UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPT OF EDUCATION, COMMUNICATION AND LEARNING

Narrating in early childhood education as a
responsive, re-creative, and remembering practice

AGNETA PIHL

Abstract

Title: Narrating in early childhood education as a responsive, re-creative, and remembering practice

Author: Agneta Pihl

Faculty Opponent: Professor Elin Eriksen Ødegaard, Høgskulen på Vestlandet, Bergen, Norge

Examinator: Associate Professor Angelika Kullberg, University of Gothenburg

Language: English

Place/date: University of Gothenburg, Sweden, June 14, 2018

The interest of the present thesis concerns how children orally retell stories they have been told. This research is carried out in dialogue with two classic research traditions in developmental psychology: one regarding whether children understand, and take into account when communicating, that others have different experience and understanding than themselves, and one regarding remembering conceptualized as a creative and sense-making practice. The thesis consists of two empirical studies conducted in a preschool setting with children 4 to 5 years old. The analytical focus of study I is on whether, and if so how, the children consider the understanding of the listener(s) when retelling stories. The analytical focus of study II is on how the children remember, and perhaps reshape, stories in retelling activities. The theoretical framework informing these studies is a sociocultural perspective, conceptualizing learning and remembering as contingent on cultural tools and practices. The empirical data consist of 19 video recordings of storytelling activities. Analytical work was guided by the principles of Interaction Analysis. Analyzing the meta-markers children use in their storytelling reveals that the children do take into account the understanding of their listener(s) when retelling stories, if not consistently so (Study I). Analyzing how one focus child retells the same story in different constellations show how she remembers details from the story told by the teacher and the very manner of how the story was told, as well as transforms the story to what more readily makes sense (Study II). The thesis has significance for our understanding of children, their storytelling and remembering. More specifically, the findings contribute to a more general reconceptualization of children's capacities to understand. An important implication for early childhood education is that when supporting children's storytelling and remembering, teachers also support children's sense making and vice versa.

Acknowledgement

Every story has an end and so does this. Writing this story has been like riding a roller coaster with its ups and downs. Indeed, it would never have been completed without the support I have received from all the people around me. You have supported me and have contributed in various ways. My wish is to make an attempt at acknowledging some of all of you.

I wish to begin by acknowledging 12 very special persons. Without them this thesis would never have been possible. To all the participating children for sharing your stories so generously, thank you! My deepest and sincerest gratitude to all the parents having faith in me and my research. I would also like to thank the participating teachers for having the greatest patience with me and my video camera. My employer has been financing my research studies and I would like to address special thanks to preschool director Marie-Louise Eklund who gave me this opportunity and who strongly have supported me. My heartfelt thanks to all my colleagues at the preschool, you are the best!

My genuine appreciation to my supervisors Niklas Pramling and Louise Peterson who both have contributed with their great professional knowledge and wisdom during the whole research process. Niklas, you are an outstanding supervisor. With your analytical brilliance and helpful critiques you have lead me the way. Louise, without you I would never have made this. You have guided and encouraged me and generously shared your sharp expertise.

would I have done without my fellow doctoral students? Anita Gustavsson, Anna Backman, Ann-Charlotte Lindgren, Ester Catucci, Kerstin Botö, Tina Jonsson, Kristina Melker, Kristina Thorshag, Lena Ryberg, Lina Hellberg, Maria Alkhede, Paulina Narkaj Adolfsson, Solveig Sotevik and Susanne Johansson you have all become dear friends.

Thank you for all organizational support provided by the department of Education Communication and Learning at the University of Gothenburg. I consider it a great luck to be part of the didactic seminar group led by Niklas Pramling, thanks to all the members for enthusiastic readings of text production in different phases.

One person who have always believed in me and who have encouraged me is my dear friend Mary Thelander. You have inspired me and you have supported me right from the start.

Encouragements from family and friends have been crucial for me. To my mother and father, thanks for supporting all my decisions in life. To Christina, thanks for being the best sister one could have.

Finally I want to thank my family, Lennart, Sofia and Sebastian, for their great patience during the time of writing this thesis. You are the most important people in my life and I love you so much.

Tjörn, April 19, 2018

Contents

Introduction

The interest of the present thesis concerns children's oral storytelling. More specifically preschool children's oral retelling of stories is studied. The study takes place in dialogue with two classic strands of research in developmental psychology. First, against the background of a long-standing debate in developmental psychology and related fields of study, whether children understand that others understand differently, particular analytical attention is directed to whether – and if so how – children consider the perceived understanding of the listener(s) when retelling stories. Second, with an interest in remembering as a sense-making practice, how children in their retelling of stories remember and perhaps transform stories are analyzed.

Narrating is a natural part of people's everyday life and it is part of shaping the identities of people, their history and social practices (Vygotsky, 1987). Narrating is a global practice for entertaining, maintaining cultural traditions over time and for passing on information from one generation to the next. As already mentioned, the interest of the present study is how children orally retell stories. Oral storytelling has a long tradition in sharing human experience and it exists in more cultures than written languages. Historically, the shift – in many but far from all cultures – from oral to written culture has reshaped our thinking, Ong (2002) argues. He clarifies how orality and literacy derive from different cultures and historic times. Orality and literacy have their own laws. Oral language is widespread; from thousands of spoken languages through history only around 100 have a written language. On a terminological note, in this thesis *storytelling* and *narrating* are used synonymously (cf. Skantz Åberg, 2018), the former more common in everyday speech and the latter more frequent in scientific discourse, when referring to the practice of telling stories. In an analogous way, *story* and *narrative* are used interchangeably to refer to what is told.

Narrative as a research interest in psychology was to large extent established by the work of Jerome Bruner (2006). He makes a distinction between a 'narrative' and a 'paradigmatic' mode of discourse. What he refers to as a paradigmatic mode is characterized by a logical and scientific way of reasoning. A narrative mode, in contrast, is described by Bruner (2006) as concerning intentional actions and experience. According to Bruner (2006), both of these mind-sets, or discourses, are important to enable different possibilities for organizing knowledge, making sense and remembering. Even if Bruner's work on narration as significant for human thinking has played a main role for psychological research he was not the first scholar to pay attention to children's narration. A pioneer in this field is Jean Piaget. In his experiments he, among other things, asked children to explain something to another child. The conclusions he drew from these experiments was that it is not until the age of 7 or 8 years that there is what can be referred to as genuine understanding between children when they talk with each other (Piaget, 1923/1926). Before this age, so-called egocentric thinking prevents shared understanding from becoming possible. This theory was later criticized by, among others, Donaldson (1978), who argued that by paying close attention to children's comments and questions another picture of children's abilities emerges.

While some important basic insights into the nature of children's narrating and remembering where identified by Piaget; for obvious reasons, the nature of these processes as they unfold during the course of activity was not investigated in manners expected of modern communication research (for a critical discussion of how data was captured and analyzed by Piaget and colleagues, see Pramling & Säljö, 2015). With the present study I intend to give some contributions of the latter kind, that is, to analyze in detail evolving processes of children's retelling and remembering of stories.

In relation to the interest in how children orally retell stories, analytical focus is in the present study also directed on the process of remembering when retelling a story. Narration and

remembering are interrelated and support one another (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011). Narrative as a resource for remembering lies in the fact that it is a tool that encompasses much information in a meaningful form; information that would be difficult to remember without this meaningful relationship (Miller, 1956; Säljö, 2011). In fact, for both individuals and collectives, narrative serves to make sense of the world and to remember.

A pioneering study on remembering was conducted by the psychologist Frederic Bartlett (1886-1969). He was interested in people's ability to remember stories. His ambition was to create experimental situations as natural as possible but with the ability to control for different factors. The children participating in the present study were orally told a story which they were later asked to retell. In contrast, in Bartlett's (1932/1995) study the participants were adults and they read a story and were later asked to retell it. With his experimental study, Bartlett demonstrated how people actively reconstructed their experiences when they retold the stories they had read. Bartlett drew the conclusion that how people remember and reconstruct stories is dependent on how they perceive the task. One important contribution of his study to psychology is the concept of schemata. People develop schemata in order to organize memories, and what is remembered is dependent on interests and earlier experiences. What people do not remember they fill in. In the case of retelling, people do so in order to create a meaningful story. Bartlett's study revealed the importance of social factors in relation to what individuals remember (I will return to Bartlett's study later on).

Research in psychology builds on separate traditions of learning and remembering. Both learning and remembering are, arguably, active processes (Säljö, 2011) and studying learning and remembering in educational contexts therefore requires an analytical focus on actual practice and how individuals or groups participate and what they take with them from these, rather than investigating learning as transmission of information and memory as a storing facility for physical objects (memories, information).

Many children are introduced to oral storytelling at an early age and it is something we learn and that constantly develops. Oral storytelling has a long tradition in early childhood education; it is a foundational cultural practice of sense making and communication. Despite this, the socio-historic heritage we have to transfer experience through oral storytelling has to some extent lost its position in contemporary educational settings, some argue (e.g., Kirkby, Faulkner & Perrin, 2014). Similarly, there has been remarkably little research on children's oral storytelling. Typically, developmental psychologists have studied children stories for information about their level of cognitive development (Engel, 1995). Traditionally, developmental psychologists have seen the structure of children's storytelling as, metaphorically speaking, a 'window' into the structure of their thinking. In contrast, this study will focus on the storytelling process and how the studied retelling activities are perceived by the children. The focus is on if, and if so how, children consider the understanding of the listener(s) when retelling a story. Moreover, the interest is in what the children pick up from the story told, what features they perhaps introduce and how the story might be transformed when retold. Finally, it is of interest to try to clarify the child's perspective on the retelling activity.

Aim and research questions

The overarching aim of present thesis is to generate insight into preschool children's oral storytelling with a focus on the processes of retelling and remembering. Retelling activities in a preschool where a child him- or herself, or together with peers, retell(s) a story previously told by the preschool teacher are studied in situ. With an interest in these processes, the following research questions are raised:

- Do children consider the perceived understanding of their listener(s) when retelling stories and – if so – how is this done?

- How do children remember, and perhaps reshape, stories in retelling activities?

The present licentiate thesis consists of two empirical studies. The first question is focused in study I, with the aim to explore if, and if so how, the children when retelling a story show responsivity to the listener's/listeners' potentially varied knowing. That is, whether the children in their storytelling indicate that they adapt to the fact that the listener has not previously heard the story and therefore does not know what they themselves know.

Study II is concerned with what the children remember and perhaps reshape in their retelling, that is, the second of the two research questions. Following one focus child enables an analytical focus on what she picks up from the story she has been told, and how she may introduce and transform the story when retelling it.

Outline of the thesis

Having introduced the thematic of the present study, in the following chapter I will give an overview of previous research on narrating, perspective-taking and remembering. Then follows a chapter on the theoretical perspective providing foundation for the present study. Then the design and method of the study are presented. The two empirical studies are summarized in chapter 5, followed by the discussion in chapter 6. The introductory part of the thesis ends with three appendices: Excerpts for study I and II in Swedish original as well as in English translation (Appendices A and B), and the consent form (Appendix C). The thesis also includes two empirical studies.

Children's storytelling and remembering as social and sense-making practice

Research on children's narratives stems from a number of disciplines, such as psychology, sociolinguistics, communication studies, educational psychology and pedagogy. In the present research on how children narrate, whether – and if so, how – they consider the differing understanding of the listener(s), and processes of remembering when retelling stories in an educational setting (preschool) are investigated. Consequently, the present study is located in the field of educational psychology/pedagogy. This overview of previous research therefore focuses on empirical studies of children's storytelling and remembering.[1] The chapter is structured in the following way: The settings were oral storytelling is experienced by children is first introduced, followed by an overview of research with the interest in storytelling and the consideration of the listener in historical as well as more recent studies. Thereafter, studies on memory and metaphors on memory will be presented. Finally, research on narrative remembering as a sense-making practice is presented.

Introduction to oral storytelling

Oral storytelling is introduced to children in early years at home and/or in educational settings (Glenn-Applegate, Breit-Smith, Justice & Piasta, 2010; Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011; Ukrainetz, Justice, Kaderavek, Eisenberg, Gillam & Harm, 2005). Oral storytelling has been

---

[1] Searching databases for research, I have focused on research on oral storytelling in early childhood education. For this search the ERIC, Education database and ProQuest search engines were used. A search on Education Collection library with the key words child* and retell* and oral* resulted in 212 hits. Generally, these studies focus on children's linguistic performance. A search on child* and retell* and oral* and perspective taking gave only one hit (Hibbin, 2016b). A search on Education Research Complete with the key words: child* and retell* and remember* gave 20 hits. A large part of those were interested in studying narratives regarding children with language impairment, autism or hearing loss. In addition to these searches, I have used research I encountered in courses and seminars I have attended. Relevant dissertations and articles through reference lists of previously found articles have also contributed to my overview of previous research. The overview of previous research is far from comprehensive for the field of narrating in early childhood education (and other settings). However, the selection I made gives a multifaceted picture of previous research relevant to the present study.

recognized by researchers to have significant benefits for children's education and various important features of their development such as literacy, identity and empathy (Hibbin, 2016a; Wells, 2009). Even so, learning to narrate seems to have disappeared from the agenda in contemporary educational settings. In a study in Norwegian preschools, Ødegaard (2007) found that the strategy taken by the teachers was on listening to the children rather than supporting them to appropriate the narrative genre. In the same manner, Hibbin (2016b) suggests that in the UK oral storytelling is under-utilized within primary education; rather, orality (speaking and listening) is taken for granted.

Even if oral storytelling is not supported per se, it is described as a vehicle to literacy (Theobald, 2016). In a study focused on interactional aspects of children's storytelling in everyday conversation, Theobald found that children managed interactions with conversational storytelling. The participating children, in a preparatory class (aged 4.5-5.5 years) were video documented in a playground. The analyses revealed how the children worked at gaining the floor for storytelling and how they collaboratively made stories comprehensible.

However, in a longitudinal study of children's progress in school, Wells (2009) made visible crucial differences among children. Those differences were explained by the characteristics of their home environments, that is, growing up in a literate family context gives children an advantage vis-à-vis other children. Even if this was not a surprise for the researchers, they had not expected the differences to appear in such early years (preschool) and that they lasted throughout the school grades. However, of all activities, sharing stories was the most important for the children's progress and the suggestion made by Wells is that stories contribute to so much more than to children's acquisition of literacy.

In a study by Pramling and Ødegaard, (2011), young children's narratives in two different storytelling activities in a preschool setting were analyzed. In the first activity, the

teachers support the children to appropriate a communicative form in a group activity, using storytelling cards. The second example is a child-initiated biographical story and the analytical focus is on how the teachers support the child to make the experiences understandable (as a story) to others who were not present in the actual event. The analysis clarifies how the teachers support the children in conveying their experiences and story, respectively, in a form that makes sense also to others listening. This support typically took the form of certain kinds of questions, highlighting narrative features such as agent, setting, and events. That is, through asking certain kinds of questions that are important to the development of the logic of a story, "what needs to be made explicit in order to become intelligible to a listener" (p. 21), the teachers scaffolded the children's appropriation of narrative genre. Furthermore, the teacher's questions guide the children's attention to what could be worth telling (see also Ødegaard, 2006). The nature of questions in educational settings is of great importance for the learning of the child, as they indicate what is made relevant by participants (e.g., Siraj-Blatchford & Manni 2008; Thulin, 2010).

Focusing on the interpsychological level of development, Hakkarainen and Bredikyte (2014) analyzed how children's competences are employed and jointly elaborated when using stories in collaborative play. Through collective storytelling, the researchers attempted to provide a resource for creative communication, arguing that narrative is a key aspect of play. According to Hakkarainen and Bredikyte (2014), previous research mainly has focused on the internalization of higher mental processes (Vygotsky, 1978). In contrast, in their study, focus was on the interpsychological level, that is, how abilities and skills are elaborated and used in joint play. The analysis revealed that the narrative format provided a frame which moved the boundaries of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) for the participants.

The present thesis concerns oral storytelling in an early childhood setting. Consequently empirical studies in similar contexts are of interest. Nevertheless, the first introduction to oral storytelling is likely to be within the family.

In family settings, oral storytelling will probably be less structured than in educational settings, as pointed out by Pramling and Ødegaard (2011). A pioneering study of narratives in a family setting is *Narratives from the Crib* (Nelson, 1989). The interest in that study was in the child's language development, her imagination and understanding. The conversation between a young child (Emily) and her parents at bedtime as well as the child's soliloquies were analyzed. The documentation went on from the child was 21 months to she was 3 years old. Nelson invited a group of researchers to analyze the transcripts. The interpretation of the data showed, among other things, that Emily's speech occurred in a story form. A conclusions Nelson draw from the analysis was that children at a young age repeat what parents say but as their language develops, it comes to function as representations of their mind; in other words, linguistically mediating their world of experience. However, an alternative interpretation by Bruner and Lucariello (1989) is that Emily uses her monologues to learn about the narrative form, as a sense-making activity. In sum, one feature of previous research is that it describes the contexts were children are introduced to oral storytelling. Moreover, narrative is described as a vehicle to children's language development as well as general development as, for example, construction of self (Bruner &Lucariello, 1989).

Storytelling and perspective-taking

Previous research has made evident that teachers have an important role in supporting children's appropriation of the narrative genre (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011). Teachers can, for example, ask questions about things to be clarified so that others (who did not attend the event referred to or who has not heard the story before) can understand the story. Who were there, where did it take place, when did it happen? The question of what needs to be made

explicit in stories to make sense to others is related to perspective-taking. What is here referred to as perspective-taking in children's retelling of stories, that is, whether – and if so, how – children consider the varied understanding of the listener(s) when retelling stories, is of interest in the present study, as I have already mentioned. Perspective-taking can be explained as an orientation to others that allows the experience that others have to differ from one's own (Mauritzson & Säljö, 2001).

As mentioned in the introduction, Piaget made the conclusion that children younger than 7 years are unable to take the perspective of the listener when they explain or retell something. Moreover, he found that the younger children invent or fill the gap (what they have not understood or remembered) when retelling stories. According to Piaget, the child him- or herself believes what is thus made up. Whether this is a conscious and deliberate invention or not, it is connected to an unconscious distortion of facts, he argues. Piaget claimed that the experiments he conducted proved that the effort to understand other people and communicate thoughts objectively does not appear until about the age of 7 years. Regarding younger children, the lack of understanding is not because they are romancing (i.e., deliberately inventing), according to Piaget's explanation, but because they are still egocentric and feel no desire to communicate or to understand others.

This explanation was subsequently criticized by, among others, Hundeide (1977). Empirical studies, exemplified by Hundeide, made evident how the perspective the researcher adopt in the interpretation of empirical observation raises different views of the child's competences. A difficulty for the child to answer a question may be caused by insufficient intersubjectivity between the child and the researcher. The conclusion Hundeide draw was that the child's ability to solve a problem is depending on the child's earlier practical experiences of the subject. Additional studies conducted by Donaldson (1978) showed that redesigning Piaget's set-up revealed that young children are able to understand from other's

point of view, that is, to decentre even at younger ages. By letting children narrate, their capacities emerged in a way that were not evident in the experiments. The conclusion drawn by Donaldson (1978) was that reasoning within the narrative form makes sense to children in a way that the experimental set ups do not.

Focusing on meta-markers in re-analyses of Piaget's data made a different image of children's ability to emerge (Pramling 2006; Pramling and Säljö 2015). Another example how children's ability emerges depending on the analytical application is a quantitative study on children's oral narratives focused on the use of artfulness (Glenn-Applegate et al., 2010). Artfulness and creativity had not previously been studied in preschool children's oral storytelling. Results of tests on children's linguistic ability regarding grammar, vocabulary already existed from a large quantitative study. Among other things the data consisted of video documentation on 48 children in the ages between 3 and 4 years telling a story to a book with only pictures, no text. The stories were encoded and the relations between the children's narrative artfulness and their performance on standardized measures of language ability were studied. The analysis showed that artfulness in the children's oral narratives positively correlated with children's language. The implication, according to the authors, is that artfulness is a valid indicator of the quality of children's storytelling. The arguments in Glenn-Applegate et al.'s study, as in many contemporary studies, is that narrating is beneficial to children's development and in particular their literacy learning (see also, Cortazzi & Jin, 2008; Hakkarainen & Vuorinen, 2018; Heilmann, Miller & Nockerts, 2010; Kao, 2017; Macleod, Macmillan & Norwich, 2008; Silva, 2017; cf. Wells, 2009). From their findings, Glenn-Applegate et al. (2010) suggest that artfulness is a valid indicator of quality in children's narratives. In a similar manner, the perspective adopted and the focus of meta-markers in the analysis of the present study suggests that a different view of the child's abilities come to the fore.

From memory as a storage to remembering as an activity

There has been much research on memory and in an attempt to explain this mental process, researchers have used different metaphors (Säljö, 2011). When we are confronted with phenomena that we do not understand we tend to relate them to physical objects, as shown in an overview of memory metaphors by Roediger (1980). He also found that spatial metaphors are often used and metaphors like storing and coding (cf. a computer) have often been used in studies of memory. In thinking of mind, we usually seek support from a metaphor of an actual physical space, a place that holds things. Expressions like: holding ideas in mind, ideas are difficult to grasp and so on are used. Comparing mind with a physical space implies that (a) memories are considered to be isolated objects stored in particular locations in mind (a space) and (b) in order to recall information it is necessary to search for and find memories. Philosophers and cognitive psychologists have adopted this view and it has become central to our theories of learning and memory.

With the ambition to study 'pure memory', Ebbinghaus (1885/1998), tried to eliminate the effects of people's previous experience and knowledge. This research was to be greatly influential in psychology. However, later research critically illuminated how people's abilities to remember are highly sensitive to context (see e.g., Hirst & Manier, 1995, for a review). Therefore, in the present thesis, children's narrative remembering is understood as contingent on how they perceive the activity they engage in.

A study with the interest in the dynamics of learning was conducted by Marton (1970). He staged an experimental study on free recall with the aim to explain how the process of internal representation develops. Internal representation is explained by Marton as mental structures of information created in an effort for people to overcome limitations in managing the complexity of the environment. The study involved 30 adults. A list of famous

names was presented orally and the participants were asked to recall the names on the list. The process of the experiment was explained by Marton as first *storing* and later *retrieval*. This was followed by an interview in which the participants were asked to specify the structure they had built up during the experiment. The results revealed that grouping phenomena was a dominant feature. A metaphor used by Miller (1956) for this process is 'chunking'. The premise for this so called organizational theory of memory is that people make sense of information by relating it, for them, in a meaningful way. As suggested by Marton, and Miller, people are limited in their ability to store information but at the same time unlimitedly able to remember what makes sense to them. The pedagogical implication Marton proposes is that a good teacher can help the student to structure. However, one does not always have a teacher around, therefore the most important task in education should be to instruct how to learn and how to remember.

A study that relates to Marton's idea on teaching how to remember (and thus how to learn) was conducted by Pramling (1990). The purpose was to study the outcome of a pedagogical approach, which intended children to reflect on their own learning. A story was read to the children and they were later interviewed about it. The results suggested that the children in the experimental groups (supposed to be more accustomed to reflect on their own learning) were more capable at understanding the plot of the story (for a further discussion, see empirical Study II of the present thesis).

Theories that express the spatial storage and search assumptions have been taken for granted and few investigators have questioned the outlines of the theories, Roediger argued in 1980 (see also, Säljö, 2011, for a more recent view confirming this claim). One difficulty that arises from this perspective is the problem of knowing that one does not know, for example some facts (Kolers & Palef, 1976). This is an interesting point in relation to my study and the empirical example when Emina expresses that she has forgotten (Excerpt 2a, line 5) and

explicitly corrects herself (in Excerpt 3 lines 108 and 110). Moreover Emina meta-comments that "she doesn't know that Emina" (Excerpt 3, line 112). An analogue for not remembering is that of a lock and key (Kolers & Palef, 1976). That is, if the key does not fit in the lock one cannot come any further in the search process. However, a limitation of the spatial metaphors is that they do not identify the processes of remembering. The increasing numbers of models have produced a great amount of hypothetical mental processes that only loosely are tied to behavior (Säljö, 2011).Therefore, the concept of remembering (rather than memory) in my study is of great relevance. This implies that remembering is an active process depending on the sense the person makes of the activity he or she is involved in. This will be further explored in the next paragraph.

Oral storytelling and remembering as sense-making practice

Oral storytelling is in the present research understood as a fundamental cultural practice and narrative as a tool for sense making, learning and remembering. This is in line with Bruner's (1990) account that people as well as collectives organize their experiences in narratives with the purpose to make sense and remember. Storytelling as a sense-making practice has been recognized by many scholars of which Wells (2009) is a prime example:

> We are the meaning makers – every one of us: children, parents and teachers. To try to make sense, to construct stories and explanations, and to share them with others in speech and in writing is an essential part of being human. For those of us who are more knowledgeable and more mature – parents and teachers – the responsibility is clear: to interact with those in our care through 'action, talk and text' in such a way as to foster and enrich their meaning making and develop their understanding. (Wells, 2009, p. 313)

Remembering was also described by Bruner (1990) as a unique human ability. His criticism of the cognitivist tradition of study on memory, as described earlier, is that making sense is something fundamentally different from processing information. The difference between memory as a faculty and remembering as a sense-making practice has important implications for how we constitute the object of study in research. This permits that narrative remembering in this research will be studied with the interest in how the children perceive the activity and what make sense to them.

An empirical study relating to remembering as a sense-making practice was conducted by Istomina (1975). The purpose of that study was to investigate how 3- to 7-year-old children remembered under two different conditions. One condition was to simply recall a number of items; the other was to remember the items in the frame of a play activity. A part of the play was that the children went shopping five ingredients to use in cooking. Children aged 3-4 years remembered 0.6 items within the first condition, whilst in the frame of a play they remembered 1. Children in the age 6-7 remembered 2.3 items in the first condition and 3.8 in play. The conclusion drawn from this study was that it is easier for children to remember within an activity that is meaningful to them. Furthermore, an implication is that the ability to remember is not constant. Rather, remembering is related to the situation and how it makes sense to the individual. In addition, children's earlier experiences (in this case shopping and cooking) function as structuring resources (Säljö, 2000) for their remembering.

Another critical discussion of the cognitivist tradition on memory studies by Säljö (2011) is that if a person in a memory study was allowed to use external resources, for instance paper and pen, her result would probably improve dramatically. This reasoning highlights the question of what is considered remembering, as also discussed by Wertsch (2002). He argues that the so-called accuracy criterion is unreasonable as criterion of remembering. Similarly, Säljö (2011) argues that mostly it is impossible – and even irrelevant

– to remember exactly. We talk to others, we discuss and we reconstruct our memories, we learn and we remember in interaction with others. Hence, in different social situations remembering plays out differently; for example, what is considered relevant to tell and remember will differ. To give an example, to tell a friend about one's holiday travels differs fundamentally in terms of what and how we remember to how we would do so if asked by the police to report on something that happened on these travels (cf. Jönsson, Linell, & Säljö, 1991).

This research builds on the tradition of remembering as a sense-making practice, a sociocultural tradition of theorizing remembering founded on Bartlett's classical study published in 1932. As I have already introduced, in his study he let individuals retell stories. Among other things, the analysis showed that what was to be remembered that were difficult to grasp were subsequently reformulated to what made sense in terms of a culturally predominant narrative form. This implied that the narrative form, reshaped not only how the individuals remembered but also what they remembered. The basis for this process, according to Bartlett, is striving for meaning, that is, we remember what we can make sense of. Bartlett's study illuminates the close relationship between narrative and remembering. This was also shown in Istomina's (1975) study, in the context of pretend play. However, Bartlett's study illuminates the close relationship between narrative and remembering. In line with Bartlett's perspective, the approach in the present study is that remembering is not simply a reproductive practice but a creative, sense-making one (cf. Wertsch, 2002).

The concept of remembering as a reconstructive practice was indeed an important contribution of Bartlett's study. However, it has been argued that Bartlett's study yielded limited evidence on the actual remembering process (Edwards & Middleton, 1987; Wagoner & Gillespie, 2014). Therefore, in a recent study, Wagoner and Gillespie (2014) used an extension of Bartlett's method with an interest in the sociocultural process on remembering.

The participants (20 individuals in the age span 18 to 23 years) read the story of the ghosts, the same story used in Bartlett's study. The participants got a distractor task and after that they were asked to write the story down as accurately as possible. The researchers were interested in the transformations that underlies reconstructive remembering. Bartlett used the concept "schemata", relating to how the participants organized their past reactions or experiences. Transformation and rationalization was due to the participant's effort after meaning. Schemata are brought from the past to novel contextualizations and the tendency to make the unfamiliar familiar. Along these lines of argumentation, Engel (1995) emphasized the need for research on the actual process of children's storytelling. In contrast to Bartlett's and Wagoner and Gillespie's studies, which were designed experiments, the present research will study narratives in situ, that is as it occurs in children's daily activities in early childhood education.

The relation between children's narrative ability and memory was also studied by Klemfuss and Kulkofsky (2008), with an analytical interest in the suggestibility in the preschool children's stories. The children were interviewed about a previously staged event. In contrast to the present study, Klemfuss and Kulkofsky focused on the narrative product, which was coded (e.g., volume, complexity and amount of descriptive details). The analysis showed that narrative ability appeared to supersede age as a predictor of resistance to suggestive questions. In relation to the present research it is interesting that the results stress narrative ability as important to yet another aspect on children's development.
As shown in an earlier paragraph, research with an interest in children's oral storytelling and remembering has mainly built on the conception of memory as a system or faculty. This results in a focus on the narrative product and the quantity of what children remember. In contrast, the aim of this research is to study the processes of storytelling and remembering (cf. Bartlett, 1932/1995; Marton, 1970). Accordingly, the concept of remembering will be used in

this study with the aim to study the process, that is, narrating is studied as an activity and

narrative is in this research understood as a fundamental tool for sense making, remembering

and learning.

A sociocultural perspective on communication and learning

In this chapter, a sociocultural perspective on communication and learning is presented. This perspective is grounded in the work of Russian developmental psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896-1934). Vygotsky himself did seldom, if ever, use the term "sociocultural" (Wertsch, del Río & Alvarez, 1995). Instead, terms such as "sociohistorical" and "cultural-historical" were used when referring to his and his collaborators' work. However, contemporary neo-Vygotskians, like James Wertsch (2007), Roger Säljö (2000) and Jerome Bruner (1996) have contributed with interpretations and elaborations on this perspective, which is today often referred to as a sociocultural perspective. A basic premise of this perspective is that human development is related to social interaction. From this perspective, communication is a responsive activity where every utterance or expression is formed through our relations to other people, others' utterances and the time and place of our cultural world.

At the heart of a sociocultural perspective is the theoretical ambition to explain and clarify the relationship between human development and social interaction, or in Wertsch et al.'s words (1995), "the relationships between human mental functioning, on the one hand, and the cultural, institutional and historical situations in which this functioning occurs on the other" (p. 3). The chapter introduces the narrative genre and its implication for sense making. Thereafter follows discussions of the concepts of appropriation of cultural tools, narrating as a mediating resource, imagination and creativity, and, finally, perspective-taking and coordination of perspectives.

Narration

A multi-functional cultural tool for sense making and communication is the narrative genre (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011; Skantz Åberg, 2018). Through history, narrative has served as a cultural tool for communication, entertainment and making sense of the world (Säljö, 2005).

Narrative genre has great importance for the child's understanding of the world (Bruner, 1991, 2006). Narrative is a way of organizing experiences and knowledge; it does not only represent but also constitute reality. Narrative allows us to tell about experiences and our thoughts about the future; it is functional for making sense not only of the world but also of ourselves. The basic constituents of narrative genre are described by Bruner (1991) as time and actions. Furthermore, to understand the nature and growth of mind it is not possible to just analyze individuals in a cultural vacuum, he argues. Rather, we must study the cultural tool-kits available, such as symbolic systems of narrative discourse.

As emphasized by Bruner (1990), people organize their experiences in narratives in order to make sense and remember. Narrative as a resource gives a different insight into remembering in that a story can enclose much information that would be difficult to remember without this meaningful relationship (Säljö, 2011). Narratives are human inventions that shape how we perceive our world and ourselves, and reshape psychological functioning (for instance, how we remember). Their structures allow us to recall experiences and make sense.

Mediation

The idea of mediation was developed by Vygotsky (1978) as a critique of behavioristic theory on learning that explained human behavior as caused by external stimuli. According to Vygotsky, this idea of behaviors being shaped or reinforced, was a simplified picture that could not explain higher mental functions regarding reasoning, remembering and problem solving. Instead, he argued that these functions are cultural and social matters. Development, according to Vygotsky's view, starts on the social or interpsychological level and is then transformed at the individual/intrapsychological level. There are always mediating resources, like language or

physical artefacts such as pen and paper, between the world and people and we can do a lot more with these tools than we can without them (Säljö, 2005).

The concept of mediation in the present study refers to when in contact with the world, we interpret and act using cultural tools (Wertsch, 2007). The use of the cultural tool narrative, as a communicative form, is seen as mediating higher mental functioning, including voluntary remembering (in contrast to memory as an elementary function). Mediation in the use of language is never objective; when mediating, we put something in the foreground and something else in the background. When the child appropriates a language and comes to perceive the world through it, this is described as language mediating the world for the child (Wertsch, 2007).

Appropriation and cultural tools

From the sociocultural perspective adopted in this study, narrative is seen as a cultural tool which mediates higher mental functions, such as thinking, problem solving and remembering. The idea of cultural tools implies that a person is not in direct contact with the world (Vygotsky, 1997). The metaphor of tool was initially used referring to physical tools such as pen and paper but later expanded to include also language and other symbolic tools crucial to human learning and sense making (Säljö, 2005). The concept of mediation refers to the shaping role of tools to how people solve problems and to carry out other activities (Vygotsky, 1997; Wertsch, 1998). New tools do not necessarily replace old tools; rather the repertoire of tools increases. For example, even when a culture develops or imports the tool of writing, the importance of oral language remains central to people's sense making (Ong, 2002), including how they organize their experiences in narratives.

The process of learning is not exclusive to educational settings; rather, it is an aspect of all human actions (Säljö, 2005). Säljö (2009) claims that within social, cultural and historical

practices, the child is introduced to what in a sociocultural perspective is referred to as cultural tools and these tools are physical and/or psychological. What cultural tools a child is introduced to and supported in taking over, is crucial to his or her learning. Language is within this perspective seen as the most important cultural tool. A learner gradually taking over a cultural tool is referred to as appropriation (Säljö, 2005). This concept is, according to Pramling and Ødegaard (2011), a metaphor for learning and a "theoretical attempt to indicate the active and dynamic nature of learning. Appropriating a cultural tool requires some effort on the part of the learner" (p. 18). A cultural tool such as speech can never be fully mastered; we may have to struggle with this tool again in the light of new communicative demands (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011; Säljö, 2005).

In line with this the stance is the premise that knowledge cannot in any straightforward way be transmitted from one person to another. Understood in terms of appropriation, it is rarely, if ever, a clear-cut case of the learner "having" or "lacking" knowledge (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011, p. 19). Appropriation in this perspective is about being able to use cultural tools in increasingly complex ways and in various practices.

Making sense is situated, that is, dependent on – as well as contributes to constituting – the social context and we act subject to how we interpret what is necessary, or expected, in the situation (Säljö, 2000). Through participating in different practices we learn how to identify and act in different discourses. And as Bruner (1991) puts it: "Principles and procedures learned in one domain do not automatically transfer to other domains" (p. 2). These domains constitute what Bruner refers to a "culture's treasury of tool kits" (p. 2). One such important cultural tools is narrative.

From a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1987), learning is a cultural process that takes place in different practices and through interaction and communication with the environment. He argues that the social, cultural and historical practices the child is part of is of

importance for how the child makes sense. The statement that learning is as an aspect of human activities and something that happens continually, whether we want to or not, is of interest also to the analysis of children's narratives.

Based on these theoretical concepts and premises, the focus of the present study is on children's re-creation and remembering of narratives. The importance of language as a cultural tool and narrative as a mediating resource is also of interest in analyzing what children pick up when retelling a story they have been told. Relevant to this is, for example, if and if so how intersubjectivity is temporarily established in the practice of storytelling; How negotiation about the meaning of stories is conducted; and what is considered in order to tell a story to be intelligible to a listener (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011).

Narratives are human inventions that shape how we perceive our world and ourselves, and reshape psychological functioning (for instance, how we remember). As noticed, narrative is an account of events that occurs over time, it has particular happenings embedded (Bruner, 1990, 1991). These happenings must be relevant to the characters' intentions, which grounds for interpretation and reasoning. Thus, to be a successful storyteller one needs to leave room for interpretation.

Interpretation in narrative can be seen as questions about the intention of the agents of the story and background knowledge of the storyteller and the listener. To be worth telling, a story needs to offer something fresh or a breach to normal human happenings, something that makes these events into some sense something extraordinary (Ødegaard, 2006). One of the features of narrative described by Bruner is the reliability of a story; that is, not to speak in terms of truth but rather to make sense. Narratives are not (only) about reality but they create realities. Some of the issues of a story might be seen as universal, but since in Bruner's view, genre is also a way of telling, narratives might not be easily translated into another genre. "Language, after all is contained within its uses" (p. 14).

Imagination and creativity

When discussing children's retelling, remembering and reshaping of stories, I do it from the Vygotskian point of view that a creative act is any human action that ends up in something new (Vygotsky, 2004). Creative activity is referred to in terms of imagination and fantasy in his work. Vygotsky notes that imagination or fantasy often is mentioned as something not true, but argues that it is actually the basis of all creative activity. The ability to combine the old and thus create something new is the basis of creativity and this ability is something the child gradually takes over, that is appropriates (Säljö, 2000).

A common claim is that children have a very rich fantasy or imagination, much more so than adults. Vygotsky (2004) argues that the case is actually the opposite. Imagination is always based on previous experiences. Hence, the richer experience, the richer the imagination. Children's imagination is therefore less rich than adults because they have less experience. The implication for education is that if we want to build a strong foundation for creativity we must broaden children's experiences, and we do so through letting them encounter new practices and cultural tools.

Fantasy is not the opposite of memory but depends on it. Imagination is important in human development because we can imagine what we have not seen and we can conceptualize from what others have experienced or narrated. In this way our experiences are broadened and our imagination serves our experience. Our imagination is based on experience and experience itself is based on imagination.

Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective is clear when he declares that every inventor is a product of his or her time and environment "Creation is a historical, cumulative process where every succeeding manifestation was determined by the preceding one" (p. 30). Reasoning

develops later and slower than imagination and this is why children's imagination seems richer, also children's emotions are as rich as those of adults. In childhood imagination operates relatively independent from reasoning, while in adolescence one has many experiences but also has developed one's reasoning.

Since a narrative, as mentioned above, contains a breach of something normal, it is necessarily normative. The normative form changes with preoccupation of age and surroundings of the circumstances around the production of the narrative. The "trouble" that follows by the breach does not need to be solved. Bruner suggests that narrative rather is designed precisely to contain such unanswered issues. A narrative has traditionally been treated as a speech act. However, Bruner argues that narrative is about negotiation and sensitivity to the context, which includes interplay of perspectives; you tell your version and I tell mine. This creates some kind of coherence and even if narrative is not cumulative as scientific discourse (paradigmatic discourse) it builds a culture or a tradition, for example a family's dinner talk. Narratives are, to use Bruner's word "accruing", which enables stories of the past to continue in the present. This is in line with Vygotsky's (2004) idea about how we use our creativity to make something new through making new combinations of something familiar. Storying is always a re-creative act; we speak in a certain communicative form that exists before us and simultaneously to what makes sense to us from hearing others' stories, but also something new. We do not simply reproduce a story.

Perspective-taking

When entering a social situation, we use our assumptions about what the other person knows and may find interesting. To develop a mutual activity some coordination of perspectives is

necessary (Säljö, Riesbeck & Wyndhamn, 2001). Perspective-taking is therefore both a premise of and an unavoidable consequence of language practices.

The teacher has an important role to support the child in developing his or her perspective-taking (Säljö, Riesbeck & Wyndhamn, 2001). The ability to coordinate perspectives and its implication for sense making has been discussed from multiple perspectives and with different concepts. One such concept is intersubjectivity (e.g., Ivarsson, 2003). This concept denotes the degree – at best partial and temporary – that participants are engaged in a mutual activity. For the present thesis, this implies that the participants in storytelling need to consider the understanding of the listener(s) if intersubjectivity is to be established.

Critical to the child's development is that he or she becomes able of "substituting a real object for a symbol" (p. 7, emphasis omitted), Siraj-Blatchford (2009) suggests, and claims that this implicates the child to view him- or herself as an object and even objectify others. In play, children pretend to be someone else and then also interact with a pretend person. In this way, the child will be able to admit others' perspectives and shift between those perspectives. Eventually, children's play becomes collaborative and the development of this higher level of abstraction is sometimes spoken about in terms of "theory of mind" (Nelson, 1996). This concept denotes the child's developing ability to understand that others' intentions and wants may differ from one's own. This ability is important in implying that eventually the child will be able to describe, explain and defend its way of thinking to others. However, from the theoretical point of view of the present thesis, the ability to consider the perspectives of others is understood as a situated ability, dependent on communicative mediation (Hakkarainen & Bredikyte, 2014; Oshiro, Pihl, Peterson & Pramling, 2017).

Method and methodology

The overarching interest of the present thesis concerns how children orally retell stories they have heard. As has already been clarified, this thesis takes its point of departure in a dialogue between two classical strands of research in developmental psychology. The first tradition is concerned with whether children understand that others may understand differently than they themselves do. This discussion grounds the interest of the first empirical study on whether – and if so how – children consider the perceived understanding of their listener(s) when retelling stories.

The interest of the second empirical study is grounded in classical research on remembering as a sense-making practice. Following one focus child, the analytical focus of empirical study II is on what the child makes use of from the story she has been told, and what features she introduces and perhaps transforms, when retelling it. In addition, there is an interest in the child's own perspective of the narrative activity.

With these research interests, the research presented in this thesis takes a qualitative approach, enabling a deepened understanding of participants' actions in their everyday social and cultural context (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011).

In this chapter I, will present the methodology that this research rests on and the methods and approaches used when generating and analyzing the empirical data. Firstly, I present the empirical data, including the setting, participants and ethical considerations of the study. Secondly, I describe the processes of data generation and the analytical work.

Setting

The empirical material was generated in a Swedish preschool setting. The particular preschool participates in a program named *from3to3* (http://www.from3to3.com/). This program started 2005 in Canada with the purpose to develop language and social reasoning skills (perspective-

taking and mental-state understanding) in children primarily speaking a minority language. The Canadian program focuses on children from the age of 3 to grade 3, thereof the name. The underlying principle for focusing on this age span is the assumption that children during this period acquire language and the ability to develop social understanding.

The aim of the *from3to3* program is to develop a pedagogy that supports children's ability to use language to create complete, coherent oral narratives and to interpret and reason about the meaning of what they hear and read. In practical terms, this support takes the form of a teacher every day telling children rhymes and oral stories. This is done without using pictures or other items. The children are later asked to orally retell these stories and rhymes to each other. The teachers also plan for opportunities for the children to represent the stories in different ways, such as drawings, writing and drama.

Since 2013, the program is also running in a Swedish preschool with multilingual children. The empirical data for the two studies was generated in this preschool. All participating children have Swedish as a second language. The particular preschool is located in an area that could be described as multicultural or multi-ethnic in the sense that most of the citizens are immigrants. I have my employment as a preschool teacher in this preschool and I was also initiating the Swedish part of the *from3to3* program.

The empirical data

With the interest in how children orally retell stories, video documentation was chosen as the method for data generation. The method for data generation links to theoretical premises, in this case a sociocultural perspective on communication and learning. Accordingly, an epistemological premise of the present thesis is that a relevant unit of analysis (Säljö, 2009) is activities in which children participate. This means that it is the activity that is in focus and not a specific 'object', for instance perspective-taking or memory per se (Säljö 2011). In the present

research, this entitles that it is the storytelling activities that the children participate in in the everyday setting that are in focus for analyses. In studies of in situ activities in everyday settings, like in the present study, video-based observation is the most appropriate method to attain empirical data as rich as possible (Heath, 2011). However, there is a need to consider how to use video as an investigative tool effectively (Jewitt, 2012). In research, video can be used in many ways, such as participatory video (e.g., in video diary format) and video interviews. The present research uses video in what Jewitt (2012) refers to as video elicitation and video-based field work. The former method is used in the second study, with the purpose to provide a base for reflection. The focus child and I watched the video recordings of her retelling. The purpose was to reflect on the activity and with an attempt to explore the child's perspective (Sommer, Pramling Samuelsson & Hundeide, 2010; Heath, 2011) on the activities. The latter, that is, video-based fieldwork, is an established method in social interactional studies (Jewitt, 2012). This method is used in the present research to record ongoing activities with the focus on how children orally retell stories and is applied both in studies I and II.

For the research project, 19 storytelling activities were video recorded from fall 2014 until spring 2016. Initially, one fixed video camera was used for this purpose. The activities were arranged differently. It could be one teacher telling a story to a group of children at circle time. It could also be that children collaboratively retold a story at circle time or one child retold a story to another child. Within the *from3to3* program, teachers are encouraged to arrange so that the storyteller sits facing the listeners. Accordingly, I discovered that an additional camera was necessary to capture all the participants' embodied actions (Heath, 2011). Like all data, video data includes and excludes elements. This partiality can be considered as a limitation. However, Jewitt (2012) instead argues that it can be considered as a potential, in necessitating selecting and filtering events in ways affording systematic analysis. In most cases I was behind one video camera but on one occasion I sit opposite the child. One additional contribution of

video based studies is the possibility to review recordings together with participants (Heath, 2011), which was made use of in the second empirical study.

Selection of cases

Already from the start of the program in 2013, storytelling activities were video recorded. This was in purpose to evaluate the program and as part of the systematic quality work of the preschool. In 2014, I was accepted to the Swedish National Research School on Communication and Relations as Foundations for Early Childhood Education (FoRFa). At this point I found myself at the present preschool two days a week. My responsibilities included running the *from3to3* project. The choice of activities that were filmed was linked to what days I was at preschool and when I was responsible for the storytelling activities. The purpose of video recordings were then to generate empirical data for my research. Video documentation offers great resources for analytical possibilities (Derry et al., 2010). At the same time, it raises challenges as for example what from extensive video material should be sampled for additional examination. The theoretical perspective chosen and the research questions guided this selection. In line with the described interest, 19 video documentations (see Figure 1) of storytelling activities were selected for a first transcription.

Date	Story	Length	Children	Teachers	Storyteller	Study
2014-10-06	The fox and the crab	12:33	10	2	Agneta	I
2014-10-07	The fox and the crab	10:24	9	2	Collaboratively	I
2014-11-03	The fox and the crab	02:04	2	1	Adam	I
2014-11-10	The fox and the walking stick	06:00	1	1	Agneta	-
2014-11-10	The fox and the walking stick	05:36	2	1	Adam	-
2014-11-10	The fox and the walking stick	04:14	2	1	Adam	-

2014-12-16	The fox and the tiger	03:37	1	1	Agneta	-
2014-12-16	The fox and the tiger	03:25	1	1	Yones	-
2014-12-16	The fox and the tiger	03:53	8	2	Yones	-
2015-01-12	The fox and the tiger	03:49	9	2	Yones	-
2015-02-17	The old fashioned bed	06:34	1	1	Agneta	-
2015-02-17	The old fashioned bed	05:02	9	2	Yones	-
2015-04-13	Four arms four legs	04:44	1	1	Agneta	-
2015-04-13	Four arms four legs	14:56	8	2	Adam	-
2015-04-20	The fox and the walking stick	07:04	1	1	Agneta	II
2015-04-20	The fox and the walking stick	03:24	2	1	Emina	II
2015-05-06	Four arms four legs	14:39	8	2	Adam	-
2015-12-01	The fox and the walking stick	06:47	2	1	Emina & Maria	II
2016-05-09	Reflection	13:28	1	1	Emina & Agneta	II
		Total: 128,53				

Figure 1. An overview of the entire corpus of empirical data.

As shown in Figure 1, the entire corpus of data consists of 19 storytelling activities, in total 2 hours and 9 minutes of video documentation. The average length of the activities is about 7 minutes. The entire corpus of data was initially analyzed before the data reduction necessary for close analysis and presentation in a research study (Derry et al., 2010). For the interest of the first empirical study, three events were chosen for in-depth analysis. Also in study II there were three activities chosen, this time following one focus child telling the same story but in different constellations. This enabled taking an analytical focus on the process over time.

Transcription, translation and analysis

Video as a method is not only a way to generate data from the field but more than anything video data constitutes a principal analytical resource (Heath, 2011). In this study, 19 storytelling activities were documented through video recordings. The video recorded activities each lasted for about 7 minutes and were transcribed into text. After transcription and an initial analytical review of the entire data, a selection of video recordings were chosen for the analysis presented in each study. The transcribed and selected data were then translated to English. The attempt in the translations was to, as close as possible, mimic the nature of the participants' speech rather than providing a text that was grammatically correct.

One of the advantages of video observations is the possibility to revisit the data for analysis. After having reviewed the empirical data, guided by the research questions, six storytelling events were selected for in-depth analysis, three for each study. The chosen activities are representative of the total empirical material: They are all storytelling and retelling activities, and the stories are all so called trickster stories and lastly the participants are in all cases children aged 3 to 5 years (with Swedish as their additional language) and their teachers.

The analytical work was guided by the principles of Interaction Analysis (IA) (Derry et al., 2010; Jordan & Henderson, 1995; for an empirical example, see Lagerlöf, 2015). Given this approach, central is the ways the children make use of various resources in situated activities. Moreover the chosen approach entitles activities analyzed as sequentially unfolding responsive actions. In the first empirical study, particular attention was paid to subtle meta-markers. From the sociocultural perspective guiding this research, meta-markers are considered essential to understanding how people clarify that they take and intend others to take their utterances (Pramling, 2006; Pramling & Säljö, 2015). Meta-markers refer to the kind of indicators that people use in communicating, through which they constitute a space for interpretation between what is literally said and what is meant. Typical examples of meta-

markers would be phrases such as 'kind of', 'similar to' and 'metaphorically speaking'. Through using such expressions speakers make clear that they do not intend their utterances to be taken literally but as a manner of speaking. Whether speakers use such meta-markers when explaining something or telling a story is therefore critical to the extent they in communication make known to each other how they intend their utterances to be taken.

In the second empirical study, the analytical interest was what the focus child made use of from the story she had been told and how she transformed the story when she retold it. An important premise of IA as well as in the sociocultural perspective adopted in this study is that knowledge and actions are fundamentally social in origin. This entitles that knowledge and practice are seen as situated in interaction between participants. The basic data for theorizing knowledge is found in details of social interactions in naturally occurring everyday interactions (Jordan & Henderson, 1995). The focus on details, such as meta-markers and transformations, in oral retelling activities includes speech as well as what is sometimes referred to as non-verbal communication. Of interest is how the children interact and how they make sense of the storytelling activities.

Validity and trustworthiness

Critical to the validity of the present kind of study is the criteria of transparency and theoretical consistency (cf. Schoultz et al., 2001; Wallerstedt, Pramling & Säljö, 2014). Through grounding analytical claims in close proximity to represented excerpts of empirical data, as done in the present study, it is possible for the reader to scrutinize this connection as well as make other interpretations (from various theoretical positions; however, in the study, data are consistently analyzed from one theoretical perspective). The criterion of theoretical consistency means that theoretical premises and principles, generation of empirical data, method and analysis are logically consistent. In the present study, I attempt to make this rationale transparent to the

reader through explicating theoretical premises and conceptual resources for analyzing data, as well as making clear why the kind of data used, its form of representation (sequential transcription in some detail), and analysis are logically consistent. In addition, the trustworthiness of the study is increased by the use of video data; this kind of data allows researchers collaboratively to iteratively look at original data and transcripts, making sure that analytical claims are properly grounded in data, and that transcripts closely reflect data (Derry et al., 2010; Jordan & Henderson, 1995). Collaborative data sessions with fellow researchers have recurred throughout the research process.

Ethics

A growing body of research involving children has been accompanied by an increased awareness on the ethical considerations of research with young children (Farrell, 2016). On the one hand, there is a need to see children as vulnerable in that they might not see the consequences of their participation in research; on the other hand, there is an understanding of children as competent participants. The global focus on early childhood has raised an understanding of children as reliable, voluntary informants on matters that affects them, according to Farrell (2016). Moreover, Farrell points out that the awakening interest in listening to what children say and how they say it has highlighted children's actual rights to participate in research. In line with this is the conceptual understanding of children as already competent participants, and not only "as one day becoming adult humans" (Farrell, 2016, p. 7). With this in mind, children can actually display their communicative competence in interactional practices. The developing field of ethics in child research is affording new possibilities; however, as Farrell (2016) puts it: "These affordances may be impaired both by concern for children's immaturity, on the one hand, and romantic optimism about children's capacities to

participate, on the other" (p. 11). Consequently, Farrell stresses the importance of systematic considerations throughout the whole research process.

Parents to the participating children have been informed in person as well as through written information of the design and the purpose of the study and they have all given their permission to their child's participation in the study, including being video recorded. Arguably, this was facilitated through me already having established a relation to the parents and the children. Although this may be true, it also entails that parents and children trust me and might not question the study as they may have done otherwise. Therefore, it was also important for me to explain to the children why I was video recording their storytelling and I always asked the children if they wanted to be recorded.

The present research follows to the ethical guidelines of the Swedish Research Council (2017). A relationship based on trust and respect between the child and the researcher is critical to gain consent and engage the child in research (Docket, Einarsdottir & Perry 2009). None of the children showed any inconvenience during the video recordings of the activities. In the empirical studies, I participate both as a teacher and as a researcher. However, also other teachers participated in the recorded activities and for this reason also they were informed and asked for permission. The information requirement is the first guideline which I consider accomplished by the conversations and written information between researcher, teachers, parents and participating children. The second guideline about the anonymity requirement entails the researcher to anonymize the participating individuals when reporting the study. All names in transcriptions (except myself) are therefore pseudonyms. The generated data is not accessible to unauthorized persons and this fulfills the confidentiality requirement.

Summary of the empirical studies

The present thesis consists of two empirical studies with the analytical focus on how children orally retell stories they have heard. This chapter summarizes the two studies. In both studies, children 4 to 5 years old participate in storytelling activities in a preschool setting. The teacher orally tells a story to an individual child or in a group activity. Later the child/children retell the stories to teachers and peers.

Study I: Children's re-storying as a responsive practice

The aim of the first study (Pihl, Peterson & Pramling, 2017) is to explore if, and if so how, the children show responsivity to the listener's/listeners' potentially varied knowing when retelling a story. That is, whether they in their storytelling indicate that the pay attention to the fact that the listener has not previously heard the story and therefore does not know what the storyteller knows. Closely adjacent to this, the study pursues an interest in what the children's retelling denotes about their understanding of the story.

How children learn to narrate and if they take into account the fact that who they tell something to has a different understanding than themselves is one of the founding theoretical and empirical interests of the tradition of educational psychology. The present study problematizes the idea that children in the age span 4 to 5 years are unable to understand one another in retelling or explaining something, as suggested by Piaget's founding research (Piaget, 1923/1926). Analytically attending to meta-markers (Pramling, 2006; Pramling & Säljö, 2015), as is done in the present study, yields another picture of such young children's abilities.

For the present study, three occasions of oral storytelling activities were selected, from a review of the entire data, for closer analysis. The first occasion is when the teacher tells the story to a group of children; the second is when a group of children retell the story

during circle time; and the third and last activity is when one child retells the same story to a child who has not heard it before. The activities are documented through video recordings and analyzed according to the principles of Interaction Analysis (IA).

The analysis shows that the children shift between speaking *inside* the narrative frame of the story and speaking *about* features of the story. Furthermore, the analysis reveals that the children in their retelling speak from different positions. One excerpt from the data illustrates all of these positions. One child, Yones, clarifies what the story is about (i.e., being the commentator) when he says: *it was about a crab and a fox.* He continues taking the position of the storyteller when he says: *and the crab said* and finally speaking as an agent within the frame of the story when he says: *shall we run a race the one who comes first has won.* As seen in this and other examples analyzed in the study, the children do consider the perspective of the listener(s), although they do not do so consistently.

The contribution to the overarching research tradition of educational psychology and the fields of children's understanding and storytelling of the present study is knowledge about how children, through shifting from speaking within the frame to meta-communicating about the story, indicate that they are responsive to the listener's understanding. Moreover, the findings show that when the children do not understand the central trick of the story they invent, transform and rationalize an alternative account. Given these findings, an interest in more specifically how the children transform the stories and what it implies for their remembering generated the research interest of the second study.

Study II: Children remembering and reshaping stories in retelling

The second empirical study (Pihl, Peterson & Pramling, under review) investigates children's retelling and remembering. In contrast to the dominant interest in previous research on children and memory on the product of children's retelling and remembering (i.e., their stories

and how much they remember, respectively), this study focuses of the processes of storytelling and remembering. The tension in research between memory (as a separate system), on the one hand, and remembering as a sense-making practice, on the other, is an important background of this study. My research will build on the tradition of remembering, which was historically initiated by Bartlett's classical study published in 1932 (cf. above).

As already mentioned, the findings from study I generated an interest in remembering and transformation in children's retelling of stories they have been told. The research questions raised are: What does the child pick up from the story she has been told? What features does she introduce and how may she transform the story when retelling it? Moreover, what does she indicate is her perspective on the activity; that is, how does the activity appear to the focus child?

My overview of previous research on children's narrative remembering (see the chapter on previous research, above) revealed that this practice predominantly has been investigated with the purpose to clarify children's other abilities. Another common approach in this tradition is to study children's autobiographical narratives. Against this background, it can be concluded that there to a large extent is a lack of research on the very processes of children's retelling. The contribution of the present study is contingent on the fact that the analysis is on how retelling and remembering are done by children. Another important feature of the study is that retelling is investigated over short and long time, and with an interest also in the child's perspective on the activity.

In this study, two children 4 to 5 years old participate in storytelling activities organized by a teacher. From the larger corpus of data, consisting of in total 19 storytelling activities, three retelling activities were chosen to present the results. The reasons for selecting these activities is that they are retellings of the same story, retold by the same child and in different constellations.

The overall results of this study are that the focus child remembers details and in different ways transforms the story. The analysis reveals six characteristics of the retelling process. Firstly, the focus child retains the basic structure of the story. Secondly, she uses embodied enactments and shifts her tone of voice when representing the different characters in the story. Thirdly, concepts that may be unfamiliar are replaced to more familiar ones, and, fourthly, she transforms the story by introduces new elements. Associative playfulness is the fifth characterization of the retelling. Lastly, the child shifts from (what is presumably an) unknown word to one that sounds similar. This study further illustrates how retelling and remembering are clearly related to the sense the child makes of not only the story but also of the activity engaged in.

Discussion

The interest of this study revolves around how children orally retell stories they have heard. Empirically, the study is grounded in a localized want for knowing more about the actual processes of children's retelling, as distinct from their stories as such or their stories as indicators of their linguistic development. This chapter will present the most important findings in relation to previous research and the theoretical perspective employed (particularly emphasizing appropriation of cultural tools and practices).Finally, the implications of the findings to our understanding of children and their storytelling, and to how to promote children's development are discussed.

Appropriation of narration as a cultural practice

In line with the sociocultural perspective adopted in the present study, learning is conceptualized as appropriation (Wertsch, 1998), that is, in terms of gradually taking over cultural tools and practices. This perspective implies that appropriation of the cultural tool narrative is depending on the narrative practices the child is engaged in. Appropriating the cultural tool of narrative includes mastering such features that ensures that what is told makes sense also to those who were not present when the events occurred or when the story initially was told (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011). Adding to this research, in the present study, through analyzing how children use meta-markers in their narration (and thus, in effect clarifying to their listener what the story is about and how its events can be understood), it has been made evident how the participating children do considered that their listeners do not necessarily know what they themselves know. Adjusting one's narration to one's audience in this way constitutes a critical feature of appropriating narration as a cultural practice. The present study contributes with detailed insight into how children do so and thus how they are in a process of appropriating this prevalent cultural practice.

Responsiveness to the understanding of others

The work of Jean Piaget has had great impact not only on psychological and educational research but also on the view of children's competences in early childhood education. Among other things, Piaget was interested in whether children take into account that others may think differently and have different experience than themselves. The conclusions he drew from his clinical experiments was that first at the age of 7 or 8 years could there can be any talk of genuine understanding between children. Before this age, he argued, egocentricity (i.e., the inability to perceive matters from the perspective of others) prevents this from being possible. In contrast, when focusing on meta-markers, as done in empirical Study I of the present thesis, another picture of children's abilities arises (cf. Pramling, 2006; Pramling & Säljö, 2015, for other analyses of this kind challenging prevalent images of children's capabilities of understanding).

The results from Study I of the present thesis shows that children as young as 4 to 5 years do take into account their listener's different understanding when they orally retell stories, but that they do not do so consistently. The latter could be read theoretically as indicating that the children are in the midst of appropriating this cultural practice. In the analysis of empirical Study I, it is clarified how children's differing considerations of their listener's understanding implies speaking from different positions.

Claiming that children as young as 4 to 5 years are able, at times, to consider the perspective of their listeners when telling stories does not mean that all children of this age necessarily do so. However, simply showing empirically that these young children are able to do so constitutes a contribution regardless of the generality of this to other populations (of 4-5-year olds).

It could be questioned whether some of the empirical findings reported, such as the fact that the children in the data (not only in the cases represented in the two empirical studies) exchange presumably unfamiliar words and concepts with more familiar ones is contingent on their linguistic experiences, that is, that they speak Swedish as an additional language. This may be so. However, considering the fact that no comparable data with children of other linguistic experiences (native-Swedish language speakers) is available, it is important not to presume that this is the case. To what extent these particular findings are specific to children with particular language experiences or constitute more general processes of children (of this age span) will have to be a question for further research. In the nature of the framework constituted by the *from-3-to-3* project, it was initiated to support the language development and social reasoning skills of second-language speakers; this, however, do not necessitate that not all children can profit from participating in these kinds of narrative activities.

Transformation and remembering

My overview of previous research on children's narrative remembering makes clear that this practice primarily has been studied with the aim to investigate other abilities in children. In addition, such studies tend to focus on the narrative product. In contrast, in the present study, the processes of retelling and remembering have been analyzed. This means, among other things, that what is analyzed is how children remember rather than how much they remember (can recall). By following one focus child, as done in empirical Study II, it was possible to analyze the nature and development of narrative activity. With an interest in the child's narrative remembering, it becomes critical to investigate her narration in terms of what (rather than how much) she shows that she remembers of the story previously told her by the teacher. The results show that she remembers, on the one hand, details of the story and, on the other,

how the story was told by the teacher (i.e., the very manner in which it was initially told). The latter is evident, for example, when the child enacts by embodied means in ways parallel to the teacher's previous telling. This finding implies that appropriating narration not only means to remember a story, and to consider the potentially different understanding of one's listerner(s) – as discussed above – but also to render one's story in an engaging presentation (the practice of narration is not merely information transmission but one of engaging one's listeners, for example, through enactment, getting in character). That children, also at this young age, show that they pick up these features of narration is shown through the detailed analysis provided in this thesis (empirical Study II).

Implications and contributions to research and early childhood education

The implications of the present thesis is that it makes contributions to further strengthening re-conceptualizing young children's capacities for understanding (and explaining), along the lines of Pramling (2006) and Pramling and Säljö (2015), and also to go beyond these studies in investigating this issue in the context of children's oral retelling of stories. In addition to clarifying how children use meta-markers to indicate their understanding to others, as previously reported in these studies, an additional contribution is to show how children's differing consideration of their listener's potentially different understanding is managed – and per implication made analytically visible – through them speaking from different positions of narration. These are novel contributions not presented in previous studies in this field.

Since the present thesis is conducted within a Swedish national research school for preschool teachers, it is important to also discuss what the contributions and implications are to early childhood education (preschool). One implication, given (a) the culturally critical standing of narrative as a form for sense making, communication and remembering, and (b) the findings that children do consider the perspective of their listeners but not consistently so,

is that supporting children to appropriate the cultural practice of narration (and thus, per implication, the cultural tool of narrative) is pivotal to supporting their development more generally. To recap what is pointed out in empirical Study II: when supporting children's narrating and remembering, teachers also support children's sense making and vice versa. Another implication, given (c) that the children in this study show that they tend to take over (i.e., appropriate) not only the unfolding events of stories but also the manner in which the teacher initially told the story, is that preschool teachers should try to make sure that the stories they tell are presented in an engaging form. A strand of professional development, according to this line of reasoning, may thus be to delve into theorizing and empirical work on drama pedagogy in early childhood education (cf. Fleer & Kamaralli, 2017). A more basic implication of the present study, and on the basis of what here has been argued, is, of course, that preschool teachers actually *do* tell stories to children and support children in re-telling these as well as telling new stories. Oral storytelling is a fundamental means of sharing experience, making sense, and remember, and thus its appropriation is a critical feature of enculturation and therefore critical to the practice of early childhood education.

Sammanfattning

Inledning

Föreliggande avhandling handlar om barns muntliga berättande. Mer specifikt studeras förskolebarns muntliga återberättande av berättelser de fått höra Studien sker i dialog med två klassiska forskningstraditioner. För det första, mot bakgrund av en långvarig debatt inom utvecklingspsykologin om barn förstår att andra förstår annorlunda. Särskilt analytiskt intresse riktads mot om – och i så fall hur – barn tar hänsyn till lyssnarens förståelse när de återberättar. För det andra, med intresse för minnande som en meningsskapande praktik analyseras hur barn i sitt återberättande minns och eventuellt omvandlar berättelserna. Barns återberättande av en viss sorts berättelser, så kallade *trickster stories*, studeras. Detta är berättelser med djur, typiskt en räv, och som handlar om spelet mellan illusion och verklighet.

Inom utvecklingspsykologin återfinns främst studier med intresse för barns berättande för att få information om deras kognitiva utvecklingsnivå (Engel, 1995). Strukturen av barns berättande har setts som ett "fönster" in till strukturen av deras tänkande. I motsats till det kommer denna studie att fokusera på processen av barns återberättande. Fokus ligger på om, och i så fall hur, barnen tar hänsyn till lyssnarens förståelse. Av särskilt analytiskt intresse är vad barnen plockar upp från berättelsen, vilka egenskaper de eventuellt introducerar och hur berättelsen möjligtvis omvandlas när den återges. Slutligen är det av intresse att försöka klargöra barnets perspektiv på aktiviteten.

Tidigare forskning

Forskning om barns berättande härrör från ett antal discipliner, såsom psykologi, sociolingvistik, kommunikationsstudier, pedagogisk psykologi och pedagogik. I föreliggande undersökning studeras vardagliga aktiviteter i en förskola. Följaktligen ligger den aktuella studien inom fältet pedagogisk psykologi/pedagogik. Muntligt berättande har betydande

fördelar för barns utbildning och utveckling. Främst har det setts som en väg till utveckling av barns litteracitet (Hibbin, 2016a; Wells, 2009).

I en studie av Pramling och Ødegaard (2011) analyserades barns berättande i två olika berättandeaktiviteter i förskola. Analysen visar att lärarna stöttade barnen i att förmedla sina erfarenheter och i deras berättande. Stöttningen skede främst genom att ställa en viss sorts frågor, klarläggande av berättandets olika funktioner som aktörer, miljö, och händelser. Det vill säga genom att ställa vissa typer av frågor som är viktiga för utvecklingen av logiken i en berättelse.

I familjesammanahang är muntlig berättande sannolikt mindre strukturerat än i utbildningsinstitutioner, vilket Pramling och Ødegaard (2011) påpekar. En banbrytande studie av berättelser inom familjen är *Narratives from the Crib*, redigerad av Katherine Nelson (1989). Intresset för den studien var barnets språkutveckling, hennes fantasi och förståelse. Samtalet mellan ett litet barn (Emily) och hennes föräldrar vid läggdags samt barnets monologer analyserades.

Frågan om huruvida barn överväger eller ens inser att andra kan förstå annorlunda än dem själva och vad detta innebär för hur de kommunicerar intresserade Piaget (1923/1926). För att undersöka denna fråga bad han barn att berätta något för ett annat barn. Han hävdade att resultaten av dessa uppgifter visade att barnen i stor utsträckning inte förstod varandra. Slutsatsen han drog var att ansträngningen att förstå andra människor och kommunicera tankar objektivt inte visades förrän vid 7 års ålder. Förklaringen var att barn före denna ålder fortfarande är egocentriska och inte känner någon vilja att kommunicera med eller förstå andra.

Denna förklaring kritiserades senare av bland annat Hundeide (1977). Empiriska studier, exemplifierade av Hundeide, visade hur tolkningen av empirin är beroende av vilket perspektiv forskaren anlägger, vilket ger upphov till olika syn på barnets kompetenser.

Ytterligare studier utförda av Donaldson (1978) visade att en rekonstruktion av Piagets experiment avslöjade att små barn kan förstå från andras synvinkel även i yngre åldrar.

En hel del forskning har intresserat sig för minnet och för att förklara denna mentala process har forskare använt olika metaforer (för en sammanfattning av studier, se Säljö, 2011). När vi konfronteras med fenomen som vi inte förstår tenderar vi att relatera dem till fysiska föremål, vilket framgår av en översikt över minnesmetaforer gjord av Roediger (1980). Han fann att rumsliga metaforer ofta används och metaforer som lagring och kodning (jfr en dator) ofta använts i studier av minne.

Med ambitionen att studera "rent minne", försökte Ebbinghaus (1885/1998) eliminera effekterna av människors tidigare erfarenhet och kunskap. Denna forskning har varit starkt inflytelserik i psykologin. Senare forskning avslöjar dock att människors förmåga att komma ihåg är mycket känsliga för sammanhanget (se exempelvis Hirst & Manier, 1995). I denna licentiatuppsats förstås barns berättande och minnande som beroende av hur de uppfattar den aktivitet de engagerar sig i. Människor är begränsade i sin förmåga att lagra information men samtidigt till synes obegränsat förmögna att lära och komma ihåg vad som är meningsfullt för dem (Marton, 1970; Miller, 1956).

En begränsning av de rumsliga metaforerna är att de inte identifierar minnandets processer. Modeller av hypotetiska mentala processer är inte tillräckligt kopplade till beteende (Säljö, 2011). Därför är begreppet minnande (snarare än minne) i min studie av stor betydelse. Minnande avser en aktiv process som är beroende av den mening deltagare ser i aktiviteten. Hur själva studieobjektet konstitueras skiljer sig således åt mellan en kognitiv (utvecklings)psykologisk tradition och en sociokulturell tradition.

Muntligt berättande förstås i denna licentiatuppsats som en grundläggande kulturell praktik och berättelse som ett verktyg för meningsskapande, lärande och minnande. Detta perspektiv på berättande harmonierar med Bruners (1990) beskrivning av hur såväl individer

som kollektiv organiserar sina erfarenheter i berättelser med syfte är att skapa mening och komma ihåg. Den forskning som jag bygger på är grundad i traditionen av minnande som en meningsskapande praktik, dvs. en sociokulturell tradition som går tillbaka på Bartletts klassiska studie publicerad 1932. Han lät vuxna individer återberätta berättelser de fått läsa. Analysen visade bland annat att det som var svårt att komma ihåg, blev omformulerat beroende på vad som framstod som meningsfullt. Grunden för denna process, enligt Bartlett, är en strävan efter mening. Bartletts studie belyser det nära förhållandet mellan berättande och minnande. I linje med Bartletts perspektiv är tillvägagångssättet i föreliggande studie att minnande inte bara är en reproduktiv praktik utan också en kreativ, meningsskapande sådan (se Wertsch, 2002).

Ett sociokulturellt perspektiv på kommunikation och lärande

Den här studien antar ett sociokulturellt perspektiv på lärande, kommunikation och minnande, så som det är grundat på arbetet av den ryska utvecklingspsykologen Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) och vidareutvecklat av samtida forskare som Wertsch (2007) och Säljö (2002), ger detta perspektiv konceptuella resurser för att studera kulturella aktiviteter som berättande. Kärnan i ett sociokulturellt perspektiv är den teoretiska ambitionen att förklara och klargöra sambandet mellan mänsklig utveckling och social interaktion (Wertsch m.fl., 1995).

Människor organiserar sina erfarenheter i berättelser för att skapa mening och för att minnas (Bruner, 1990). Berättelse utgör en rik resurs för individers (och gruppers) minnande; en berättelse kan innehålla mycket information som skulle vara svårt att minnas utan detta meningsfulla förhållande (Säljö, 2011). Berättelser är exempel på ett kulturellt redskap, dvs. mänskliga uppfinningar som formar hur vi uppfattar vår värld, oss själv och omformar psykologiska funktioner (till exempel hur vi minns).

Begreppet mediering i föreliggande studie refererar till att vi i kontakt med världen tolkar och agerar med hjälp av kulturella redskap (Wertsch, 2007). Användningen av det kulturella

redskapet berättande ses som att det medierar högre mental funktion, inklusive aktivt minnande. Från ett sociokulturellt perspektiv används begreppet appropriering när en lärande gradvis tar över ett kulturellt redskap (Säljö, 2005). Ett kulturellt verktyg som exempelvis berättande kan aldrig bli helt bemästrat. Vi kan behöva kämpa med det här redskapet återigen när vi möter nya utmaningar, inklusive nya former av berättelser (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011; Säljö, 2005).

Metod och metodologi

Utifrån beskrivet forskningsintresse tar studien som presenteras i denna uppsats ett kvalitativt tillvägagångssätt som möjliggör en utökad förståelse för deltagarnas handlingar i sitt vardagliga sociala och kulturella sammanhang (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). En grund för denna empiriska studie är det kanadensiska *from3to3*-projektet som startade 2005. Syftet med detta projekt är att utveckla språk och socialt resonemang hos minoritetsspråkiga barn från 3 år till år tre i skolan. Från 2013 pågår programmet också i en svensk förskola, liksom i det kanadensiska projektet, med flerspråkiga barn. Konkret går det till på det sättet att deltagande lärare samlar barnen och berättar rim, ramsor och muntliga berättelser. Barnen uppmanas senare att muntligen återberätta dessa för och med varandra.

Med intresse för hur barn muntligen återberättar, valdes videodokumentation för att generera data. I studier av aktiviteter *in situ* i vardagliga miljöer, som i den här studien, är videobaserad observation den lämpligaste metoden för att uppnå en så rik empiri som möjligt (Heath, 2011). Från en större mängd data, bestående av 12 barn i åldrarna 3-5 år och totalt 21 berättelser valdes 6 aktiviteter ut för djupare analys. De dokumenterade aktiviteterna analyserades enligt principerna för interaktionsanalys (Jordan & Henderson, 1995; jfr Derry m.fl., 2010; för ett empiriskt exempel, se Lagerlöf, 2015). Den transkriberade datan har översatts till engelska, med ett försök att efterlikna deltagarnas tal snarare än att tillhandahålla grammatiskt korrekt text.

Barnens vårdnadshavare har informerats, både personligen och skriftligt, om utformningen och syftet med studien. Alla barn, deras föräldrar och lärare har gett sitt tillstånd att delta. Forskningen följer de etiska riktlinjerna från Vetenskapsrådet. Det innebär att allt deltagande var frivillig och att deltagare (utom deltagande forskare) fått pseudonymer i studierna. Ingen av barnen visade några tecken på obehag vid datagenerering.

Sammanfattning och resultat av de två delstudierna

Detta kapitel sammanfattar de två delstudierna. I båda studierna deltar barn 4 till 5 år i berättaraktiviteter i förskolan. Läraren berättar muntligt en berättelse för ett enskilt barn eller i en gruppaktivitet. Senare återberättar barnet/barnen berättelsen för lärare och andra barn.

Studie I: Barns återberättande som en responsiv praktik

Syftet med den första empiriska studien (Pihl, Peterson & Pramling, 2017) är att undersöka om, och i så fall hur, barn i sitt berättande antyder att de uppmärksammar det faktum att lyssnaren inte tidigare hört historien och därför inte vet vad de själva vet.

Till den aktuella studien valdes tre tillfällen av muntliga berättaraktiviteter ut för närmare analys. Analysen visar att barnen växlar mellan att tala *inom* berättelsens ram och att prata *om* berättelsens olika drag. Vidare klargör analysen hur barnen i sitt återberättande talar från olika positioner. Bidraget till utbildningspsykologi och intresset för barns förståelse och berättande från den aktuella studien är kunskap om hur barn genom att skifta från att tala inom ramen till att metakommunicera om berättelsen indikerar att de svarar på lyssnarens förståelse.

Studie II: Barns minnande och transformering av berättelser vid återberättande

Den andra empiriska undersökningen (Pihl, Peterson & Pramling, under granskning) undersöker ett barns återberättande och minnande. I motsats till det dominerande intresset i

tidigare forskning om barn och minne som en produkt fokuserar den här studien på processerna i berättande och minnande.

De frågor som ställs är: Vad plockar barnet upp från berättelsen? Vilka teman presenterar hon och hur transformerar hon eventuellt berättelsen när den återberättas? Dessutom rymmer studien ett intresse för barnets perspektiv på aktiviteten; det vill säga hur aktiviteten framstår för barnet.

De övergripande resultaten av denna studie är att fokusbarnet kommer ihåg detaljer och på olika sätt omvandlar berättelsen. För det första behåller fokusbarnet grundstrukturen i berättelsen. För det andra förkroppsligar hon berättelsens skeenden och ändrar sitt tonfall när hon representerar de olika karaktärerna i berättelsen. För det tredje ersätts begrepp som sannolikt inte är kända med mer bekanta begrepp, och för det fjärde omvandlar hon berättelsen genom att introducera nya element. Associativ lekfullhet är det femte karaktärsdraget i återberättandet. Slutligen skiftar barnet från (vilket förmodligen är ett) okänt ord till ett som låter likartat. Denna studie illustrerar vidare hur återberättande och minnande tydligt är relaterade till den mening barnet gör av inte bara berättelsen utan också av den aktivitet som hon deltar i.

Diskussion

I linje med det sociokulturella perspektivet som antagits i den här studien, förstås lärande som appropriering (Wertsch, 1998), det vill säga att gradvis ta över kulturella redskap och praktiker. Detta perspektiv innebär att appropriering av det kulturella redskapet berättande är beroende av de praktiker barnet är engagerat i (Pramling & Ødegaard, 2011). Genom att analysera hur barn använder metamarkörer i sina berättelser (och därigenom faktiskt klargör för lyssnaren vad berättelsen handlar om och hur dess händelser kan förstås) har det i denna uppsats (dess empiriska studier) tydliggjorts hur de deltagande barnen tar hänsyn till att deras lyssnare inte

nödvändigtvis vet vad de själva som berättare vet. Att justera sin berättelse till en publik på detta sätt utgör en kritisk funktion för att appropriera berättande som en kulturell praktik. Den föreliggande studien bidrar med en detaljerad inblick i hur barn gör detta och därmed hur de är i en process för att appropriera denna betydelsefulla kulturella praktik.

Denna uppsats bidrar till att ytterligare förstärka rekonceptualiseringen av små barns förmåga att förstå (och förklara), i linje med Pramling (2006) och Pramling och Säljö (2015), samt att gå vidare från dessa studier genom att undersöka denna fråga i samband med barns muntliga återberättande. Förutom att klargöra hur barn använder metamarkörer för att indikera sin förståelse för andra, är ett ytterligare bidrag att visa hur lyssnares potentiellt annorlunda förståelse hanteras av barnen. Dessa är nya bidrag som inte presenterats i tidigare studier inom detta område.

En pedagogisk implikation, givet (a) den kulturellt kritiska utgångspunkten i berättande som en praktik för meningsskapande, kommunikation och minnande, och (b) resultaten som visar att barn tar hänsyn till lyssnarens perspektiv, även om de inte gör det konsekvent, är att stöttning i barns appropriering av det kulturella redskapet berättelsen är avgörande för att stödja deras utveckling mer allmänt. När man stödjer barnets berättande och minnande, stödjer lärare också barns meningsskapande och vice versa. En annan implikation, givet att (c) barnen i den här studien visar att de tenderar att ta över (dvs. att appropriera) inte bara händelserna i berättelsen utan även hur läraren ursprungligen berättade, är att förskollärare försöker berätta på ett engagerat sätt. En mer grundläggande konsekvens av den här studien och på grundval av vad som här har hävdats är naturligtvis *att* förskollärare faktiskt berättar olika berättelser och stöttar barn i att (åter)berätta. Muntligt berättande är ett grundläggande sätt att dela erfarenhet, meningsskapande och minnande, och dess appropriering är därför ett kritiskt inslag i tidig utbildning.

References

Bartlett, F. C. (1995). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1932).

Bruner, J. S. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, *18*(1), 1–21.

Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (2006). Narrative and the paradigmatic modes of thought. In *In search of pedagogy, Vol. 2: The selected works of Jerome S. Bruner* (pp. 116–128). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bruner, J. S., & Lucariello, J. (1989). Monologue as narrative of the world. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Narratives from the crib* (pp. 73–97). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (2008). Narrative learning, EAL, and metacognitive development. In R. Evans & D. Jones (Eds.), *Metacognitive approaches to developing oracy: Developing speaking and listening with young children* (pp. 77–92). London: Routledge.

Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., Hall, R., Koschmann, T., Lemke, J. L, Sherin, M. G., & Sherin, B. L. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *19*, 3–53.

Docket, S., Einarsdottir, J., & Perry, B. (2009). Researching with children: Ethical tensions *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, *7*, 229–283.

Donaldson, M. (1978). *Children's minds*. Glasgow, Scotland: Fontana/Collins.

Ebbinghaus, H. (1998). *Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology* (H. A. Ruger & C. E. Bussenius, Trans.). Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press. (Original work published 1885).

Edwards, D., & Middleton, D. (1987). Conversation and remembering: Bartlett revisited. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *1*, 77–92.

Engel, S. (1995). *The stories children tell: Making sense of the narratives of childhood*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Farrell, A. (2016). Ethics in early childhood research. In A. Farrell, S. Lynn Kagan & E. K. M. Tisdall (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of early childhood research* (pp. 187–195). London: Sage.

Fleer, M., & Kamaralli, A. (2017). Cultural development of the child in role-play: Drama pedagogy and its potential contribution to early childhood education. In S. Lynch, D. Pike & à Beckett (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on play from birth and beyond* (pp. 111–128). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Glenn-Applegate, K., Breit-Smith, A., Justice, L. M., & Piasta, S. B. (2010). Artfulness in young children's spoken narratives. *Early Education and Development*, *21*(3), 468–493.

Hakkarainen, P., & Bredikyte, M. (2014). Understanding narrative as a key aspect of play. In L. Brooker, M. Blaise & S. Edwards (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of play and learning in early childhood* (pp. 240–251). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hakkarainen, P., & Vuorinen, M.-L. (2018). Narrative learning of literacy. In M. Fleer & B. van Oers (Eds.), *International handbook of early childhood education, Volume I* (pp. 251–267). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Heath, C. (2011). Embodied action: Video and the analysis of social interaction. In D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 250–269). London: Sage.

Heilmann, J., Miller, J. F., & Nockerts, A. (2010). Sensitivity of narrative organization measures using narrative retells produced by young school-age children. *Language Testing*, *27*(4), 603–626.

Hibbin, R. (2016a). Oral storytelling, speaking and listening and the hegemony if literacy: Non-instrumental language use and transactional talk in the primary classroom. *Changing English*, *23*(1), 52–64.

Hibbin, R. (2016b). The psychosocial benefits of oral storytelling in school: Developing identity and empathy through narrative. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *34*(4), 218–231.

Hirst, W., & Manier, D. (1995). Opening vistas for cognitive psychology. In L. M. W. Martin, K. Nelson & E. Tobach (Eds.), *Sociocultural psychology: Theory and practice of doing and knowing* (pp. 89–124). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hundeide, K. (1977). *Piaget i kritisk lys* [Piaget in a critical light]. Oslo: Cappelen.

Istomina, A. M. (1975). The development of voluntary memory in preschool age children. *Soviet Psychology*, *13*(4), 5–64.

Jewitt, C. (2012). *An introduction to using video for research*. London: National Centre for Research Methods.

Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction Analysis: Foundations and practice. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *4*(1), 39–103.

Jönsson, L., Linell, P., & Säljö, R. (1991). Formulating the past: Remembering in the police-interrogation. *Multidisciplinary Newsletter for Activity Theory*, 9/10/1991, 5–11.

Kao, S.-M. (2017). The organizational patterns of first graders on three narrative tasks. In S. Garvis & N. Pramling (Eds.), *Narratives in early childhood education: Communication, sense making and lived experience* (pp. 130–146). London: Routledge.

Kirkby, J. Faulkner, J., & Perrin, J. (2014). 'Once there was a ...': Reclaiming storytelling in the middle years. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, *22*(2), 1–10.

Kolers, P. A., & Palef, S. R. (1976). Knowing not. *Memory & Cognition*, *4*(5), 553–-558.

Lagerlöf, P. (2015). Musical make-believe playing: three preschoolers collaboratively initiating play 'in-between'. *Early Years*, *35*(3), 303–316.

Macleod, F. J., Macmillan, P., & Norwich, B. (2008). 'Listening to myself': Improving oracy and literacy among children who fall behind. In R. Evans & D. Jones (Eds.), *Metacognitive approaches to developing oracy: Developing speaking and listening with young children* (pp. 65–76). London: Routledge.

Marton, F. (1970). *Structural dynamics of learning* (Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences, 5). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Mauritzson, U., & Säljö, R. (2001). Adult questions and children's responses: Coordination of perspectives in studies of children's theories of other minds. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *45*(3), 213–231.

Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, *63*(2), 81–97.

Nelson, K. (Ed.). (1989). *Narratives from the crib*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nelson, K. (1996). *Language in cognitive development: The emergence of the mediated mind*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Oshiro, A., Pihl, A., Peterson, L., & Pramling, N. (2017). Understanding the psychology of a trickster tale: 5-year-old Japanese kindergarten children collaboratively retelling a *kitsune* story. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, *8*(1), 58–74.

Ong, W. J. (2002). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word* (30th anniversary edition). London: Routledge.

Piaget, J. (1926). *The language and thought of the child* (M. Warden, Trans.). London: Harcourt, Brace. (Original work published 1923).

Pihl, A., Peterson, L., & Pramling, N. (2017). Children's re-storying as a responsive practice. In S. Garvis & N. Pramling (Eds.), *Narratives in early childhood education: Communication, sense making and lived experience* (pp. 89–101). London: Routledge.

Pihl, A., Peterson, L., & Pramling, N. (under review). Children remembering and reshaping stories in retelling.

Pramling, I. (1990). *Learning to learn: A study of Swedish preschool children*. New York, NY: Springer.

Pramling, N. (2006). 'The clouds are alive because they fly in the air as if they were birds': A re-analysis of what children say and mean in clinical interviews in the work of Jean Piaget. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *21*(4), 453–466.

Pramling, N., & Säljö, R. (2015). The clinical interview: The child as a partner in conversations vs. the child as an object of research. In S. Robson & S. F. Quinn (Eds.), *International handbook of young children's thinking and understanding* (pp. 87–95). London: Routledge.

Pramling, N., & Ødegaard, E. E. (2011). Learning to narrate: Appropriating a cultural mould for sense-making and communication. In N. Pramling & I. Pramling Samuelsson (Eds.), *Educational encounters: Nordic studies in early childhood didactics* (pp. 15–35). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Roediger, H. L., III. (1980). Memory metaphors in cognitive psychology. *Memory & Cognition*, *8*(3), 231–246.

Schoultz, J., Säljö, R., & Wyndhamn, J. (2001). Heavenly talk: Discourse, artifacts, and children's understanding of elementary astronomy. *Human Development*, *44*, 103–118.

Silva, M. (2017). The contribution of narrative to early reading comprehension. In S. Garvis & N. Pramling (Eds.), *Narratives in early childhood education: Communication, sense making and lived experience* (pp. 119–129). London: Routledge.

Siraj-Blatchford I. (2009). Conceptualising progression in the pedagogy of play and sustained shared thinking in early childhood education: A Vygotskian perspective. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *26*, 77–89.

Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Manni, L. (2008). 'Would you like to tidy up now?' An analysis of adult questioning in the English Foundation Stage. *Early Years*, *28*(1), 5–22.

Skantz Åberg, E. (2018). *Children's collaborative technology-mediated storymaking: Instructional challenges in early childhood education* (Gothenburg Studies in Education). Göteborg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Sommer, D., Pramling Samuelsson, I., & Hundeide, K. (2010). *Child perspectives and children's perspectives in theory and practice* (International perspectives on early childhood education and development, 2). New York, NY: Springer.

Swedish Research Council. (2017). *Good Research Practice*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Säljö, R. (2000). *Lärande i praktiken. Ett sociokulturellt perspektiv* [Learning in practice: A sociocultural perspective]. Stockholm. Prisma.

Säljö, R. (2005). *Lärande och kulturella redskap. Om lärprocesser och det kollektiva minnet* [Learning and cultural tools: On processes of learning and collective memory]. Stockholm: Norstedts Akademiska.

Säljö, R. (2009). Learning, theories of learning, and units of analysis in research. *Educational Psychologist*, *44*(3), 202–208.

Säljö, R. (2011). Att lära och minnas i vardagliga verksamheter. In R. Säljö (Ed.), *Lärande och minnande som social praktik* [Learning and remembering as social practice] (pp.13–41). Stockholm: Norstedts.

Theobald, M. (2016). Achieving competence: The interactional features of children's storytelling. *Childhood*, *23*(1), 87–104.

Thulin, S. (2010). Barns frågor under en naturvetenskaplig aktivitet i förskolan. *Nordisk Barnehageforskning*, *3*(1), 27–40.

Ukrainetz, T. A., Justice, L. M., Kaderavek, J. N., Eisenberg, S. L., Gillam, R. B., & Harm, H. M. (2005). The development of expressive elaboration in fictional narratives. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *48*, 1363–1377.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 1: Problems of general psychology, including* Thinking and speech (R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton, Eds.). New York, NY: Plenum.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 4: The history of the development of higher mental functions* (M. J. Hall, Trans., R. W. Rieber, Ed.). New York: Plenum Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and creativity in childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *42*(1), 7–97.

Wagoner, B., & Gillespie, A. (2014). Sociocultural mediators of remembering: An extension of Bartlett's method of repeated reproduction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *53*, 622–639.

Wallerstedt, C., Pramling, N., & Säljö, R. (2014). Learning to discern and account: The trajectory of a listening skill in an institutional setting. *Psychology of Music*, *42*(3), 366–385.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (2009). *The meaning makers: Learning to talk and talking to learn* (2nd ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (2007). Mediation. In H. Daniels, M. Cole & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 178–192). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V., del Río, P., & Alvarez, A. (1995). Sociocultural studies: History, action, and mediation. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del Río & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 1–34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ødegaard, E. E. (2006). What is worth talking about? Meaning-making in toddler-initiated co-narratives in preschool. *Early Years*, *26*(1), 79–92.

Ødegaard, E. E. (2007). What's on the teacher's agenda? *International Journal of Early*

Childhood, *39*(2), 45–65.

Appendix A: Excerpts for Study I

Excerpt 2_a: Clarifying what the story is about

1.	AGNETA:	((håller pekfingret framför munnen)) sh °nu så ska jag säga en sak till° (.) igår (.) på samlingen (.) då var inte Emina här. /…/ Men när inte du ((pekar på Ensar)) var här åh inte Sofia ((pekar på Sofia)) åh inte Emina ((pekar på Emina)) (.) då berättade vi en ny saga (.) igår. (.) Är det nån som kommer ihåg?
		((holds her index finger in front of the mouth)) sh ° Now I'll say one more thing ° (.) yesterday (.) at circle time (.) Emina wasn't here. / ... / But when you ((points at Ensar)) wasn't here and not Sofia ((points at Sofia)) and not Emina ((points at Emina)) (.) we told a new story (.) yesterday. (.) Is there anyone who remembers?
2.	Children:	[Aa Aa
		[Aa Aa
3.	AGNETA:	[vad den sagan handlade om?
		[what the story was about?
4.	Yones:	Ja, ja det var en krabba [och en räv
		Yes, yes it was a crab [and a fox

Excerpt 2_b: Distinguishing between *what* happened and *how* it happened

8.	Yones:	Det handlade om en krabba åh en räv och krabban sa ska vi köra tävling den som hinner först har vinnit. Åh när krabban sa (.) klara färdiga kör sprang räven (.) räven sprang och sprang (("springer" med armarna)) och sen började bli (jättetrött) åh (.) åh han lekte eh eh (.) han letade efter (vrider huvudet och tittar åt höger och vänster) Han letade efter _

		It was about a crab and a fox and the crab said shall we run a race the one who comes first has won. And when the crab said (.) ready set go the fox ran (.) The fox ran and ran (("runs" with his arms)) and then started to get (tired) and (.) and he played eh eh (.) he was looking for (turns his head, looking right and left), he was looking for _
9.	**Adam:**	**efter räven ((Agneta vänder huvudet mot Adam))**
		for the fox ((Agneta turns her head towards Adam))
10.	**Yones:**	**Han letade efter (.) HAN LETADE EFTER ((tar tag i Agnetas ben. Agneta vänder sitt huvud mot Yones)) (.) åh det är jag**
		He was looking for (.) HE WAS LOOKING FOR ((grabs Agneta's legs. Agneta turns her head towards Yones)) (.) And it's me
11.	**MUNA:**	**Yasir ska berätta en saga**
		Yasir will tell a story
12.	**Yones:**	**Sen (.) sen han eh sen (han till räven sen sa) sen sa krabban till räven "Har du inte kommit ännu jag är redan här" sen sa oh nej de vann mig**
		Then (.) then he uh then (he to the fox then said) then the crab said to the fox "Have you not arrived yet, I'm already here" then said oh no they won me
13.	**AGNETA:**	**Vem vann?**
		Who won?
14.	**Yones:**	**Krabban**
		The crab
15.	**AGNETA:**	**hur kunde krabban vinna?**
		how could the crab win?
16.	**Yones:**	**jag vet inte den var den var snabb**
		I don't know it was it was fast
17.	**AGNETA:**	**den var så snabb? (.) Hur (.) Vad var det som hände i sagan? ((tittar runt på alla barnen i ringen))**

		it was <u>so</u> fast? (.) How (.) What was it that happened in the story? ((looks around at all the children in the circle))
18.	Adam:	**Han bara eh krabban bara sprang fort ((gör en snabb rörelse med handen))**
		He just uh the crab just ran quickly ((makes a quick movement with his hand))
19.	AGNETA:	**°var han så snabb och kunde springa före? °**
		°was he so fast and could run ahead? °
20.	Ensar:	**ja**
		yes
21.	Adam:	**ja FÖRE ÄN RÄVEN (.) före än räven**
		yes BEFORE THAN THE FOX (.) before than the fox
22.	Ensar:	**han springde fort**
		he runned fast

Excerpt 2_c: Retelling together

41.	AGNETA:	**Okej då gör vi tillsammans, vi som var med ((gör en cirkelrörelse med båda händerna)) berättar för Emina, Sofia och Ensar (.) okej. (.) ° Det var en gång en. ° ((böjer sig framåt))**
		Okay, let's do it together, we who attended ((making a circular motion with both hands)) tell Emina, Sofia and Ensar (.) Okay. (.) °once upon a time there was a° ((leans forward))
42.	Olivia:	**en**
		a
43.	Yones:	**räv**
		fox
44.	Adam:	**räv**
		fox
45.	AGNETA:	**ahh**
		ahh

46.	Yones:	**och han var <u>så törstig</u>, törstig så han gick nu till (.) bäcken och dricker vatten ((böjer sig fram och låtsas dricka)) och han dricker och dricker**
		and he was <u>so thirsty</u>, thirsty so he now went to (.) the creek and drinks water ((leans forward and pretends to drink)) and he drinks and drinks
47.	Adam:	**och han ((böjer sig också fram och låtsas dricka))**
		and he ((leans forward and pretends to drink))
48.	Yones:	**sen kom bara en krabba åh vad synd krabba >du är inte snabb< (.) <u>Jo</u> det är jag (.) Jag brukar springa (allt till gräset och så komma tillbaka hit) okej då, du är snabb**
		then a crab just arrived and what a pity crab > you are not fast < (.) <u>Yes</u> I am (.) I usually run (to the grass and then come back here) okay then, you're fast
49.	Adam:	**ska vi tävla? ((Agneta och Adam har ögonkontakt))**
		Shall we race? ((Agneta and Adam have eye contact))
50.	Yones:	**nu ska vi tävla då**
		now we race then
51.	AGNETA:	**Ja ska vi <u>tävla</u>? Sa krabban**
		Yes, shall we <u>race</u>? the crab said
52.	Adam:	**ja det kan vi göra ((Agneta och Adam har ögonkontakt))**
		yes we can do that ((Agneta and Adam have eye contact))
53.	Yones:	**om jag (.) OM JAG hållde så ((håller sina händer bakom ryggen. Agneta och Adam har ögonkontakt))**
		if I (.) IF I held like that ((holds his hands behind his back. Agneta and Adam have eye contact))
54.	Ensar:	**((springrörelser med armarna))**
		((running movements with his arms))
55.	Yones:	**°och sen säger klara färdiga gå (.) nu ska vi springa och se vem som kommer först. Okej då! °**
		° and then says ready set go (.) now let's run and see who comes first. Okay then! °
56.	Adam:	**De sprang krabban sprang så fort utan räven**
		They ran the crab ran so fast without the fox

Excerpt 3_a: The questions of *what* happened and *how* return

8.	Adam:	**En gång (.) det var räv som som som eh eh en krabba som var i vattnet och han kom upp från eh eh vattnet och sen i eh ska vi tävla? ”Ja det kan vi göra”. Och sen (.) och sen dom stog (.) dom (.) på doms plats åh åh och sen det var en en en rä (.) räven han han räknade en (.) han sa klara, färdiga kör åh sen dom spring. (.) Och och krabban var i i i rävens svans**
		<u>Once</u> upon a time (.) It was a fox which which which eh eh a crab which was in the water and he came up from eh eh the water and then in uh shall we race? "Yes, we can do that". And then (.) and then they stood (.) they (.) at their places and, and, and then there was a a a fo (.) the fox he he counted one (.) He said ready set go and then they run. (.) And and the crab was in in in the fox's tail
9.	AGNETA:	**Oh**
		Oh
10.	Adam:	**och räven sprang fort fort fort och fort fort (.) <u>och</u> och och krabban gick från av från från rävens eh eh eh <u>svans</u> (.) Och sen han eh eh han han gömde sig i <u>stenet</u> och sen han räven han hitta en en (.) en <u>krabban</u> åh sen sen (.) och sen sagan var slut.**
		and the fox ran fast fast fast and fast fast (.) <u>and</u> and and the crab went off from from from the fox' eh eh eh <u>tail</u> (.) And then he eh eh he he hid in <u>the stone</u> and then he the fox he found one one (.) a <u>crab</u> and then then (.) and then the story ended.
11.	AGNETA:	**okej, men vem kom först då? (.) Vem [vann?**
		Okay, but who came first then? Who [won?
12.	Adam:	**[krabban**
		[the crab
13.	T:	**<u>hur</u> kunde han komma först?**

		<u>how</u> could he come first?
14.	**Adam:**	**han vann med (.) <u>fort</u> med sina (.) sina, sina sina eh eh fötter. Dom var fort.**
		he won with (.) <u>fast</u> with his (.) his, his eh eh feet. They were fast.

Appendix B: Excerpts for Study II

Excerpt 1 a: *Changing an unfamiliar word to a more familiar one*

1.	TEACHER:	så
		so
2.	Emina:	det var en gång en… en hm tjej som är räv och hon knackade (knackar på sin
		once upon a time there was a… a hm girl who is a fox and she knocked (knocks
3		stol) på dörren. Snälla får jag sova på din ehh säng? sa hon.
		on her chair) on the door. please can I sleep on your ehh bed, she said

Excerpt 1b: *Retaining meaning with alternative wording*

4	Emina:	Neej det finns inte (slår ut med händerna) plats. Men då kan jag ta svansen
		noo there is no (throws her hands out) room. but then I can take the tail
5		(tar efter en låtsassvans) och och eh lägga på huvudet. Och sa pojken okej. Och
		(grabs a pretend tail) and and eh put on the head. and the boy said okay. and
6		sen när det bli… sol sen han sa jag ha jag har ingen kyckling (högt) jag
		then when it gets… sun he said I have no chicken (said in a loud voice) I

Excerpt 1c: *Enacting the story with embodied means and shifting tone of the voice*

7	Emina:	vill ha min kyckling sa han, och hon. Och sen knackade på annan dörr (knackar
		want my chicken he said, and she. and then knocked on another door (knocks

8		på sin stol). Och sen snälla pojken får jag (spara) sova till din säng? Det finns
		on her chair) and then kind boy can I ((save)) sleep to your bed. there is
9		inte plats (slår ut med händerna) Och sen, då ska jag lägga svansen här i
		no room (throws her hands out) and then, then I will put my tail here in
10		huvudet (tar upp handen till huvudet). Och han sov och sov och han sov (
		the head (raises her hand to her head). and he slept and slept and he slept
11		tyst, lutar huvudet och blundar) och sen när det blir sol, då sa han jag har
		quietly (leans her head and shuts her eyes) and then when it gets sun, then

Excerpt 1d: *Transforming a subject through shifting from a word to a similarly sounding one*

12	Emina:	inte mina godisar. Och sen då får du gå ut här och (lägger armarna i kors)
		he said I have not my candies. and then you get to walk out here and (puts
13		prenada [*tolkning* '*promenera*']
		her arms in cross) prenada [*interpretation*: Swedish: '*promenera*', i.e.

Excerpt 1e: *Introducing and excluding elements from the story*

14	Emina:	så… och sen… spring kom hunden och hoppade på räven och sen … räven
		walked] so… and then… run came the dog and jumped on the fox and
15		spring så fort (viftar med en arm) som han kunde.
		then… the fox run so fast (waves her arms) he could

16	Emina:	och sen han läggde sig och hunden sede svansen och sen (talar högre) … tog
		and then he putted (put) him and the dog saw-ed (saw) the tail and then
17		(tar ett steg fram och låtsas ta något) svansen. Och han gråter räven, han
		(speaking louder)… took (takes a step forward and pretends to take
18		har ingen svans. Och sen... snipp slapp var svag eh eh ehm en till saga (ler)
		something) the tail. and he cries the fox, he has no tail. and then... *snipp*
		slapp var svag eh eh ehm another story (smiles)

Excerpt 2a: *Meta communicating about the story*

1	Emina:	Okej det börjar så här, en gång det var en en en räv. Sen han ville gå ut och
		okay it starts like this, once upon a time there was a fox. then he wanted to
2		sova. Knacka på dörren (Knackar med handen på stolen)
		go out and sleep. knock on the door (knocks with her hand on the chair)
3	Maria:	knackar med sin hand på sin stol
		(knocks with her hand on her chair)
4	Emina:	snälla kan jag sova hos dig? Nej nej nej det finns inte plats. Snälla jag ska
		please can I sleep with you? no no no there is no room. please I will
5		jag ska. (lägger huvudet bakåt) Ahh jag igen glömmer. Jag ska lägga min
		I will (leaning her head backwards) ahh I again forget. I will put my
6		svans på min huvude. Okej då… kom in bara (med ljusare röst). Sen när det

		tail on my heady (head). okay then… just come in (said with a lighter voice).
7		var morgon räven han han tog sin käpp (Håller sina händer mot axeln som
		then when it was morning the fox he he took his cane (holds her hands
8		om hon håller en käpp) och läggde uppe (lyfter händerna ovanför huvudet)
		towards her shoulder as if holding a cane) and putted (put) up (lifts her hands
9		sen sa (tar ner händerna igen) var är min käpp var är min käpp (med ljusare
		above her head) then said (lowers her hands) where's my cane where's my
10		röst) Du ska ge mig godis (ler) sa räven mmm (blundar, tittar upp i taket)
		cane (said with a lighter voice) you shall give me candy (smiles) said the fox
11		aha (lutar sig framåt) jag vill få godis nu jag har tappat min… (tittar upp i
		mmm (shuts her eyes, then looks at the ceiling) aha (leans forward) I want
12		taket)
		candy now I have lost my… (looks up at the ceiling)

Excerpt 2b: *Telling* that *something happens but not* how *it happens*

13	TEACHER:	vad hade han tappat? Sin?
		what had he lost, his
14	Emina:	vänder sig på stolen och blundar
		turns around on the chair and closes her eyes

15	TEACHER:	var det käppen?
		was it the cane?
16	Emina:	käppen, nu får du ge mig godis jag har tappat min käpp
		the cane, now you'll have to give me candy I have lost my cane
17	TEACHER:	mm
		mm
18	Emina:	och sen han hade (äte) godis han gått på en annan. Gick gick (går med fingrarna på
		and then he had ((eated[ate])) candy he walked on another. walked walked (walks
19		stolen och sina ben)gick. Knackade (knackar på sin stol)
		with her fingers on the chair and her legs) walked. knocked (knocks on her chair)
20	Maria:	M knackar på sin stol
		(knocks on her chair)
21	Emina:	snälla kan jag sova hos dig? Nej nej det finns inte plats (med starkare röst) sa den
		please can I sleep with you? no no there is no room (said with stronger voice) it said
22		mannen. Men jag kan lägga min svans under. Okej då (ljusare röst) sa den pojken.
		the man. but I can put my tail under. okay then (with a lighter voice) said that boy
23		Och sen när det var igen morgon då sa han, var är mina godis var är min godis (med
		and then when it was again morning then he said, where's my candy where's my

Excerpt 2c: *The lamb returns through adhering to a song*

24	Emina	ljusare röst) Och sen, nu får du ge mig en kyckling sa räven. Och sen… mmm vad
		candy (with lighter voice) and then, now you'll have to give me a chicken said the
25		heter... okej då men glöm inte den (säger sedan något ohörbart). Då ska sova, sa
		fox. and then… mmm what's called... okay then but don't forget it (inaudible). then
26		räven. Och sen när... det var morgon igen då räven den sa, var är min kyckling!
		shall sleep, said the fox. and then when... it was morning again then the fox it said,
27		(med starkare röst) nu får du ge mig en en bä bä vita lamm, jag vill äta upp
		where's my chicken (with a stronger voice) now you'll have to give me a a
28		den (ler) sa... okej då nu får ja, nu går jag annans hus nu (sen sovde igen tills
		bä bä vita lamm (bä bä white lamb), I want to eat it (smiles) said... okay then
29		han) gått gått gått (går med fingrarna på stolen, vänder sig med ryggen mot
		now I get, now I go another's house now ((then sleepped (slept) again to he))
30		kameran) ha jag såg en till hus knacka (knackar med handen i stolen)
		walked walked walked (walks with her fingers on the chair, turns her back towards the camera) hah I saw one more house knock (knocks with her hand on the chair)
31	Maria:	(knackar med handen på stolen, ler)
		(knocks with her hand on the chair, smiles)

Excerpt 2c: *The lamb returns through adhering to a song*

Excerpt 2d: *Introducing sounds*

60	TEACHER:	men vad hände vad hände sen med hunden då?
		but what happened what happened then with the dog
61	Emina:	hon gick i an i annan hus och sen rörde sig rörde sig hunden. Den sa, det
		she went in in another house and then moved then moved the dog. it said,
62		är min bä bä vita lamm jag går (reser sig från stolen, låtsas ha en säck över
		it's my *bä bä vita lamm* I walk (gets up from the chair, pretends to have a
63		axeln) springer springer (gör springande steg) och sen plötsligt den öppnas
		sack over her shoulder) runs runs (makes running movements) and then
64		(korsar och öppnar händerna) och där var den (med viskande röst). Den sa
		suddenly it opens (crosses and opens her hands) and there it was (with a
65		voff voff (går tillbaks till sin stol) jag vill ha, den den sa aaooo aooo han
		whisper). it said *bow-vow* (gets back on her chair) I want, it it said aaooo
66		vill äta upp min min svans. Vad hjälpte di min mina ben? Jag hjälpte… att
		aooo he wants to eat my my tail. what helped you my my legs. I helped…
67		ni ska gå. Vad hjälpte du näsan då? Luktade vilken stans skall du gå. Vad
		for you to walk. what did you help then the nose. smelled where you should
68		hjälper ni ögon? Vi har kollat var du går. Men vad har du hjälp svansen?
		go. what help you eyes. we've seen where you go. but what have you helped

Excerpt 2d: *Introducing sounds*

69		Inget (med bestämd röst). Då släpper jag dig (reser sig upp från stolen och
		tail, nothing (with a firm voice). then I'll let you go (gets up from the
		chair
70		låtsas ta av sig en svans). Och sen hunden (lägger sig på golvet) aoom han
		and pretends to disconnect the tail). and then the dog (lays down on the
71		tog rävens svans. Nej min svans, sen räven jaga den ah ah ha (kryper fram
		floor) aoom he took the fox's tail. no my tail, then the fox chased it ah ah
		ha
72		över golvet) nej min svans min svans. (reser sig upp) nu *snapp slut sagan*
		(crawls across the floor) no my tail my tail. (gets up) now *snapp slut*
		sagan
73		*var slut*
		The end

Excerpt 3: *Elaborating with two identities*

104	Emina:	*sen* och sen *när det var morgon* det var morgon… *nu får du ge mig en hund ohh*
		then and then *when it was morning* it was morning… *now you'll have to give me a*
105		(tittar mot T och ler)
		dog ohh (looks at the teacher and smiles)
106	TEACHER:	hi hi hi
		hi hi hi
107	Emina:	nej ingen huund (lutar sig mot dataskärmen och höjer rösten)

		no not a dooog (leans forward towards the screen and raises her voice)
108	TEACHER:	var det inte så
		wasn't it like that
109	Emina:	nej... det e det var en det var en lamm igen det var en lamm
		no... it eh it was a it was a lamb again it was a lamb
110	TEACHER:	jaha
		aha
111	Emina:	hon vet hon vet inte den Eminan (pekar mot dataskärmen och ler)
		she doesn't she doesn't know that Emina (points at the screen and smiles)
112	TEACHER:	den där Emina har har glömt hur det var men den här Emina kommer ihåg
		hat Emina has forgotten how it went but this Emina remembers
113	Emina:	ja
		yes
114	TEACHER:	vad konstigt tycker jag att den Emina har glömt men den här kommer ihåg.
		how strange I think that that Emina has forgotten but this one remembers
115	Emina:	det var jag
		it was me
116	TEACHER:	är det du
		is that you
117	Emina:	ahh

		yees

Appendix C: Consent form

Till vårdnadshavare

Hej,
Förskolan Almgården/ Peppargatan 7-9 ingår i ett projekt tillsammans med Mary Thelander/ Kanada om att stötta barns berättande och sociala förståelse. Inom ramen för detta projekt genomför jag nu på halvtid ett uppsatsarbete vid Göteborgs universitet. Två dagar i veckan arbetar jag kvar på förskolan. Då vi nu har nytillkomna barn sedan projektet startad i oktober 2013 skickar jag ut denna medgivandeblankett. Uppsatsen skrivs inom den nationella forskarskolan, Forskarskola i kommunikation och relationer som grundläggande för barns lärande (FoRFa). För att följa arbetet med berättande och hur barnen berättar och förstår berättelser behöver jag dokumentera arbetet. Detta görs genom att filma våra berättelseaktiviteter. Dessa filmer analyserar jag sedan för att ha som underlag när jag skriver. Materialet kommer att användas till forskande ändamål samt undervisningssyfte.

Deltagande är frivilligt och att varje deltagare har rätt att avbryta sin medverkan när de så önskar. För att kunna genomföra och spela in berättelseaktiviteterna behöver jag tillåtelse från dig som vårdnadshavare. Jag ber dig därför att fylla i talongen och återlämna denna till mig så snart som möjligt. Studien följer Vetenskapsrådets forskningsetiska principer. När jag (tillsammans med mina handledare) skriver om studien kommer barnen och förskolan att ges fingerade namn. Tveka inte att kontakta mig eller mina handledare om du har några frågor.

Vänliga hälsningar Agneta

Agneta Pihl   Niklas Pramling   Louise Peterson
agneta.pihl@gu.se   niklas.pramling@ped.gu.se   louise.peterson@ped.gu.se

Institutionen för pedagogik, kommunikation och lärande
Göteborgs universitet
Box 300
405 30 Göteborg
031- 786 XXXX

Vårdnadshavare till: …………………………………………………..

☐ Ja, jag ger tillåtelse att mitt barn får delta i studien.

☐ Nej, jag vill inte att mitt barn deltar.

Målsmans underskrift:………………………………………………………….

Namnförtydligande:……………………………………………………………