitator oriented his action to the contexts rather than in a pre-structured way. He stressed acknowledgment and attention at children as persons, acting as a person among persons, and ensuring that this kind of attention was reciprocal in the classroom. In this way, contingencies could affect the effectiveness of his method. He excluded all the operational methods which are generally used by educators in the relationship with children, in particular evaluation and normative interventions; he preferred affective contributions, through the use of irony, and jokes, so that questions were not linked to expectations about the "correct" answer but to curiosity. He tried to avoid educational actions even in situation in which problems in the handling of the class emerged, since his approach was based on the relevance of the person, independently of how he/she behaved. He showed to the children the limits of the problematic situation and testified embarrassment and difficulty; if this did not work he accepted this as a result of a non-educational action. The other Italian facilitator used different methods, depending on communicative competences and habit to dialogue in the classroom; in general, he used photographs as a tool to facilitate communication between the children, therefore to promote their participation equally without forcing them and letting them free to talk about what they wanted to talk. Both facilitators used testimony, bringing a personal photo and narrating about its meanings, about themselves and what it represented for them, instead of explaining what children had to do.

The UK facilitators got into the classroom with the idea to listen to children and learn from them, as the best way to support children, to make them feel competent and confident and therefore to allow them to communicate more freely and to learn from one another. Facilitation is not just about leaving room for children to express themselves, rather facilitating a form of communication where the child is listened to as someone who knows his stuff, has implications for learning. This is a more networked learning, with each child as a node connected to others and to facilitators as a peer, learning can come from any direction, not only from the adult.

The German facilitators adopted more structured methods.

1. Dream journey, called by the children "Kopfkino" (lit. mental cinema). Children were invited to imagine to be in their own picture; this helped to recall the memories related to the picture, making easier to tell about it and therefore to be more interested in the pictures of others.
2. Reflection on own priorities. Children were invited to reflect about why they brought a picture and in general to think what was really important to them. That was a good way of getting to know themselves and also each other, as well as of fostering a more conscious choice of the second picture.
3. Symmetric disposition at the beginning of the session. Some questions (e.g. do you like the most to look at the pictures, to hear about the stories) took children to position themselves, break the usual diversity lines, helping the facilitator to know them.
4. Thumb up/thumb down. This supported the involvement of everyone and get an idea about possible diversity of opinions in the class.
5. Reporter. Two groups were formed, of reporters and experts. Every reporter got the picture of an expert and prepared questions. The reporter asked the question to the expert who answered, after that they managed and answered each other questions. The expert had the task to give the floor to those who had questions.
6. Asking to avoid raising hands, rather looking at each other silently and deciding who will ask question or say something next.
7. Sitting in a circle to enhance the children's distance from the daily school-situation. Thus children felt more open and free to try out new roles. It gave also the possibility to change the position of children (i.e. if it there was a group disturbing the others or if someone was bothering the neighbour) and to empower children who needed an extra support (i.e. they seemed to be excluded).
8. Writing notes and questions on the pictures before the presentation. This was particularly useful in a class with difficulties in learning and communicating.

9. Flexibility in accepting objects and Internet pictures and when the children did not bring in the second picture. In the last case, the facilitators asked the class to recreate, through the collaboration of the whole class, the scenes of the pictures which some children wanted to bring but did not bring and to take pictures of them.

Some German facilitators also stressed that working with one picture instead of two would have given more time for more intensive exchange and for creative development. Moreover, they proposed to use an introductory meeting to give children the task of bringing a picture, letting them understand why they should do it, what are the goals of it, how they could choose it. An introductory meeting would also favour the construction of a relationship of trust, which all German facilitators noticed as important for the development of the project and as growing meeting after meeting.
According to the German and Italian facilitators, children learned both competences and contents of knowledge but above all developed new attitudes. The Italian facilitators highlighted self-awareness, reciprocal knowledge, attitude to dialogue and sharing memories and personal stories. The German facilitators stressed dialogic skills, sich as listening (asking questions to foster stories; presenting thoughts), visual skills (perceiving and describing pictures; using pictures to tell stories; conceiving new pictures), communication skills (presenting, asking questions, conscious non-verbal communication), social skills (putting themselves in someone else's shoes, showing empathy, self-organization), curiosity about the others, consciousness of their own rights of participation and tolerance towards different perspectives.

4.3 Children's approach to facilitation

In UK and Italy, the acceptance of the activities was widespread. In UK, children quickly understood the methodology, accepted it without the need of being instructed to do so and genuinely enjoyed the activities. They liked the possibility to bring pictures and talk about their memories freely, rather than having to follow a plot written by someone else. They loved to have time to deliver their narratives rather than be confined to a quick presentation. They could talk about memories from the photograph rather than having to say what the picture was about. Thus, children's alignment to the project's agenda was an expression of children's preference. The UK facilitators observed that cultural stories were discussed mainly by children as family life, personal stories, or memories and reactions to belonging to a family first rather than a culture or religion. Children mainly talked about their lives and experiences 'self'. When questions were asked by peers, the questions were mainly about the 'self' with children asking 'how did you feel? What did you do? Who helped you? I did that…I went there…My dog died to'. Children asked about the person, made connections and followed their own interests.
In Italy, lack of participation was limited to some cases of silence, disturbing behaviours and problems of language. The only activity that was not completely accepted in both settings was hearing or seeing themselves in the audio or video realised about the second/produced photo. Most children were embarrassed and some of them refused to use this material as they were uncomfortable with it. The problem regarded the transition from private to public context without the possibility to change their speech according to the reaction of the classmates, and being mocked by them. According to the Italian facilitators, the most important problem, however, was that children were more interested in talking with the facilitator than with their classmates. According to one facilitator, the level of participation was very good in some classes and not so good in others, where the use of non-cognitive and non-normative actions, like word tricks and irony, did not prevent dyadic interactions leaving classmates as external auditors. According to the other facilitator, participation was very good with some exceptions due to language difficulties and to the embarrassment for the recording of their speech about the produced photo.
In Germany, some resistance towards the activities was observed mainly at the beginning of the activities and among pre-adolescents. However, the level of resistance decreased meeting after

meeting. Older children, almost adolescent, had more difficulties to accept the activities; they were more critical towards adults and very much influenced by other kinds of communicative habits and role allocation. Participation depended on children's character and competence while the biggest problem was represented by the lack of trust regarding the project, classmates and teachers. In each class there were less extroverted students and all facilitators tried to empower them. Feeling comfortable with classmates played an important role in children's decision of sharing their private stories. All German facilitators observed, however, that children changed their attitude and behaviour, learning to take advantage of a space in which they were well accepted. The general relation with the teacher and their personality and style had an important influence on children' attitudes and behaviours. The teachers' absence determined more problems of behaviour, but if the teachers were seated outside the circle children were looking at them frequently as authority. Both Italian facilitators also emphasised this teachers' role, at least in some cases.

In UK, the facilitators recognised great autonomy to the children who participated without the need of any guidance. Some support was only needed, albeit initially, to avoid that a few children took over the activities reducing the space for other children's participation. However, such arrangement proved to be temporary as by the end of the cycle of activities, the children were generally able to self-manage the distribution of opportunities to talk. By the end of the project, children were very good in taking the risk to say something but almost never talking on top of others' narratives. It is learning to learn in a dialogic way and independently, or at least with more independence.

In Italy and Germany, the facilitators recognised children's autonomy, but stressed its limitations and in particular the paradox of creating its conditions from outside. In Italy, one facilitator said that the children were mainly dependent on him because everything was decided from outside, though inside that contexts he perceived them as autonomous. According to the other facilitator, in one class the children were autonomous as they could work without the facilitator and the teacher systematically intervening. However, he highlighted the paradox that adults decided that children could dialogue alone. In Germany, all facilitators were engaged in fostering the autonomy of children, supporting the development of processes in which children could freely but respectfully express themselves and even coordinate autonomously their interactions. They understood facilitation as coordination of processes that develop dynamics through the actions of children. According to one facilitator, the children succeeded into getting in an autonomous dialogue. According to another facilitator, there was an increase of autonomy, motivation and active participation through the process of recreating scenes and taking pictures of them (see above).

According to an Italian facilitator, differences among children only depended on their personal characters. Another Italian facilitator looked at a cultural difference, noticing that girls from Bangladesh did not intervene much and seemed shy during the activities, but at the end of them they talked to each other. In Germany, the biggest differences were observed among classes and, above all, age, as the youngest children were generally from the beginning more excited and open towards the project, facilitators, pictures and stories. Children usual way of perceiving schools, themselves in the class and the other classmates was important in their approach to differences.

In Italy, the context influenced facilitative actions. Relational problems among the children could influence positively or negatively the meetings. A German facilitator adopted the strategy of moderating very carefully processes in which the difference line represented a difference on power, trying not to reinforce it, instead relativizing it.

Some problems were also observed. In Germany and Italy, sometimes children brought pictures they were not interested in. According to one Italian facilitator, even if the photos were the starting point for the activities, they were not always fully successful in promoting participation because part of them were not chosen by the children, who therefore did not invest on them. Italian and German facilitators also observed conflicts.

According to both Italian facilitators, each class shows a conflict history, structured conflict dynamics that are influenced also by teaching and a particular competence in handling or avoiding conflicts. In particular, according to one facilitator conflicts may be an effect of educational requests to adhere to external values and children are aware and owner of conflicts and can prevent them. One facilitator

did not observe conflicts during the activities, even though there were some occasions in which the children expressed different opinions. The other facilitator observed some conflicts, which he did not consider problematic, and some differences in the children's ability in handling them. He mediated these conflicts, without proposing right or wrong points of view, showing curiosity and asking questions to understand. In one case, he positioned himself at the same level of the child, playing, prevaricating and then highlighting the limit of his action and thus making him understand the importance that everyone had the chance to express themselves in dialogue, rather than to reach a solution or a shared value. He suggested that working on conflict would be interesting.

In Germany, all facilitators observed classes in which the atmosphere was tense, and aggressive language was used by individuals against individuals, group against individuals and groups against groups. In a class, an important conflict regarded girls and boys. The general atmosphere in the class had clear consequences on the way students behaved; for example, in one class some students refused to tell their stories as they were afraid to be laughed at. However, the atmosphere became more and more respectful during the activities. For this reason, all facilitators asserted the importance of having more time to spend with children before starting the activities, to develop positive relations. Despite the short time, the facilitators could express their observations about negative language, exclusion and conflict lines. In particular, a facilitator worked on the tendency to offend, and explicitly reflected with the children about the option of a dialogic perspective and approach. Another facilitator separated groups by changing their place and empowered those students with less power by seating next to them.

In Italy and Germany, the facilitators also reported the problem of finding the right way of dealing with some children. In Germany, this happened above all at the beginning of the activities, before building relationship of trust. In these cases, the teachers could be helpful, using their power to calm down the children. One facilitator referred about some linguistic problems he had with two children who could not speak German. In Italy, one facilitator acted as a person and this produced different effects, sometimes of gratification and other times of frustration. In particular, when he tried to promote the participation of some children who excluded him, he had to recognise the limit of his action. Sometimes he obtained some results, other times he did not. In these cases, sometimes the teachers intervened asking for silence. However, differently from the German facilitators, he ignored the teachers to show the children that they could also ignore them.

In Germany, other two critical issues were the presence of the camera which was a disturbing factor above all at the beginning, before children got used to it, and time pressure. The central factor was the low ability of the children to focus their attention on the activities. Work in smaller groups and short energizers were the strategies that the facilitators used to increase children's attention.

4.4 Relations with children and adults

The facilitators felt that their presence and the activities were very well appreciated by the vast majority of children. Their relationships with children were positive and funny. The UK facilitators, in particular, highlighted that these relations were surprising, challenging, emotive and extremely insightful regarding culture, family life and the child's life world. They experienced high level of engagement and enthusiasm during each activity. Children were eager to participate, sharing personal narratives, photographs and memories with each other. They signalled that positive attachments quickly began to develop because personal investments between children and facilitator created a bond based on trust, connections and relationships. Some children developed stronger links which could be due to time spent on narratives or depth reached during longer discussion, particularly between peers. During post visits to schools, both children and facilitators remembered each other on a personal level, or remembered their shared narratives, discussions and bonds, celebrated the shared connections still there due to time spent co-constructing new memoires. Topics, sensitive memories and life experiences exchanged by children were at times surprising and challenging. This was due to comments and questions children led or opened up during interlaced narratives that were outside

of safe school topics or outside their comfort zone. Facilitators felt safe to enter topics led by children although they were worried in case teachers might not approve some of the topics which could potentially jeopardize the project or cross blurred boundaries between teaching and facilitation and school and project. Some topics visited during discussions led by children were outside facilitators knowledge, life experiences or expectations and therefore provoked facilitator strategies to develop or adjust quickly and a real interest and exchange during facilitation to explore more about what children where sharing and why they wanted to share it.

The Italian and German facilitators told stories of children calling them and talking to them in the schoolyard. They were usually very welcomed, even by the apparently more rebellious children, with the only exception of some cases in which there was some lack of interest. In some cases, it was very hard for the children to accept the end of SHARMED after the fourth workshop.

The German facilitators described their role as a mix of friend and teacher. Even if they tried to act in a hierarchy-free way, they were still recognised as authoritative. However, they could develop a trustful relationship. In Italy, one facilitator perceived an acknowledgment of his person because children were pleased to meet him and were involved in interpersonal relations. However, this acknowledgment was limited to the class context and, though in some circumstances he felt a personal appeal, he did not have the chance to develop a relationship out of this context. All German facilitators perceived a very good relationship with the teachers. Some facilitators highlighted that it was important to clarify their role to help the teacher understand that it was not about showing them how they could do better, but giving them the opportunity to learn something new, by observing the facilitation process. As a critical element, with the teachers who were less present exchange was not significant. Finally, one facilitator told about very fruitful cooperation with teachers during the dialogue process as co-moderators as well as very difficult situations, where the teacher was unconsciously challenging dialogue.

According to the Italian facilitators, the relationship with the teachers was different according to the school grade and the level of involvement. Relationships were very good and a-problematic with primary school teachers, while some difficulties arose with secondary school teachers. In particular, a teacher who participated in the training was not present during the activities while the teachers who were present did not know anything about the project or were not interested in it.

In UK, relations between facilitators and teachers were positive, even if a diversification regarded the teachers' attitude towards the challenge of doing something outside the curriculum and the reactions to the project in action. Communication between facilitator and teacher combined formal school life expectations with project intent that required negotiation. Flexibility was the key to gain access to schools and then the classrooms. Feedback was honest and open with teachers who accepted the challenge of doing something different in the classroom outside of the curriculum. The facilitators asked for feedback from teachers about interactions and classroom behaviour. They avoided to threat the teacher role or authority, thus improving the opportunity to collect teacher views. Teachers reacted differently to the project. Some teachers wanted to join in whilst other teachers choose not to, or opted to use the time to do paperwork. Time and space for the project to run inside the curriculum was a challenge at times to establish relationships and time to develop connections with teachers. Stronger connections were made when some teachers and facilitators shared their personal life stories because it opened up a connection due to shared memories. Children seemed extremely positive when their teacher shared memories and photographs, joined in discussion or asked questions about memoires or photographs and continued the activities after the project finished.

According to an Italian facilitator, using photos was successful when the relationship between school and families worked well, as parents discussed with their children about the material and some of them spent some time to narrate the story of the photos. However, sometimes this did not happen, mainly because of newness of this activity and of some difficulties of families with language problems.

In Germany, all facilitators observed in some teachers the same tendency of some parents to take care of the image of their children. These teachers attempted to discipline, to justify or to manage their students' behaviours.

4.5 Influence of the project

The facilitators perceived the activities as successful. However, degrees of success were differentiated. The Italian and German facilitators were not able to say if the activities influenced the relationship between children, as they did not know what happened after the workshops and the activities were too limited in time. Nevertheless, all facilitators put in evidence that the activities could potentially have some influence on children. They perceived that the stories that were told could have changed something about the relationships between children, as they learned something new about the classmates and empathised with them, realising in many cases to have things in common.

According to an Italian facilitator, the project was successful in giving children the opportunity to participate as persons but it was not fully successful in promoting dialogue between children. According to the other Italian facilitator, the project succeeded in promoting dialogue between children and in showing the teacher how this form of communication can be promoted and its effects on participation. A teacher told him she had to reconsider her teaching methods, though it is not possible to know what happened after the activities. The German facilitators observed the change of behaviour of many children involved, developing the ability and the motivation to listen to each other, learning from each other and about each other. SHARMED also opened up a space for the expression of different emotional issues which was itself a big opportunity to strengthen the tights of the class or solve some knots.

In UK, general traits and characterises evolved during facilitation regarding children's behaviour. Participation developed in the majority of classes across the activities; child led discussion and autonomy became more dominant at each new stage of activity. Discussions led by children seemed to remove boundaries within shared spaces for children to open up and discuss their interests, life and challenges. Behaviour in the majority of classrooms captured children using humour, questions, negotiation, raised voice, self-audits/assessment to challenge children behaviour or input from peers, with some groups co-constructing their own rules and expectations. In contrast, a minority of classes evolved behaviour quite differently by becoming loud and noisy. Interestingly the teachers in these two particular classes did not stay in class for the project activities and reminded children of school rules, behaviour sanctions and possible reprisals prior to the start of each project activity session. These two groups particularly provoked facilitators to change their facilitation style. The team reflected on the session quite negatively at first wondering what had happened or changed because the activity did not seem to go as expected. However, during the next session the facilitator asked the children what they thought of the previous activity and surprisingly they said that they really enjoyed the activity and project. This experience and response from the children provoked a reflection on how project aims and intent along with facilitation styles prevented facilitators to measure the trueness of the type of interactions observed. Further analysis found that children led and then responded to facilitation in a style they choose and wanted (which could be due to a rigid classroom rules or boundaries they usually experience or because one of the classes had a high turnover of supply teachers). Thus, facilitators were challenged by this group, in particular about facilitation style used and about project interpretation and expectations.

Chapter 7. Educational and societal implications

This final chapter regards the educational and societal implications of SHARMED. The complexity of the project and its outcomes do not allow a linear straight conclusion about its realisation and consequences. Firstly, in this concluding chapter we aim to reflect on the different parts of the final report, to reach some more articulated conclusions about SHARMED. This also includes the comparison between the different European settings, which is important to assess the possible expansion at European level, and the impact on multicultural contexts and intercultural communication, which was a fundamental requisite of the SHARMED project. Secondly, this chapter includes information about dissemination and presentation of the final tools for further application in SHARMED-like projects. In the very last section, we will provide a summary of the relevant aspects to apply SHARMED.

1. Social and cultural contexts of the project

Our first reflection regards the social and cultural contexts in which the activities were realised. This context includes four variables, which can present local variability: (1) organisation; (2) expectations in the school system (in particular among the teachers); (3) children's interest; (4) characteristics of migration processes and settlements. For these four variables, different conditions in different European contexts should be expected.

For what concerns the organisation of activities, different ways of organising school education can have an impact on timetable and accessibility. The de-synchronisation of activities may be a problem in projects that involve an international partnership, but it is not a problem in national or local settings. However, it is important to know and verify the possibility of accessing schools during the school year. This is linked with the school expectations: at least at the beginning of the project, it is possible, if not probable, that schools and teachers tend to organise a SHARMED-like project in a way to avoid disturbance of the regular teaching activities. This type of project can be seen as an experimentation that should not disturb regular teaching.

The evolution of this type of expectations depends on the local school system, above all on the degree of distance between teaching on the one hand and dialogic and participatory approaches, which are adopted in SHARMED-like projects, on the other. Both low and high distance can have advantages and disadvantages. In the SHARMED project, low distance was clear in the Italian settings, where non-curricular activities may be rather frequent above all in primary schools, but also in some secondary schools. Low distance enhances the acceptance of the proposed activities, but it may also create some "competition" with teachers, who are interested in stressing their own competence. However, this competition can be productively transformed in enhancement of new classroom activities. High distance was clear in the UK setting, where the school system is based on testing and performance. In this case, teachers can be very interested in unusual activities, but they can be stressed

by the difficulty of integrating them in regular teaching, which are based on enhancement of children's performances. The German settings presented more nuanced and differentiated characteristics, with both warmly interested teachers and rather "cold" teachers, who did not appreciate the "disordered" activities during SHARMED. In some cases, traditional forms of teaching were claimed as more successful, in other cases, new forms of facilitation where welcomed. This situation might be considered rather probable in several European countries.

While expectations in school systems and among teachers depend on local approaches to teaching, children's expectations may depend on the proposed forms of communication, in particular on facilitators' styles. In all settings, children considered their participation in SHARMED as a positive experience and only a marginal minority considered this experience as negative. The only aspect that deserves some reflection and that suggests future adaptation is that children enjoyed very frequently aspects entailing a less visible role, for instance being the audience for classmates' stories and pictures, while aspects implying a public participation, such as presenting pictures, telling stories and exchanging ideas, were the less appreciated.

However, while the general assessment is very positive, its frequency increased from German settings to Italian and UK settings. In Italian and UK settings, almost all children showed enthusiasm for the experience, though some more difficulties where observed in the UK setting. This was shown by both the level of participation during the activities and by children's direct evaluations. Fun, expression of opinions, discovering others, doing and learning something, feeling respected, appreciated and involved were the most frequent reasons for appreciation. Children also observed classmates' supportive behaviour and felt comfortable with the facilitators, above all Italy, where the percentage of children who felt very comfortable with them was much higher than in the other settings. Only a marginal minority (very marginal in Italy) felt uncomfortable with facilitators. Facilitators were described as open to children's interests and feelings (above all in Italy), friends (above all in UK).

In the German settings, enthusiasm was lower and more differentiated, according to the children's evaluation, though children's participation during the activities was very visible. Some differences may be explained by the different ways of facilitating classroom interactions. In Germany, facilitation included some normative orientations and some difficulties in managing conflicts. This is also shown by the frequent perception of facilitators as teachers. In UK, facilitation worked very well for many aspects, in particular in enhancing new narratives and interlacements between narratives, but sometimes the facilitators provided appreciations and comments, which might be interpreted as judgments. In Italy, there was a difference between facilitation in Modena and in FVG, the latter being more similar to the German one, which was visible in the internal comparison, but not in the whole corpus, as the quantity of data collected in Modena was much higher. Facilitation in Modena was more effective in avoiding a normative and judgemental appearance, in providing mediation of conflicts and in enhancing agency and dialogue.

Finally, it is also important to consider type of school and gender in assessing this type of activities. It may be interesting to observe that during SHARMED, for several aspect, children in primary schools appreciated the activities more frequently than children in secondary schools and females were involved in the activities more frequently than males.

Against this background, type of migration is an important factor that influences the degree of success of the activities, for what concerns both children's language competence and their motivation in participating. In a context in which an established mélange of different origins meets a shared spoken language (e.g. in London), the impact of language and culture is minimal and the exchange of experiences in the classroom is easy and based on confidence of understanding and acceptance. This is shown by the fact that in London no variations in assessment were observable regarding the spoken language, probably due to the generalised high competence of all children in the use of the English medium.

In a context with more linguistic differences and some cultural diffidence, the impact can be higher. The differences in assessment of activities between native speakers and children natives of another language were rather nuanced in Germany and Italy, where discovering and learning were high but personal expression was seen as more difficult. Interestingly, however, in Italy facilitators were more

frequently appreciated by non-native speakers than by native speakers. The analysis of the activities shows that the impact of cultural and linguistic differences can be based on the facilitation process. In some cases, facilitation can transform difficulties in interest in self-expression. In other cases, facilitation, above all if more rigidly structured, can confirm difficulties, leaving insufficient space for self-expression. Thus, while a careful assessment of the cultural and linguistic context is very useful, its knowledge must be coupled with a careful use of facilitation (see below).

2. Types of activities and methodology of facilitation

The second reflection regards the types of activities. The SHARMED project was based on standardised activities in the different settings. This standardisation was chosen in order to compare the degree of success of activities. This allowed evaluation of the degree of success of the activities. An interesting research outcome is the primary interest in oral activities, shared by children and teachers. According to the involved teachers, in particular, written texts are less useful than oral narratives and dialogue in achieving the objectives of a SHARMED-like project. While SHARMED was planned to give more relevance to visuals and narratives, it seems clear that what is felt as missing in the schools is the ability to involve children in oral narratives, rather than working on written texts. Another important aspect of evaluation is that children preferred to listen to their classmates' stories and look at their photographs, rather than to participate actively. However, this preference is not visible through the video-recordings of the activities, which show children's very active participation, at least in the Italian and UK settings. In UK, in particular, children showed their enthusiasm about the possibility of self-expression provided by SHARMED, in a school context strongly oriented to school performances. Of course, video-recordings highlights active participation rather than listening to and looking at, however they show that active participation was a very important and successful of SHARMED.

A third important aspect of this type of activities is the management of problems and conflicts. Here, again we can see a mismatch between the children's declarations in the questionnaire and the video-recordings, at least for the UK setting. In this setting, the children perceived conflicts that were not at all visible in video-recordings, at least if confronted to the Italian settings, where some conflicts were evident and where, however, they were much more frequently interpreted as "different views". This shows that there may be different perceptions of what conflict is and this may depend on the local context. It could be that the more controlled school context in UK, expression of different views is seen as more conflictive.

The third reflection regards the methodology of facilitation, which is linked with the previous two conclusions. The partners agreed about the shared application of some principles of facilitation, which were however very general. They included promotion of active participation, dialogue and avoidance of normative actions. Against this background, variations were considered admissible and reasonable, as accorded to specific styles of facilitation. This consideration was based on the assumption that as it is impossible to force facilitation in a rigid scheme. Against this background, it is interesting to observe that the German facilitators decided to introduce a series of standardised activities, while the Italian and UK facilitators followed more flexible methods, though replying them along in all meetings. During the SHARMED project, the recording of differences in style and method of facilitation were useful to understand what facilitation may be in different settings and according to different views of participation and dialogue. Of course, they are by no means exhaustive of the whole range of facilitative methodologies. We have described in some details the facilitative actions and the different facilitative methodologies in Chapter 4. In these conclusions, it is interesting to stress the different conceptions of participation and dialogue that emerge from the facilitators' choices and styles.

What recordings show is that participation was interpreted in three different ways. First, participation was interpreted as uttering more or less long, individual (personal) narratives, actively promoted by other participants' questions and comments, and confirmed through open appreciation. Second, participation was interpreted as co-construction, in which the facilitator is continuously involved

through questions and formulations. Third, participation was interpreted as children's autonomous individual (personal) contributions, very loosely solicited and based on more standardised techniques. This type of difference is partly based on personal styles, which are influenced by theoretical approaches, and partly based on the cultural context of facilitation. It is not easy to distinguish between these factors, but some examples can be useful to suggest their different influence.

The first example regards a facilitator in Italy, who explained his work as based on the intention of avoiding any normative action and counting on the contingent, personal involvement of children and himself. This interest in contingent situations, based on personal feelings and attitudes, shaped his style. This is a risky basis for action, which requires high sensitivity for contingent situations and personal expression, from both facilitator and children. However, children's assessment showed that this style worked better than any other during the SHARMED project. It was perceived as genuine and attentive. Its "cost" was that, while narratives were systematically co-constructed so that the children were (and felt) constantly supported in their verbal action, the produced narratives were rather fragmented. Moreover, dialogue was much more frequent between the facilitator and the child, though the facilitator made efforts to involve the other children. Working on contingent situations and personal involvement also means avoiding to "force" dialogue and thus probably to lose some opportunities to enhance it.

The second example regards the facilitators working in UK who made large use of complex speech turns, in which they combined positive feedback, personal comments and personal stories. This type of action enhanced effectively both children's participation and interlacements among children's narratives, so that children uttered frequently longer and complex narratives and sequences of narratives. However, a negative effect of this methodology was children's rather frequent observation of hierarchical relations. Maybe this observation was influenced by the context (see above), but in any case the general assessment of relationships with facilitators was a bit less positive then in the Italian case. This shows that a very active positioning of the facilitator can have different effects.

The third example regards facilitation in Germany. Here, the high standardisation was based on a much less active style, including active listening and short and few questions. Facilitators focused their attention on the direct involvement of the other children for questions and comments. However, this was not always successful, in particular with migrant children who had few opportunities to express themselves, and probably needed more support. This shows that the frequently stressed requirement of "listening" to children is successful when children talk a lot autonomously, which is not a frequent condition in many schools.

3. Project effects

The fourth reflection regards the effects of SHARMED-like activities. These effects may be expected to be different in different settings. For this aspect, it is important to take into account the strong limitations regarding the comparison between the Activity Group and the Control Group, which made several results very dubious, in particular in the UK setting. Given this warning about the comparison between the AG and the CG, it is however interesting to note that the frequent deterioration of relationships in the CG, in particular with the classmates, may show that the SHARMED activities have prevented problems in the classrooms, since these may increase during the school year.

In general, in the SHARMED project, the effects were much more frequently positive than negative, but there were some exceptions, regarding the perception of relationships with classmates. In UK, the activities with classmates, in relation to the projects' aims, produced high positive effects; however these effects were not confirmed in Germany. In Italy, the perception of classmates' attitudes and self-assessment of reactions to classmates' stories increased significantly; however, these effects were more nuanced in UK and less positive in Germany. Some negative effects can be explained through a more reflective attitude developed during the activities, as children could reflect on their relationships and their ways of acting, thus becoming more critical. However, video-recordings of activities also show a relevant influence of the style of facilitation in enhancing participation effectively. In particular, in Germany the context seemed to determine some obstacles inhibiting the

achievement of positive effects. This influence of the context was visible through the activity of facilitation, which was not so effective in enhancing agency and dialogue as in the other settings.

During the SHARMED project, it was not possible to observe generalised differences regarding gender and language. However, an important result was that males felt positively affected more frequently than females, though females assessed more positively the activities. Probably, males could observe a dialogic way of communicating which is less frequent in their traditional socialisation. In any case, the video-recordings of the activities of facilitation show that both males and females participated actively; they were free to self-select, and it was not possible to observe a clear difference in their self-selection and attitude to narrate. Beyond these results, paying attention to the dynamics of gender relations in the classroom is an important aspect of facilitation.

Another important result is that the effects on children speaking other languages than the national one (CSFLB) were different in the three settings, confirming our conclusion about the impact of different types of migration (see above). In Italy, the effects among CSFLB were more positive than among the native speakers, in terms of both improvement of classroom relations and use of photography. In particular, these children participated more actively, perceived less problems with the classmates, exchanged stories with them and were interested in them, perceived classmates' interest and respect, talked of their cultural and personal background, considered different perspectives as more positive. The only negative effects regarded the perception of mocking and some aggressive behaviours, but this perception was rather infrequent. Video-recordings confirm the strong involvement of CSFLB during the activities. In Germany, the effects on the CSFLB were more controversial, and some negative effects were visible, regarding active participation, classmates' interest, talk of cultural and personal background, perception of different perspectives as positive, perception of classmates' respect and mocking. These effects were confirmed by the video-recordings, which showed scarce involvement of the CSFLB in narratives and dialogue. Finally, in UK, the most important positive effects concerned the native speakers. It is rather clear from the video-recordings that migrant children were more involved in the Italian setting. These results show that consideration for the specificity of the connection between local types of migration and facilitation is a very important aspect of SHARMED-like activities.

4. Further activities in the involved schools and dissemination

The SHARMED project did not include tools to verify the continuity of the activities in the involved schools, as its main objective was a larger scale of dissemination. However, during the interviews, the teachers said that the level of interest in photographs and stories continued after the conclusion of the SHARMED activities. In UK, several teachers said that they continued the activities and sharing narratives after the end of the project, because many children were disappointed that they did not get an opportunity to share their photograph during the experimental activities. One facilitator worked with the teachers who were implementing facilitative methodology.

In particular, the interviewed teachers stressed the following examples of innovation promoted by SHARMED.

1. Some common experiences shared via SHARMED were used for further discussions, teaching activities and planning (UK).
2. Some teachers changed their planning and session after SHARMED activities to allow children continuing discussing around topics that children themselves had led on and developed (UK).
3. SHARMED was the pivot for the construction of further activities. For example, one class edited a journal to evaluate SHARMED experiences and thoughts; one group used cameras to take photographs in school and to discuss topics and school areas, which were linked to a project about geography (UK).

4. The photographs were used to continue the project so that children could share narratives. One teacher "noticed children interacting with each other who had not previously been drawn to each other during class activities or play time" (UK).
5. Several teachers gained more awareness of possibilities and results offered by methods of facilitation, reflecting on their teaching approach and, in particular, on the limitation of directive actions that inhibit children's participation; they observed, understood and reflected on the complexity of educational communication (Italy).
6. Some teachers used images as an input in curricular subjects, sometimes starting from personal narratives, and usually tried to include children from other countries asking them to narrate about specific feasts (Italy).
7. Stories narrated during the workshops let the teachers discover new things about students, in particular delicate and potentially problematic issues on which they worked after the end of the project (Italy).
8. SHARMED worked as a bridge between children since the discovery of classmates through stories allowed the opening up of children to group relationships and the opening up of small groups to other groups. Teachers worked on these new relationships after the end of the activities (Italy).
9. SHARMED-like activities were understood as possible ways to work on autobiographical and descriptive texts, both oral and written; to get to know better students and their families; to welcome new students; to improve dialogic approach during circle time activities; to use more extensively visual inputs; to strengthen children's empathy and mutual help in learning (Italy).
10. While reading the Diary of Anne Frank, especially the children who came to Germany as refugees could connect to this experience and the other students realized what it means to live in a country where war is part of the daily life, being able to link this story to the story of the children from their class (Germany).

Beyond the involved schools, dissemination of SHARMED started from the beginning of the project and developed as a continuous process. The project, the tools and the outcomes have been disseminated both at local level (parents, other schools, external partners), and at the level of wider institutions in charge of educational policies. Dissemination also addressed institutions and organisations that were not directly involved in the project but that could be interested in it.

Dissemination was addressed to teachers, families, children, experts and policy makers. A local networking was created and kept updated through regular communication and direct involvement, sharing these contents. In particular, it was possible to work in the following directions of networking: (1) contact with other schools; (2) contacts with local policy makers; (3) cooperation with institutions, organizations and associations that focus on education; (4) involvement of professionals and researchers; (5) promotion of meetings. The activities of dissemination of tools and outcomes included the use of network members as multipliers of information and know-how. Construction and management of social media profiles to establish a continuous and dynamic news update and to promote online interaction and active creation of contents. A large mailing list was developed to disseminate the SHARMED progress and results, and to inform local media about the project and its outcomes. The members of the partnership participated in other networking activities and seminars/conferences.

At the end of the project, the SHARMED website has been filled with important materials to promote download and active participation, and communication of results in networks and organizations has been improved. Finally, publications about the results of SHARMED have been planned.

5. Tools for SHARMED-like projects

The most important outcome of SHARMED is the series of products, which were foreseen from the beginning of the project, as a way of explaining and disseminating innovation beyond the involved schools and in particular at the European level. SHARMED has developed these tools for further

applications. They are a training package, both face-to-face and online (MOOC, Massive Online Open Course), guidelines for the activities, an evaluation package and an archive. All these tools are available on the SHARMED website (www.sharmed.eu) and are described in the Guidelines (website, section Your SHARMED). The archive is password protected for ethical reasons and can be only visited (after permission) by educational institutions and organisations.

The **training** for teachers, educators and facilitators is available in the section Learning Platform of the SHARMED website. It has been provided in two forms: (1) a short training of approximately one day, based on a training package and (2) a longer Massive Online Open Course (MOOC). The training relies on the discussion of examples from facilitation processes; therefore, it is a precious resource toward the implementation of SHARMED-like projects based. On successful completion of the training package, trainees are able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of a range of concepts and debates underpinning theories and principles of facilitation, dialogic discussion and children's narratives.
2. Critically evaluate the relative balance of powers and accountabilities between children, teachers, facilitators, curricula, and routines
3. Know and be able to analyse critically how the role of adults can open or close down spaces for children to lead, share, narrate, question and negotiate within provision that is led via facilitation that promotes child-initiated pedagogy
4. Be able to evaluate the congruence between selected characteristics and traits within the process of facilitation and related themes, analysing how facilitation translates into practice
5. Examine personal/professional perspectives and reflections on particular challenges and strengths identified around the use of facilitation within educational contexts that affect how children's voices and narratives are engaged with and heard, or not

A training handbook is available to guide the organisation of activities. The aim of this methodology is to support trainees to explore the concept of facilitation and related themes to plan and use facilitation within future practice. Trainees are supported to critically analyse the processes and themes linked to facilitation and provoked to reflect how skills and teaching strategies: (1) can be transferred between teaching and facilitation; (2) can further develop and be challenged to promote children's autonomy, voice and participation. Implementation of facilitation within an educational context can be explored in view of impact on practice aiming to promote the voice, expression, role and spaces belonging to children. Over the training, trainees undertake self-audits of their own practice, impact and context enabling them: (1) to construct an action plan towards the use of facilitation; (2) to develop teaching strategies; (3) to identify/sum up pedagogical philosophy.

Training is delivered through a combined learning approach based on workshops to allow reflection on examples of facilitation relevant for the topic of the specific module. Workshops allow independent work, in pairs or in small groups to analyse materials.

Training is therefore mostly group-led with trainer's role modelling facilitation. Transcripts of facilitation examples are available as an appendix to the training handbook. The transcripts, provided in the handbook, are accompanied by analytical notes to support trainers in leading the discussion. Transcripts and transcript analysis/notes provided in the handbook can be utilised by trainers freely as a resource (1) to support knowledge, (2) to aid memoire, (3) to project promotion capturing facilitation impact. Material in appendices aim to underpin and provoke trainer/trainee discussion and knowledge exchange.

Modules can be delivered all together or separately, depending on trainers/trainees availability. During delivery, the trainer can manage timing, style and how tasks flow, depending on cohort input and needs. The training handbook provides a modules plan meant to guide the organisation of modules and activities for each module. However, trainers can deliver and use suggested material/plans in relation to experience, cohort demand and context whilst adhering to SHARMED-like project aims.

Besides facilitating activities, a pivotal aspect of trainers' role is to provide feedback to trainees. Feedback shall be helpful and informative, consistent with aiding the discussion, learning and development process. The nature of the feedback shall be determined during training delivery and may take a variety of forms including verbal comments, individual and group feedback, or other forms of effective or efficient feedback to provoke discussion and reflection.

The Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) is based on the same structure and philosophy of the short training package, which is largely extended to include more examples and specifically designed tools for self-assessment. The MOOC is a tool for self-learning based on a modular framework, promoting autonomous learning with videos, links to further readings, documents such as transcripts and slides. The MOOC and its materials are available for an unlimited number of users with different backgrounds, professional profiles and aspirations. The only condition is the interest in expanding knowledge on the application of facilitation within SHARMED-like projects. Trainees have to register beforehand but all they need is a computer, smartphone or tablet with internet connections. The very nature of a MOOC allows trainees learning at home conveniently, flexibly and at their own pace.

The organisation of modules follows the organisation of modules in the short training. However, an introduction to the rationale, aim and use of the MOOC is provided. Each module is followed by activities for self-assessment in order to support the trainees to verify the achievement of the module's learning outcomes (illustrated at the beginning of each module). Self-assessment consists in short quizzes. The advancement to the following module does not depend on the success of self-assessment. However, the certificate documenting the successful achievement of all MOOC learning objective will depend on passing the threshold of a final test, summarising the themes of the overall MOOC.

The **archive** includes all collected photographs, which were authorized through the informed consent form, in Italy, Germany and United Kingdom, the texts written by the children about these photos, several (selected) video-recordings of the activities. The access to the archive requires username and password. To obtain these, it is necessary that interested persons ask for registration showing their belonging to an official institution. This is necessary to ensure the respect of children's rights. The users are requested to use the pictures just for educational purposes their publication out of the archive is not allowed. In the archive, photographs, texts and videos are linked to each other, so that users can easily switch between the different media around the same story. The contents of the archive are provided in three languages (English, German and Italian).

The archive can be used (1) to find inspiration about the types and use of materials and (2) to use directly the (anonymised) materials, whereas there is no time or no way to plan the autonomous collection of visual materials. In both cases, it is useful to be aware of the types of photographs, narratives and methods used in the SHARMED project. The archive, therefore, is an additional source of knowledge and inspiration, but it cannot replace the knowledge acquired through the training and the carful understanding of the methodology. On the one hand, the archive can be used to activate facilitation in the classroom, about different topics and in different areas of learning. On the other hand, the archive can inspire teachers, educators and facilitators in the construction of their own archives.

The archive offers three different ways of searching for the included materials. The first way is browsing with filters. The users can restrict their research through selecting several categories.

(1) Type of visual material (pictures, videos, stories)
(2) Specific schools in specific cities in specific countries
(3) Gender of the child who brought the photograph (female, male, other)
(4) Age of the child who brought the photograph
(5) Class attended by the child
(6) Author of the photograph (child, parents, close person, other, unknown)
(7) Pictures brought and pictures taken by children
(8) Photograph found in family album or online.

The second way is browsing through three types of keywords:

(1) Primary keyword regarding the object (animal, ceremony, changing, character, close persons (not family), emotion, event, family, holidays, friend, me, objects, place, leisure, sport)
(2) Sub-keywords regarding attitudes (admiration, disapproval, agreement, disagreement, appearance, disappearance, birth, death, conflict, peace, departure, return, meeting, separation, happiness, sadness, comfort, discomfort)
(3) Keyword regarding the types of narratives, only for videos (narratives about family, self, personal life, historical events, migration).

Finally, it is possible to browse the archive (1) through a map of the places where the pictures have been taken; (2) on the basis of the date when they have been taken. For these ways of browsing, some limitations may regard the availability of the data.

The **guidelines** aim to give some orientation to those teachers, educators and/or facilitators interested in applying SHARMED-like projects. They are not a way of reproducing what SHARMED has been, but a way of thinking of activities that are inspired to innovation following the experience of SHARMED. For this purpose, the guidelines include several sections, though they are thought as an instrument easy to understand and quick to read. They include:

1. Short presentation of the objectives of a SHARMED-like project.
2. Summary of the key concepts guiding this type of innovation (i.e. a summary of Chapter 1 of this final report).
3. Description of possible target groups and partnerships.
4. Indications about planning and organising the activities, based on the experience of the SHARMED project, including suggestions about the type of activities that might be realised.
5. Description of the training program and materials that can be used, including the MOOC.
6. Description of the methodology of facilitation (i.e. a summary of Chapter 4). This is the longest part of the guidelines.
7. Short presentation of the evaluation package.
8. Description of the training offered for SHARMED-like projects
9. Description of the meanings and the ways of using of the archive.
10. Indications about the dissemination strategies and activities.

The **evaluation package** includes all the tools used during the SHARMED project, i.e. questionnaires, audio-recorded interviews and video-recordings. The package also provides some suggestions about their use, in particular about the different resources requested by their application. In this way, the interested professionals can evaluate which tools they prefer to use. The package includes both the instructions for the use of the tools and the complete forms used during SHARMED. In more details, the tools included in the package are the following.

1. Four types of questionnaire for a background research (regarding both children and parents), a pre-test before the activities, a post-test after the activities and assessment of activities.
2. Two types of audio-recorded interviews for teachers and facilitators, after the activities.
3. Focus group with children on assessment of the activities.
4. Video-recordings and transcriptions of interactions during the activities.

The combination of guidelines and evaluation package offers a complete guide to realise and assess innovative activities in schools and classrooms.

6. Final reflections

The experience of SHARMED leads to the following general conclusions about the possible dissemination and extension of SHARMED-like projects in Europe.

1. Facilitation of children's participation and dialogue, through use of photographs, has important effects, above all in multicultural classrooms.
2. Personal memory is a powerful engine for participation and dialogue and photographs are very effective in enhancing personal memories.
3. This participation shows children's agency and authority in accessing to and producing knowledge.
4. This also improves dialogue in children's families, where many stories may be shared before they are narrated in the classroom, but without limiting children's autonomy in narrating in the classroom context.
5. Facilitation presents different styles in different situations, without losing its general meaning. This means that facilitation can be adapted to different settings and this is a strong point of this methodology.
6. The training in using facilitative methodology is very important, as facilitation is a complex way of enhancing participation and narratives and cannot be left to good will and enthusiasm.
7. Variety of creative activities can be enhanced through facilitation and photographs, and this is another strong point of SHARMED-like projects, which may be understood using the tools available on the website (see section 5 above).
8. It is very important to evaluate the context of the activities (using the evaluation package), for what concerns both composition of the class, ways in which schools organise teaching, teachers' motivation and involvement of parents. This is very important to maximise the effects of a SHARMED-like project.
9. The way in which migrant children are included in the class and can be motivated to talk is an important variable; it if is underscored, the activities can fail an important objective.
10. The activities are not only beneficial for migrant children; rather they can engage the whole class in important dialogic communication.
11. The experience of the SHARMED project shows that the contextual features, the type of migration and the children's attitude to be involved (again on the basis of the context) can be different in different situations; these situations are less linked with "countries" than with particular local contexts, as the Italian case clearly shows.
12. Children's active participation can lead to conflicts and avoiding conflicts is not fruitful for class relations, therefore facilitation should include some ability in mediating conflicts.
13. Finally, this type of project is based on a learning-by-doing process, which may be adapted to specific conditions. The tools that the SHARMED project has provided can be particularly useful for this adaptation, while they do not aim to predefine the choice among different options.

References

Abdallah-Preitcelle, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education, 17*(5), 475-483.

Alanen, L. (2009). Generational order, In J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro & M.S. Honig (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 159-174). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Alred, G., Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (Eds.) (2003). *Intercultural experience and education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Assman, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ayoko, O.B., Härtel, C.E., & Callan, V.J. (2002). Resolving the Puzzle of Productive and Destructive conflict in Culturally Heterogeneous Workgroups: A Communication Accommodation Theory Approach. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *13*(2)*,* 165-195.

Bamberg, M. (2005). Narrative discourse and identities. In J.C. Meister, T. Kindt, & W. Schernus (eds.), *Narratology beyond literary criticism* (pp. 213-237). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bamberg, M. (2011). Narrative practice and identity navigation. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (eds.), *Varieties of Narrative Analysis* (pp. 99-124). London: Sage.

Baraldi, C. (2012). *Participation, facilitation and mediation in educational interactions.* In C. Baraldi & V. Iervese (eds.), *Participation, facilitation, and mediation. Children and young people in their social contexts* (pp. 66-86). London/New York: Routledge.

Baraldi, C. (2014a). Children's participation in communication systems: a theoretical perspective to shape research. In *Soul of society: a focus on the leaves of children and youth. 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. & Corsi, G. (2017). *Niklas Luhmann. Education as a Social System*. Dodrecht: Springer.

Baraldi, C. & Iervese, V. (2017). Narratives of memories and dialogue in multicultural classrooms. Narrative Inquiry, 27(2), 398-417.

Barsalou, L.W. (2008). Grounded cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*, 617–645.

Benjamin, S., & Dervin, F. (2015). Introduction. In S. Benjamin & F. Dervin (eds.), *Migration, diversity and education. Beyond third-culture kids*. Basingstoke: Palgrave- MacMillan.

Berntsen, D. & Rubin, D.C. (2012). Understanding autobiographical memory: An ecological theory. In D. Berntsen & D.C. Rubin (eds.). *Understanding autobiographical memory: Theories and approaches* (pp. 290-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bietti, L.M. (2015). Contextualizing embodied remembering: Autobiographical narratives and multimodal communication. In C. B. Stone & L. M. Bietti (eds.), *Contextualizing Human Memory. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding How Individuals and Groups Remember the Past* (pp. 127-153). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Black, L. (2008). Deliberation, Storytelling, and Dialogic Moments. *Communication Theory, 18*, 93-116.

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.

Bowling, D., & Hoffman, D. (2000). Bringing peace into the room: the personal qualities of the mediator and their impact on the mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, 2000, *16*(1), 5-28.

Bush, B. R., & Folger, J. (1994). *The promise of mediation: Responding to conflict through empowerment and recognition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Byrd Clark, J.S., & Dervin, F. (eds.) (2014). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Clark, A. & Percy-Smith, B. (2006). Beyond consultation: participatory practices in everyday space. *Children, Youth and Environment*, *16*(2), 1-9.

Conway, M.A. (2005). Memory and the self. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *53*, 594–628.

Conway, M.A. & C.W. Pleydell-Pearce (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*, *107*, 261-288.

Dervin, F., & Liddicoat, A.J. (Eds.) (2013). *Linguistics for intercultural education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, S. (2006). *Photography: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farini, F. (2011). Cultures of education in action: Research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international educational setting. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 2176-2186.

Fisher, W. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Gardner, R. 2001. *When Listerners Talk. Response Tokens and Listener Stance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Graham, A., & Fitzgerald, R. (2010). Progressing children's participation: Exploring the potential of a dialogical turn. *Childhood, 17*(3), 342-359.

Gourevitch, P. & Morris, E. (2009). *The Ballad of Abu Ghraib*. New York: Penguin Books.

Guilherme, M. (2012). Critical language and intercultural communication pedagogy. In J. Jackson (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 357-371). London: Routledge.

Guirdham, M. 2005. *Communicating Across Cultures at Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gundara, J.S. (2000). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion.* London: Paul Chapman.

Gundara, J.S., & Portera, A. (2008). Theoretical reflections on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*(6), 463-468.

Harré, R. & van Langenhove, L. (eds.) (1999). *Positioning Theory*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and Restoring Respectful Relationships in Schools*. London/New York: Routledge.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analysing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience. In T. Van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3. Discourse and Dialogue* (pp. 95-117). London: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1), 1-29.

Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 15-38.

Herrlitz, W., & Maier, R. (eds.) (2005). *Dialogues in and around multicultural schools*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hoerl, C. (2007). Episodic Memory, Autobiographical Memory, Narrative: On Three Key Notions in Current Approaches to Memory Development. *Philosophical Psychology*, *20*, 621-640.

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*. Thousand Oaks & London: Sage.

Holliday, A. (2012). Culture, communication, context and power. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 37-51). London: Routledge.

Hutchby, I. (2005). Active Listening: Formulations and the Elicitation of Feelings-Talk in Child Counselling. *Research on language and Social Interaction, 38*(3), 303-329.

Hutchby, I. (2007). *The Discourse of Child Counselling*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jackson, J. (2014). The process of becoming reflexive and intercultural: Navigating study abroad and re-entry experience. In J.S. Byrd Clark & F. Dervin (eds.). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education* (pp. 43-63). Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

James, A. (2009). Agency. In J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro & M.S. Honig (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 34-45). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

James, A. (2009). Agency. In J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro & M.S. Honig (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 34-45). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

James, A. & James, A. (2004). *Constructing childhood. Theory, policy and social practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

James, A. & James, A.L. (2008). *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies*. London: Sage.

Jeong, H.-W. (2008). *Understanding Conflict and Conflict Analysis*. Los Angeles-London: Sage.

Leonard, M. (2016). *The sociology of children, childhood and generation*. London: Sage.

Kramsch, C., & Uryu, M. (2012). Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space. In J. Jackson (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 211-225). London: Routledge.

Legerstee, M. 2005. *Infants' Sense of People. Precursors of a Theory of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Luhmann, Niklas. 2000. *Art as a Social System*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Luhmann, Niklas. 2002. *Das Erziehungssystem der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*(4), 315-345.

Matthews, H. (2003). Children and regeneration: setting and agenda for community participation and integration. *Children & Society, 17,* 264-276.

Mahon, J., & Cushner K. (2012). The multicultural classroom. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 434-448). London: Routledge.

Mayall, B. (2002). *Towards a Sociology for Childhood: Thinking from Children's Lives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mearns, D. and B. Thorne. (1999). *Person-Centred Counselling in Action*. London: Sage.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons*: *Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and development of children's thinking*. London/New York: Routledge.

Moline, S. (2011). *I See What You Mean*. Portland: Stenhouse.

Moosa-Mitha, M. (2005). A difference-centred alternative to theorization of children's citizenship rights. *Citizenship Studies, 9*, 369-388.

Mulchay, L. (2001). The Possibilities and Desirability of Mediator Neutrality – Towards an Ethic of Partiality?. *Social & Legal Studies, 10*(4), 505-527.

Nair-Venugopal, S. (2009). Interculturalities: reframing identities in intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 9*(2), 76-90.

Nelson, K. (1993). The psychological and social origins of autobiographical memory. *Psychological Science*, *4*, 7-14.

Nelson, K. & Fivush, R. (2004). The emergence of autobiographical memory: A social cultural developmental theory. *Psychological Review*, *111*, 486-511.

Norrick, N. (2007). Conversational storytelling. In D. Herman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative* (pp. 127-141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norrick, N. (2012). Remembering for narration and autobiographical memory. *Language and Dialogue, 2*(2), 193-214.

Norrick, N. (2013). Narratives of vicarious experience in conversation. *Language in Society*, *42*, 385-406.

O'Connor, C., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting Participant Frameworks: Orchestrating Thinking Practices in Group Discussion. In D. Hicks (ed.), *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling* (pp. 63-103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oswell, D. (2013). *The agency of children. From family to global human rights*. London: Routledge.

Picard, C.A., & Melchin, K.R (2007). Insight Mediation: A learning-centered Mediation Model. *Negotiation Journal*, 23(1), 35-53.

Piller, I. (2007). Linguistics and intercultural communication. *Language and Linguistic Compass, 1*(3), 208-226.

Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural communication. A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Poitras, J. (2005). A Study of the Emergence of Cooperation in Mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, 21(2), 281-300.

Rogers, C., & R. Farson. (1979). Active Listening. In D. Kolb, I. Rubin & J. MacIntyre (eds.), *Organisational Psychology* (pp. 168-180). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Schell, A. (2009). Schools and cultural difference. In H. Kotthoff & H. Spencer-Oatey (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 303-321). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A Conversation Analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sharpe, T. (2008). How can teacher talk support learning? *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 132-148.

Shier, H. (2001). Pathways to participation: openings, opportunities and obligations. *Children & Society, 15,* 107-117.

Shier, H. (2010). 'Pathways to participation' revisited. Learning from Nicaragua's child coffee workers. In B. Percy-Smith & N. Thomas (eds.), *A Handbook of children's and young People's participation. Perspectives from theory and practice* (pp. 215-229). London/New York: Routledge.

Sinclair, R. (2004). Participation in practice: Making it meaningful, effective and sustainable. *Children & Society, 18*, 106-118.

Sinclair, J, & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skowronski, J.J. & Walker, R.W. (2004). How describing autobiographical events can affect autobiographical memory. *Social Cognition*, 22, 555-590.

Somers, M. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23(5), 605-649.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2009). *Intercultural interaction. A multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Stewart, K.A., & Maxwell M.M. (2010). *Storied Conflict Talk. Narrative Construction of Mediation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stone, C.B., & Bietti, L. (2016). *Contextualizing Human Memory. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding how Individuals and Groups Remember the Past*. New York: Routledge.

Valentine, K. (2011). Accounting for agency. *Children & Society, 25*, 347-358.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communication across cultures*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Tupas, R. (2014). Intercultural education in everyday practice. *Intercultural Education, 25*(4), 243-254.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. New York/London: Routledge

Wierzbicka, A. (2006). The Concept of 'Dialogue' in Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Discourse Studies, 8*(5), p. 675-703.

Winslade, J., & Monk, G. (2008). *Practicing narrative mediation: Loosening the grip of conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winslade, J. & Williams, M. (2012). *Safe and Peaceful Schools*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press

Wyness, M. (2013). Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis. *Childhood*, 20(4), 429-442.