

Audiovisual Methods in Research with Children: Interaction with Cameras and Videos*

Larissa Krüger-Fernandes^{**,***} , Lady Daiane Martins Ribeiro , & Fabrícia Teixeira Borges 

Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, DF, Brasil

ABSTRACT – This article aims to analyze the use of audiovisual methods in research with children. Four children participated in this research about the presence of digital technologies in their lives in an urban childhood context. The methodological procedures were conversation circles and the production of videos. Results show the participants' interaction with the camera as an "other" that should be positioned, a transposition of meanings from audiovisual production to the research context, and the influence of the format of YouTubers' videos on the production of a video in a group. In addition to functioning as recording instruments, cameras, and audiovisual products imply specific modes of interaction and positioning among children.

KEYWORDS: audiovisual methods, research with children, developmental psychology, qualitative research.

Métodos Audiovisuais em Pesquisas com Crianças: A Relação com Câmeras e Vídeos

RESUMO – Este artigo objetiva refletir sobre a utilização de métodos audiovisuais em pesquisas com crianças. Participaram desta pesquisa quatro crianças sobre a presença das tecnologias digitais em suas vidas em um contexto de infância urbana. Os procedimentos metodológicos foram rodas de conversa e a produção de vídeos. Os resultados evidenciam a relação dos participantes com a câmera como um outro que precisa ser posicionado, a transposição de significados relacionados ao contexto de produções audiovisuais para o momento da pesquisa e a influência do formato dos vídeos de youtubers na produção de um vídeo em grupo. Para além de funcionarem como instrumentos de registro, as câmeras e os produtos audiovisuais suscitam modos específicos de interação e de posicionamento entre as crianças.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: métodos audiovisuais, pesquisa com crianças, psicologia do desenvolvimento, pesquisa qualitativa.

In research with children, the use of different methods has been explored mainly in the areas of Education (Martins Filho & Barbosa, 2010; Werle & Bellochio, 2016), Sociology and Anthropology of Childhood (Delgado & Müller, 2005; Friedmann, 2011; Pires, 2007) and Psychology, especially Developmental Psychology (Campos-Ramos & Barbato, 2014; Krüger-Fernandes, 2018; Naves et al, 2018, Ribeiro et al, 2020). A concern of research in these areas is regarding the leading role of the participating children, with the main challenge being the goal of contemplating children's expressive processes (Werle & Bellochio, 2016). This implies elaborating methodological designs that place children in an

active role, even occupying the status of researchers or co-researchers in some cases (Alderson, 2005; Campos-Ramos & Barbato, 2014).

Bearing in mind that the ethical relationship between children and researchers always cuts across the entire research process and emphasizing that current research always implies an interpretation of adults about children, taking on this role and planning the methodological design having this in mind may provide contexts of greater expression of participants (Becker, 2016; Fernandes, 2016; Martins Filho & Barbosa, 2010). The methodological procedures adopted in research with children range from playful practices mediated or not by

* Este artigo é baseado na dissertação de mestrado da primeira autora.

** Pesquisadora em formação pela Escola Internacional de Doutorado da Universidad de Educación a Distancia – UNED, no Programa de Doutorado Diversidad, Subjetividad y Socialización. Estudios en Antropología Social, Historia de la Psicología y de la Educación.

*** E-mail: larissakf54@gmail.com

Submetido: 18/10/2021; Aceito: 13/01/2022.

objects (Almeida et al., 2020); conversation circles (Alessi, 2014; Ribeiro et al., 2020); production of drawings and stories (Friedmann, 2011); to photographs and videos produced by the children, by their caregivers or by researchers (Farias & Müller, 2017; Maheirie et al., 2014; Pires, 2007; Plowman & Stevenson, 2012), among others.

The presence of digital technologies is part of an urban childhood that interacts with audiovisual production and audiovisual products (Krüger-Fernandes, 2018). Children are increasingly more comfortable in the presence of cameras and recording equipment, interacting directly with them in the research context, as was the case of the research reported in this article. The audiovisual products accessible on YouTube platform channels, for example, are present in the discursive exchanges between children and in their ways of expressing themselves, having in the YouTubers their most powerful expression (Krüger-Fernandes, 2018; Dalethese, 2017). Because they are increasingly present in children's routines, in moments of play as well as in moments of study and research, digital technologies present an accessible and everyday language for them (González-Patiño, 2011; Plowman & Stevenson, 2012; Krüger-Fernandes & Borges, 2020). Regarding the use of audiovisual methods, this popularization and accessibility of mobile digital devices in recent years – particularly smartphones – in various social strata, including their presence in the daily lives of children (*Comitê Gestor da Internet no Brasil*, 2019), has made the handling of these devices effective in research contexts.

According to Dalethese (2017), during interaction with the YouTube platform and with YouTubers, children access the logic of the spectacle existing in that culture, which has as values the fame (counted in numbers of subscribers) and the possibility of monetization (to use a common term in the platform) of audiovisual products, which means receiving financial gains related to the number of views of the videos. Considering this context, video production practices today are often conducted with the objective of sharing. This implies a notion of an imagined audience with which there is a dialogue during the video. This imagined audience is present since the shooting process and enhances an “I” for the other (Bakhtin, 2011) that is displayed in these videos (Sibilia, 2016). In other words, the imagined ‘other’ establishes the boundaries of what can be said, experienced, and reproduced. Moreover, it highlights ideological elements (Volóchinov, 2017) that delineate the processes of otherness (Bakhtin, 2011) that make up these children's relationship with images both as viewers and creators (Almeida et al., 2020).

These considerations are strongly related to the tools used for producing images as cultural artifacts because each instrument highlights or neglects features, establishes functions and discards others, modifies the contexts of production, and shapes sociological and psychological aspects. According to Jobim e Souza (2008), the technical image is configured as an instrument of invention and

recreation of reality, and technical innovation expands the experimentation of reality and demands creating new cultural codes to reach these new experiences that need to be experienced in language.

On this topic, Orozco-Gómez (2006) states that a new type of knowledge related to the production and editing of images has been emerging, precisely because of the audiences' increased contact with the media. The contact with audiovisual productions by the population and the increasing access to image production technologies have made it possible to consider the use of these resources in research. It should be emphasized that the presence of audiovisual methods in research implies specificities related to the production of meanings regarding audio and video-capturing instruments. Besides functioning as recording instruments, the cameras and audiovisual products in research trigger specific modes of interaction and positioning, as well as reflection processes that emerge from the representation of reality in video format.

According to Positioning Theory (Harré & Langenhove, 2003), participants of dialogues assign themselves fluid roles that change during conversations, being thus configured as positioning dynamics driven by the logic of power and identification. During the creation of a group video in a research context, for example, we find the emergence of negotiation processes between participants, as well as extremely active imaginative processes (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016) both in the retrieval of memories of audiovisual products and in the creation of the final narrative that happens still during planning and shooting. Moreover, the contact with the finalized audiovisual product allows an exotopic positioning (Bakhtin, 2011) regarding the lived experience, enabling the re-signification of practices and of oneself as a subject capable of producing something new, surpassing reflections and affections (Maheirie et al., 2014).

Literature review shows (Garcez et al., 2011; Honorato et al., 2006; Silva et al., 2014) articles that address factors related to the use of audiovisual methods in research with children. These articles focus mainly on videotaping as a method of recording and even of research feedback. The articles on the topic point out advantages, such as the possibility of capturing details that go unnoticed in direct observation of interactions among children and advance reflections on technical and ethical aspects of the use of videotaping (Garcez et al., 2011; Honorato et al., 2006). The decision to transcribe or not the audiovisual material is also addressed, considering transcription as a process influenced by the researcher's assumptions when approaching their object of study (Silva et al., 2014).

These considerations are crucial and essential when we consider the use of audiovisual methods in research with children. To contribute to this scenario, we should also address the presence of cameras in the research context and the participants' interaction with them, as well as the

interactional and psychological processes involved in the production of a group video. The investigative practice with children led us to come across these issues, and the research context made us think about these methodological implications. To do so, we draw from our theoretical background – the Cultural Psychology approach to Human Development (Bruner, 1997; Valsiner, 2012; Vygotsky, 2020; Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016); from authors of the philosophy

of language (Bakhtin, 2011; Volóchinov, 2017) that underpin our method of analysis – the Dialogical Thematic Analysis (Silva & Borges, 2017; Krüger-Fernandes et al, 2021); as well as other authors' contributions from other fields related to Psychology that allow us to analyze the relations with cultural artifacts and discursive interactions established among research participants, especially children.

METHODOLOGY

This paper stems from information produced in research intended to analyze two conversation circles conducted with four children and the audiovisual narratives produced by them about the presence of technologies in their lives. We selected three moments of the research in which the interaction with these instruments was more evident: (a) the beginning of the first conversation circle; (b) a video produced by one of the participants; and (c) the moment of the production of a group video, which occurred at the beginning of the second conversation circle.

In this article, we address some points: the interaction of participants with the camera as an “other” that needs to be positioned; the transposition of meanings generally used in the audiovisual production context to the moment of the research; the context and modes of production of a video made by a participant; and the influence of the format of YouTubers' videos in the production of a group video.

The research used a qualitative design with conversation circles and audiovisual resources (video production) to produce information with participants. Qualitative research is characterized as a situated activity that takes on a bricolage aspect, in which the researcher assembles the information produced with participants, using different instruments and techniques that cannot be thought of in order of importance

and are reflected in the research results (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018).

Based on the understanding of knowledge construction as a product of dialogic interaction among all those involved in the research process (Bakhtin, 2011), and aiming to consider the children's voices, the research was structured in three moments: 1) Conversation Circle about Technology; 2) Children's Production of Videos about Technology; and 3) Conversation Circle after the Production of Videos. This way, the study intended to offer different conditions for the production of information, facilitating dialogue and reflection processes about the same theme.

The research used audiovisual production tools – two video cameras on tripods used for video graphing the conversation circles, and the children's smartphones – for recording and producing information. The children interacted with these devices throughout the process, which brought very specific characteristics to the process and the information produced. We emphasize the use of mobile digital devices (smartphones) by the participating children for the production of the information (videos), considering that the use of these devices to express their ideas places them in a privileged cultural place due to their history of interaction with the devices.

METHOD

Research Context and Participants

The research took place in the common area of a condominium in an Administrative Region of the Federal District in Brazil. To conduct the research outside an institution, the choice of a condominium as a research location in which the meeting with the participants would be held was considered to be a valid alternative. As the children lived in the same place, they already knew each other and some of them were close friends, which may also have facilitated a more spontaneous interaction of the group throughout the research.

At first, contact was made with a potential participant – Bela (12 years old) – who introduced us to the field by walking around the common area of the condominium in search of other participants. This process of field approach lasted one month. After this initial contact, three more children showed interest in taking part in the research. Thus, four children with ages ranging from 9 to 12 years participated in the research. Participants were selected by convenience, according to the following criteria: (a) having smartphones and tablets of their own or at their disposal; (b) being able to use the devices to successfully make videos, reducing the need for assistance and granting more openness to the child's

spontaneous expression. Table 1 shows the participants' characterization.

The first contact was made with the tutors of the potential participants. The Socioeconomic Questionnaires, the Terms of Free and Informed Consent, and the Terms of Authorization for the Use of Image and Voice for Research Purposes were then handed out for completion. Questions about the research were answered, and phone contacts were informed. We emphasize that, before contacting participants, the research project was approved by the Research Ethics Council of the Institute of Human Sciences (*Conselho de Ética em Pesquisa do Instituto de Ciências Humanas, CEP/ IH*) of the University of Brasília.

In the first meeting, a conversation circle about technology was conducted. The meeting first approached the ethical aspects of the research with the children in an appropriate language, and the Terms of Consent were presented. The children's understanding of the research was explored and questions were answered. Terms were signed and the children were offered the possibility of choosing codenames to refer to in the research report.

At the end of the conversation circle, children were asked to produce a video about technology using the devices they had access to. Three weeks later we met in another room at the same condominium and learned that only Mar and Bela had produced their videos. Although Bela had also made her video, participants decided to record a video together as soon as we finished watching Mar's video. This fact allowed us to witness the process of creating a group video, including the negotiation of ideas, preparation to be on the camera, as well as the prospection of editing the final narrative that occurs during the shooting.

Procedures of Conversation Circle Analysis

The Dialogical Thematic Analysis (Silva & Borges, 2017; Krüger-Fernandes et al., 2021) analyzed the information produced in the field, in which the emerging themes and sub-themes are identified as well as the relations between them. In this type of analysis, the turns of speech are considered as a dialogical construction of

information, that regards the inseparable presence of the researcher in continuous interaction with participants in the process of producing the research information. This type of analysis is based on the ideas about language designed and discussed within the Bakhtin Circle (Bakhtin, 2011; Volóchinov, 2017). Therefore, the Dialogical Thematic Analysis focuses on describing the dialogical processes, i.e., the interlocutory game that is established between the research subjects. For this reason, the approach to the audiovisual material and the transcribed material is thoroughly done, prioritizing the sequence of dialogues, verbal, and body expressions.

Transcription was the first step in reviewing the information from the conversation circle. It considered the verbatim statements of participants, their behavior, as well as aspects of the interaction that occurred at the moment of the speech. Dialogues were organized in turns of speech and pauses, overlapping speeches, emphases, and inaudible speech were indicated by these symbols: R= Researcher; B= Bela; U= Unicorn; M= Mar; S= Superman; . = short pause; .. = medium pause; ... = long pause; word = emphasis; _ = overlapping speech; (...) = inaudibility; [...] = suppression of speech for better understanding of the dialogue; * = behavior description.

Procedures to Analyze Videos Produced by the Children

The transcription of the videos produced by the children followed the model elaborated by Rose (2003) which considers both visual and verbal dimensions. The forms of editing were considered as part of the visual dimension, including types of cuts, camera movements, and the presence or absence of background music. The children's speeches were transcribed to make up the verbal dimension. The analysis started with the transcription, which should not be understood as a copy of the video (original text), but as a source of entirely new results. Besides the thematic analysis of the verbal content, the audiovisual material was analyzed as an amalgam of meanings, images, techniques, composition, and sequence of scenes (Rose, 2003).

Table 1
Table of Participants (Codenames Chosen by Participants)

Codename	Sex	Age	Attends:	Family income range
Bela	F	12	Private school	More than 10 minimum wages
Unicorn	F	11	Public school	More than 10 minimum wages
Mar	F	09	Private school	More than 10 minimum wages
Superman	M	09	Public school	From 2 to 5 minimum wages

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Starting the Conversation: The Camera as an 'Other' in the Dialogue Construction

While we were setting up the cameras, some of the children's conversations caught our attention. Right at the beginning, when the children were deciding where to sit on the couch, Bela and Unicorn started a dialogue interacting with the camera. Although it occurred playfully, the tone of the dialogue is of a challenge, and it seems to be an attempt to position oneself (Harré & Van Langenhove, 2003) as someone dangerous, or as someone with whom the other needs courage to talk to, as it can be observed in the following dialogue:

1. U- What's up, bro? Do you really want to mess with me?
2. B- Do you want to mess with me? Hmmm.
3. U – Ahmm, will you have the courage to do it?
4. B- Be smart, bro.
5. U- Who wants to mess with the...group...bro.
6. B- Bro.

Considering this is a moment of initial dialogue in which positioning in the group is still being established, Bela and Unicorn already make clear their positioning as more dominant, automatically positioning the other as someone who should be afraid and "be smart". According to Harré and Van Langenhove's (2003) Positioning Theory, positioning oneself and positioning the other constitute the attribution of fluid roles to participants in a discursive construction, which makes people's actions intelligible and relatively determined as social acts. Because these positions are fluid, they may change during the conversation, and different and even contradictory positions may be adopted throughout the conversation. These positions can be passively accepted or challenged by others through the dialogical processes that characterize the dynamics of conversation since the control of the dialogue over the other is characterized as an ideological endowment of power (Harré & Van Langenhove, 2003).

The dialogue thread shows that Bela validates Unicorn's positioning and positions herself as similar. This resonance that Unicorn perceives regarding her speech seems to be related to a restructuring of the sentence in speech turn (1) to speech turn (5) and that consists of the change from a positioning of a solitary self (me) to a positioning of the group (us) (Harré & Van Langenhove, 2003). The emphasis on the word 'bro' may also indicate this belonging to the group. It should be noted that 'bro' is a slang term in the English language and is derived from the word brother (Merriam-Webster, 2020).

Another element that draws attention is the fact that the children address the camera while dialoguing, positioning the other in this artifact (Bakhtin, 2011). In this case, the other is the gaze that will see the screen in the future. The other who will watch the screen in the future is present in the dialogue above and many other dialogues throughout the conversations and videos made by the children. This may be considered an action that transcends time and builds new chronotopes by the displacement of the self concerning the camera, which works both as the other and as the self on the border between the various voices (Bakhtin, 2018).

This interaction leads us to think of a temporal displacement toward the future (Valsiner, 2012), the assumption that the lens that records the image, that will further be displayed on the screen, always has an observer – an "other" who needs to be positioned -; and the presence of the camera, that for these children refers to the image on the screen that will unavoidably be watched. This interaction is only made possible by the presence of the camera which acts as a mediator in the production of such meanings (Jobim e Souza, 2008). According to Vygotsky (2020), the interaction with cultural artifacts is externally oriented, changing the relationship between humans and their environment in a dialectical movement that eventually changes their nature, leading to changes in cognitive functioning. The cultural artifact becomes a mediating instrument through the appropriation of the utilization schemes by the subject (Vygotsky, 2020), establishing a semiotic mediation with the world.

Sometime after the dialogue described above, Unicorn gets up from the couch and, tossing her hair from side to side as shown in Figure 1, says:

1. U- Guys, I'm the main actress, okay. I'm the star... You there, keep quiet. Cause you are actresses, dancers in the background.
2. S- Really, you're the main actress. Yeah, you're the main actress.

Again, Unicorn expresses herself in a way that creates tension between her position and the other participants (Harré & Van Langenhove, 2003). Unlike the first dialogue, in which the other is not explicit, in the example above she explicitly refers to her friends (other participants), even pointing at them with her finger. The analogy that Unicorn makes of the research moment with a shooting set or a theatrical space matches elements that she identifies as belonging to this context, such as video cameras and tripods that are mediating the processes of meaning-making in dialogue (Volóchinov, 2017).



Figure 1. Videorecording Frame

In this context, she imagines herself as the “main actress” and the other participants as “actresses, dancers in the background”. In addition to the hierarchy dynamics that she establishes through this dialogue, imaginative processes are also present and allow her to imagine herself and her friends as being something different from what they are. The imaginative processes stem from experiences with the everyday world (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016), therefore from the reality experienced. This leads us to reflect on the familiarity of these children with the aforementioned context.

Adding a counterpoint in a tone of irony, Superman reinforces the idea that Unicorn is the main actress. The repetition of Unicorn’s speech and his ironic tone indicates that he disagrees with what she says, maybe because he thinks it is unfair, maybe because he wants to be the “main actor”. Ironically, he seems to challenge Unicorn’s position and, thus, the position that she assigned to the other participants. Irony is characterized as an ambiguous form of discourse that establishes ambivalence, giving rise to a dissonance between the speech and the meaning of the speech (Alvarce, 2009). This dissonance can only be understood about other elements of the discourse, such as the extra-verbal aspects of the situation of production, reception, and circulation of meanings, thus enabling the analysis of speech as an ideological sign (Volóchinov, 2017).

When Superman repeats Unicorn’s speech in speech turn (2), he is using one of the main resources of irony, namely bivolucism. This feature is defined as a word in two voices, in which two conflicting opinions or two conflicting intentions are present (Bubnova, 2011). The conflict exposed in Superman’s ironic speech gives rise to tension (Volóchinov, 2017) established between the two participants regarding being more important than the other. This fact is related to the idea of appearing in the video, being closer or farther from the camera. According to this logic, participants understand visibility as being a sign of greater or lesser

importance (Sibilia, 2016). The “actresses and dancers in the background” do not even have the right to speak – “You there, keep quiet”. This desire to be seen entails the idea of an altered subjectivity, built for the other’s gaze (Sibilia, 2016), an exhibition of the self, a spectacle of the I.

The meanings expressed at this moment are closely related to the presence of the cameras. Similarly, another dialogue indicates this notion of an image built for the other that is contextually related to the video recording situation and to the fact of being on the camera (Sibilia, 2016). In the next dialogue thread, the researcher points out that one of the participants had put on lipstick, getting ready for the research moment. Unicorn responds in a way that relates this preparation to the fact of being filmed, which Bela complements with the idea of being a “celebrity” and “appearing at the University of Brasília”. We notice that the participants connect the idea of being a celebrity and appearing at the University of Brasília, suggesting that the University of Brasília is understood as a place of visibility for children in contact with the meanings present in this culture (Bruner, 1997; Valsiner, 2012). Bela indicates that being a participant in research being conducted at the University of Brasília is perceived as a factor of fame in the world of spectacle (Debord, 1997; Sibilia, 2016).

R- Bela put on lipstick. Wow.

U- Obviously. We’ll be on camera.

B- We’re celebrities. We’re going to appear at the University of Brasília.

We could say that participants channel the voices of the culture in which they live (Bakhtin, 2011; Volóchinov, 2017) when expressing the links between having visibility in some medium and being a celebrity or being famous. According to Sibilia (2016), the word famous is no longer

an adjective, becoming a self-justifying noun, with no need for a complement such as a famous actress or a famous politician. In this way, “celebrity is self-legitimizing: it is as tautological as the spectacle because it is the spectacle” (Sibilia, 2016, p. 312, free translation). The only factor that justifies celebrity is, therefore, visibility mediated by an instrument that carries a set of these historically constructed meanings deposited in it, i.e., the camera (Bruner, 1997; Jobim e Souza, 2008).

Soon after, Bela mentions the idea of having a YouTube channel relating it to the actual possibility of “getting rich”. Corporally interacting with Unicorn as she speaks, her words shape the social context in which she develops (Volóchinov, 2017), in which the visibility mentioned in the previous paragraph, and that is currently accessible to many through the YouTube platform, is related to significant monetary gains (Dalethese, 2017).

B – Guys, imagine if we had a YouTube channel. We’d be rich.

*Bela looks at and interacts with Unicorn. Unicorn leans back and puts her hands open in front of her face.

We understand that Bela’s speech expresses the notion that anyone, even a child, can have a YouTube channel and that the consequences of this visibility are understood as

a valid option to earn money and become a professional (Hidalgo-Mari & Segarra-Saavedra, 2017), as we will see in the second conversation circle when children decide to be YouTubers in the production of a group video.

Production of Videos about Technology by the Children: Analysis of Mar’s Video

In Mar’s video, we can notice the presence of other children acting in the production process together. The camera (smartphone) was in the hand of the participant Unicorn and another child interactively acted with Mar in a rehearsed dialogue. The selection of the location for filming, the editing method used, and the presence of other children acting as a team are important points to understand what is relevant to the participant in question. Table 2 shows an example of the transcription of the videos produced by the children.

The decision to film at the condo’s playground shows the relevance of this place as a meeting point for the children. It may indicate that Mar feels comfortable at this place where children circulate without much adult supervision. Another relevant fact is that, although her video addresses the issue of technology, the very choice of the playground as a filming location stands as a counterpoint to the use of mobile digital devices by children. In a way, in her video Mar illustrates

Table 2
Example of Transcription of the Videos Produced by the Children: Mar’s Video

Mar’s Video – Organized by Cuts	
Visual Dimension	Verbal dimension
Camera movement from left to right. Two benches and a little girl turning cartwheels appear in the video until the camera stops and focuses on the playground toy (colorful, plastic, made up of slide, toboggan). Sitting on the top of the toboggan, a girl wearing a kitty cat tiara and casual clothes appears. She asks Mar, gesturing with her hands interrogatively. Rehearsed lines. Cut (done using the cell phone pause button).	T- Mar, what are you doing?
Still camera. Close-up on Mar who is sitting higher up on the same toboggan. Mar has the cell phone in her hand and alternates her gaze between the camera, the cell phone, and T. while talking. Cut (done using the cell phone pause button).	M- I’m studying for my English test.
Still camera. Frame closed on T. who first looks at the camera and then looks away to Mar. She gestures interrogatively while asking the question to Mar. Cut (made with the cell phone pause button)	T- On your cell phone?
Still camera. Close-up of Mar. With the cell phone in her hand, Mar looks first at the camera and then at T. Her expression shows a certain impatience as if she is stating the obvious to her friend. Cut (done using the cell phone pause button).	M- Technology helps a lot of things nowadays. Don’t you know that?
Still camera. Frame closed on T. who first looks at the camera and then looks away to Mar. T. speaks in a thin voice. Cut (done using the cell phone pause button).	T- No, I don’t.

Note. Video 1 is organized by cuts. Location: condominium playground at night. Initials used in the dialog: M- Mar; T-Girl with kitty tiara; U- Unicorn (shooting).

the coexistence between more conventional games – such as turning cartwheels, playing at the playground, or going down a slide – with the presence of mobile digital technologies (Plowman & Stevenson, 2012).

Regarding editing, the participant used a feature of her cell phone camera that allows her to film several takes one after the other, pausing the shot to mark a cut. If the user doesn't like the take, it is possible to delete it and shoot it again, and the parts are automatically joined. When the video is complete, you just have to click the stop button. This is a convenient option that does not require extra editing apps or programs for video production.

The participant's choice to work with other children indicates that, for her, making a video is group work in which each one plays a role in the process. The production of her video involved at least four children: one child handled the smartphone camera, making camera movements, marking the cuts, and delimiting frames; another child acted as an extra by turning cartwheels in the opening shot; one child acted as an actress by performing the dialogues rehearsed with Mar; and, finally, the participant herself. In the first shot of the video, the camera moves from left to right, referring to something the participant had said during the first conversation circle.

M- Can we use; can we also use experiences from other movies?

R- Like what?

M- Like, to use some other movies as examples. And get some ideas.

R- Sure...and where would you look at that?

M- In a movie that I find funny.

R- That you like?

M – Yeah.

R- What is it?

M- *O diário de Tati*¹.

R – Yes, you can get some ideas from it. What is it about this movie that you like so much?

M- No...it's because it starts by showing her room, then it goes to her bed, she doesn't want to wake up.

*While Mar is talking, she shows with her left hand the movement of the camera from right to left.

R- Oh yeah? Oh, cool...This is a scene, you understand?

M- It's something that it is like me because I also hate waking up... Sooo.

¹ *O Diário de Tati* is a Brazilian comedy film released in 2012 by Globo Filmes. It was directed by Mauro Farias, with a script based on the book *O Diário de Tati*, by Heloísa Périssé, who stars in the feature film.

We understand that Mar draws on experiences she has previously had with videos and films to creatively imagine and plan her video (Orozco-Gómez, 2006; Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016). The fact that Mar emphasizes the form of the audiovisual narrative – camera movement – and not only its content shows us her understanding of how this language is structured (Orozco-Gómez, 2006).

The verbal content of Mar's video addresses an issue related to her school experience emphasizing the role of the smartphone/Internet in her learning process. This suggests the relevance of the theme for the participant, and her understanding of digital technologies as mediators of her study-learning processes (González-Patiño, 2011). This amalgam of meanings, images, techniques, composition, and sequence of scenes (Rose, 2003) that is accessible by the composition created by Mar in her video (visual and verbal elements) offers us a complex picture in which digital technologies coexist with more traditional childhood plays and mediate the participant's study-learning processes.

Conversation Circle Post-Video Production: Production of a New Group Video

The second conversation circle took place three weeks after the first circle. The second circle was intended to watch the videos made by the participants and to witness the children's perceptions and reflections about the process of making the videos and the research in general. However, when meeting with the children the researcher learned that not all participants had made the video. Only Bela and Mar had produced their videos and, in addition, Bela said she did not like her video and asked for permission to make another one.

Because of the mentioned facts, we started the second conversation circle by watching Mar's video together and, during this activity, the children proposed making a group video. From that moment on, the children got together to produce a group video, mobilizing imaginative processes, negotiating ideas, and reflecting on decisions. Therefore, the researcher witnessed the production process of this new video from the moment of its conception to its completion.

Conceiving the Group Video: A YouTuber's Channel

After watching Mar's video, the children got together to produce a group video. They began to brainstorm options for locations, costumes, and the motto of the video. The activity demanded children expose their ideas and negotiate decisions as a group, as can be seen in the following excerpt:

U- We can do it like this...Hi, guys.

B- But are we going to do a vlog or are we going to do like... like...we could do like...we were the preppies.

U- Oh, no.

B- I'm giving you an idea; you have to give yours too.

U- No...we pretend that we are a channel of famous YouTubers and we make up questions...then we ask them like this: What is the Internet for you? Then someone asks something else... what is this? [...] Then, each one answers the same question, for example, you ask: what is this?

B- Nice.

U- Then Mar answers: for me, this, and this. Superman answers: for me this and this. Bela answers: for me that's it, that's it. The same ones...this is it; this is it.

Analyzing the logic of power in speech (Volóchinov, 2017) in this dialogue, we can notice that Unicorn seems to take the lead in decisions, which ends up causing some discontent in another participant: Bela. Despite that, Unicorn's idea is accepted by the group with no need to try to convince the other participants, which indicates everyone's identification with the choice: "a famous YouTuber's channel".

Since the first conversation circle, children refer to the YouTubers they watch and imitate their behavior, the way they use their voice to interact directly with the camera. They rely on the format of this audiovisual narrative to express themselves, and the selection of this format for the group video only consolidates the presence of this cultural phenomenon in the lives of these children (Valsiner, 2012). By "pretending" that they have a famous YouTube channel, they are saying they want to be YouTubers, that they want to experience this role, and that they build their selves mirrored in these personalities (Dalethese, 2017). In the next excerpt, we see that they play with the idea of being famous, and make references to famous personalities in this field, such as Maísa²:

U- Hey Superman, do you like my idea? We'll pretend we are a channel of a super famous Youtuber.

S – You are Maísa...just kidding, hahaha.

U- I'm going to be the channel owner because I came up with the idea.

B- Ahhhh, Unicorn. Please, bro. We'll all be together.

U- Then I say: I am here with several participants...ahm, Mar, aahm [...]...Bela, Mar...

In Unicorn's speech, we can see that the activity of producing the video mobilized imaginative processes (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2016) in which the children shifted through

time anticipating and planning what they would do and what they would say during the shooting. Still, during the negotiation of what the video would look like, Superman begins to interact directly with the camera, addressing an imagined audience with whom he seems to have intimacy, which appears in his lines: "Hi guys", "Welcome to another video", "From our channel", "From your channel" at the end of the excerpt below.

U- Okay, let me start.

B- Wow, Unicorn. Stop being selfish, man. So, make your video, then. Oh, my God.

R- Are you ready?

B- No...it's going to be...it's going to be the Unicorn channel.

U – Ready? Each one will ask a question and then they will answer.

S- No...

B- Let's do it this way...[...] each one does their own thing and then we'll make participations.

U- Nooooooooooooooooo.

S – Hi, guys.

M – No, let's do it... everyone together.

U- Yes. It's going to be a lot of work.

S- Welcome to another video.

U – From our channel.

S – From your channel.

*Superman looks at the camera pointing at it with his index finger.

We can notice that, while Bela and Unicorn are arguing about who will start the video and what each one will say, Superman takes the floor (Volóchinov, 2017) by looking at the camera and greeting the channel's audience. This upsets the other two participants and alters the power relations, with Unicorn validating Superman's positioning (Harré & Van Langenhove, 2003). This only happens because of the way Superman expresses himself consistent with the way YouTubers communicate (Hidalgo-Marí & Segarra-Saavedra, 2017).

The interaction that spontaneously unfolds between Superman and the Unicorn at the end of the excerpt above suggests their familiarity with the format of this type of audiovisual narrative (Orozco-Gómez, 2006). The lines naturally complement each other. Moreover, the children decide to "pretend" that the questions they are asking in the video were sent by their audience in the comments section, complementing their imaginative experience with the possibility of synchronous interaction in that space. For this, they used a smartphone device with which they "pretended" to read the questions.

² Maísa da Silva Andrade (May 22, 2002) is a Brazilian TV host, Youtuber, actress, and singer. She started her career at the age of three, when she took part in a talent show on the Raul Gil TV program, on Record and Band TV channels.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The use of audiovisual resources in research with children cannot be understood only from its functionality as a videotaping instrument. The presence of cameras brings to the research process – and thus to the information produced in this context-specific features that become apparent in participants' interactions. For the research presented in this article, the children actively interacted with the cameras, transferring meanings belonging to the context of audiovisual productions to the research moment, and turning to the camera as an “other” that needs to be positioned and that is part of the interlocutory game. The production of videos by the children also worked as a way of expressing what is important to them, and their understanding about the production of audiovisual narratives.

These processes are marked by the strong presence of imaginative functions that operate as a displacement of the here and now, moving through different levels of reality

to materialize their narratives in the logic of audiovisual language. We highlight the important role of the audiovisual cultural elements with which the children had contacted earlier in their lives as enablers of these imaginative movements. During the activity of creating a group video, children were also requested to exercise their negotiation skills, as they had to make decisions together.

In this sense, the use of digital devices for the production of information in this research required reflections on the presence of cameras and videos produced by children. We consider that using these devices to express their ideas places them in a privileged place due to the interaction history that these children have with the devices. We emphasize that, throughout the research, children gave clues about what they thought of the proposed methodological procedures, demanding a process of continuous reflection and adaptation of these procedures based on the reactions of the participants.

REFERENCES

- Alvarce, C. S. (2009). *A ironia e suas refrações: Um estudo sobre a dissonância na paródia e no riso*. Editora UNESP.
- Alderson, P. (2005). As crianças como pesquisadoras: Os efeitos dos direitos de participação sobre a metodologia de pesquisa. *Educação & Sociedade*, 26(91), 419-442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302005000200007>
- Alessi, V. M. (2014). *Rodas de conversa: Uma análise das vozes infantis na perspectiva do círculo de Bakhtin*. Editora UFPR.
- Almeida, B. P., Krüger-Fernandes, L., & Borges, F. T. (2020). De espectadora a criadora: Imaginação, faz de conta e mídia televisiva no desenvolvimento infantil. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 32, e205296-19. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-0310/2020v32205296>
- Bakhtin, M. (2018). *Teoria do romance II: As formas do tempo e do cronotopo*. Editora 34.
- Bakhtin, M. (2011). *Estética da criação verbal*. Martins Fontes.
- Becker, B. (2016). A voz da criança na pesquisa e na sociedade: em busca de metodologias (efetivamente) participativas. *Revista Brasileira de Psicologia*, 3(1), 9-24.
- Bruner, J. (1997). *Atos de significação*. Artes Médicas.
- Bubnova, T. (2011). Voz, sentido e diálogo em Bakhtin. *Bakhtiniana: Revista de Estudos do Discurso*, 6(1), 268-280. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S2176-45732011000200016>
- Campos-Ramos, P. C., & Barbato, S. (2014). Participação de crianças em pesquisas: Uma proposta considerando os avanços teórico-metodológicos. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 19(3), 189-199. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-294X2014000300004>
- Comitê Gestor de Internet no Brasil. (2019). *TIC Kids online Brasil: Pesquisa sobre o uso da internet por crianças e adolescentes no Brasil 2018*. <https://cetic.br/pt/publicacao/pesquisa-sobre-o-uso-da-internet-por-criancas-e-adolescentes-no-brasil-tic-kids-online-brasil-2018/>
- Dalethese, T. (2017). *Faz de conta que todos nós somos youtubers: Crianças e narrativas contemporâneas*. [Unpublished Master's degree dissertation]. Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. Available from: <http://www.unirio.br/ppgedu/DissertaoPPGEduTHAMYRESRIBEIRODALETHESE.pdf>
- Debord, G. (1997). *A sociedade do espetáculo*. Contraponto.
- Delgado, A. C., & Müller, F. (2005). Sociologia da Infância: Pesquisa com crianças. *Educação & Sociedade*, 26(91), 351-360. <https://www.scielo.br/pdf/es/v26n91/a02v2691>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research*. (5th ed.). SAGE.
- Farias, R. N. P., & Müller, F. (2017). A cidade como espaço da infância. *Educação & Realidade*, 42(1), 261-282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-623654542>
- Fernandes, N. (2016). Ética na pesquisa com crianças: Ausências e desafios. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 21(66), 759-779. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782016216639>
- Friedmann, A. (2011). História do percurso da sociologia e da antropologia na área da infância. *Revista Acadêmica de Educação do ISE Vera Cruz*, 1(2), 214-235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14212/veras.vol1.n2.ano2011.art57>
- Garcez, A., Duarte, R., & Eisenberg, Z. (2011). Produção e análise de videografações em pesquisas qualitativas. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 37(2), 249-262. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022011000200003>
- González-Patiño, J. (2011). Rutinas de la infancia urbana mediadas por la tecnología: Un análisis visual. *Papeles de Trabajo sobre Cultura, Educación y Desarrollo Humano*, 7(2), 1-16. <https://revistas.uam.es/ptcedh/article/view/9865>
- Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (2003). *Positioning theory*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Hidalgo-Marí, T., & Segarra-Saavedra, J. (2017) El fenómeno youtuber y su expansión transmedia. Análisis del empoderamiento juvenil en redes sociales. *Fonseca, Journal of Communication*, 15, 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.14201/fjc2017154356>
- Honorato, A., Flores, C., Salvaro, G., & Leite, M. I. (2006). A vídeo-gravação como registro, a devolutiva como procedimento: Pensando sobre estratégias metodológicas na pesquisa com crianças. The 29th annual meeting of the *Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Educação. Annals of the 29th ANPEd*. Caxambu: ANPEd.
- Jobim e Souza, S. (2008). Imagem técnica e estética: Sobre os modos de produção da cultura e da subjetividade no mundo contemporâneo. In A. P. Gouvêa (Org.), *Cine Imaginarium*.

- Imaginário e estética: da arte de fazer psicologia, comunicação e cinema (pp. 265-282). Companhia de Freud: PUC-Rio: FAPERJ.
- Krüger-Fernandes, L. (2018). *Infância urbana e novas tecnologias: Uma análise pela perspectiva da criança*. (Master's degree dissertation, University of Brasília). Repositório Institucional da Universidade de Brasília. <https://repositorio.unb.br/handle/10482/32310>
- Krüger-Fernandes, L., & Borges, F. T. (2020). Infâncias urbanas e tecnologias digitais: Reflexões a partir de uma roda de conversa com crianças. In: A. Versuti, C. Mier & J. Santinello (Orgs.). *Comunicação, Educação e a Construção do Conhecimento* (2ª ed., pp. 154-175). Ria Editorial. <http://www.rieditorial.com/index.php/comunicacao-educacao-e-a-construcao-doconhecimento/>
- Krüger-Fernandes, L., Ribeiro, L. D. M., & Borges, F. T. (2021). Análise Temática Dialógica aplicada a uma roda de conversa com crianças: Uma explanação baseada em relato de pesquisa. *Teias*, 22(64), 226-240. [10.12957/teias.v22n64.50727](https://doi.org/10.12957/teias.v22n64.50727)
- Naves, R., Peres, S. G., Borges, F. F., & Borges, F. T. (2018) A videogravação como recurso metodológico em pesquisa qualitativa para análise de interações. *Brazilian Journal of Education, Technology and Society*, 11(2), 248-261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14571/brajets.v11n2.248-261>
- Maheirie, K., Strappazon, A. L., Müller, F. L. B., Mayorca, D. S., & Barreto, F. R. (2014). Subjetivação, criação e produção audiovisual: Uma experiência em torno de um espetáculo musical. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 26(2), 84-92. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-71822014000600009>
- Martins Filho, A. J., & Barbosa, M. C. S. (2010). Metodologias de pesquisas com crianças. *Revista Reflexão e Ação*, 18(2), 08-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17058/rea.v18i2.1496>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Bro. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved on August 17, 2020. Available from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bro>.
- Orozco-Gómez, G. (2006). Os meios de comunicação de massa na era da internet. *Comunicação & Sociedade*, 3, 373-378. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2316-9125.v11i3p373-378>
- Pires, F. (2007). Ser adulta e pesquisar crianças: explorando possibilidades metodológicas na pesquisa antropológica. *Revista de Antropologia*, 50(1), 225-270. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-77012007000100006>
- Plowman, L., & Stevenson, O. (2012). Using mobile phone diaries to explore children's everyday lives. *Childhood*, 19(4), 539-553. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568212440014>
- Ribeiro, L. D. M., Krüger-Fernandes, L. & Borges, F. T. (2020). Diálogos argumentativos de crianças em processo de alfabetização: Uma análise dialógica. *Revista Educação e Linguagens*, 9(18), 464-488.
- Ribeiro, L. D., Krüger-Fernandes, L. & Borges, F. T. (2020). Roda de conversa mediada por leitura dialógica com crianças: Uma proposta metodológica de pesquisa qualitativa sobre processos argumentativos. In: S. Oliveira e Sá; F. Freitas; P. Castro; M. G. Sannamed; & A. P. Costa (Orgs.). *Investigação qualitativa em educação: Avanços e desafios*. (pp. 83-95). Ludomedia. <https://doi.org/10.36367/ntqr.2.2020.83-95>
- Rose, D. (2003). Análise de imagens em movimento. In M. W. Bauer, & G. Gaskell (Orgs.), *Pesquisa qualitativa com texto, imagem e som* (2ª ed., pp. 343-264). Vozes.
- Silva, C. C., & Borges, F. T. (2017). Análise Temática Dialógica como método de análise de dados verbais em pesquisas qualitativas. *Linhas Críticas*, 23(51), p. 245-267. <https://doi.org/10.26512/lc.v23i51.8221>
- Silva, N. M. V., Santos, C. V. M., & Rhodes, C. A. A. (2014). Do vídeo para o texto escrito: Implicações para a análise da interação. *Psicologia em revista*, 20(3), 513-528. <https://doi.org/10.5752/P.1678-9523.2014V20N3P513>
- Sibilia, P. (2016). *O show do eu: A intimidade como espetáculo*. Contraponto.
- Valsiner, J. (2012). *Fundamentos da psicologia cultural: Mundos da mente, mundos da vida*. Artmed.
- Volóchinov, V. (2017). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*. Editora 34.
- Vygotsky, L. (1934/2020). *Pensamiento y lenguaje (Colección Esenciales)*. Ediciones Paidós.
- Werle, K., & Bellochio, C. R. (2016). Protagonismo infantil, desafios éticos e metodológicos na pesquisa com crianças. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 23(special edition), 227-242. [doi: 10.18764/2178-2229.v23n.especial/p227-242](https://doi.org/10.18764/2178-2229.v23n.especial/p227-242)
- Zittoun, T., & Gillespie, A. (2016). *Imagination in a human and cultural development: Cultural dynamics of social representation*. Routledge.